
Annual Activity Report
Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence
The Inaugural Year AY 2017-2018
Missouri University of Science & Technology

Table of Contents

History of CAFE	3-4
CAFE Staff	4-5
CAFE Mission and Vision	5
Gap Analysis Report.....	6-8
Recommendations.....	6
Actions.....	7
Faculty Events	8-11
New Faculty Orientation.....	8
Early Career Faculty Forums.....	9
CERTI and CAFE Events.....	10
CERTI, CAFE Merger.....	11
Campus Faculty Awards Program.....	12
New Program Development and Enhancement.....	12-14
Miner Master Mentors.....	13
Ten Steps to Teaching Success.....	13
Ten Steps to Research Success.....	14
Promotion of CAFE.....	15
Professional Development of Staff.....	15
Funding.....	15
Appendices	
Gap Analysis Report.....	17-30
Spreadsheet of Attendance at Events.....	31-32
White Paper for Endowment.....	33-34
Missouri University of Science and Technology Promotion and Tenure Suggested Guidelines.....	35-73

HISTORY OF CAFE

Provost Robert Marley initiated the development of the Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence in spring of 2017 to provide a focal point for faculty development from “hire to retire.” However, the concept of having a faculty development center at Missouri S&T started many years prior.

In 2003, Vice Provost of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies Harvest Collier wrote a proposal and established a center to foster student-teacher engagement and encourage strategies to transform S&T’s learning environment: The Center for Educational Research and Teaching Innovation (CERTI) began hosting faculty development events to further that mission.

In 2007, a handful of staff within IT formed an educational technology (ed tech) group tasked with helping faculty with technology in the classroom with an end toward improved learning. CERTI and Ed Tech began to collaborate to offer faculty professional development around teaching.

In 2009, an eLearning committee began looking at blended and online learning with staff from educational technology, IT, and other administrators. The committee’s goal was to identify and possibly address what needed to be adjusted to allow for blended and online learning. This began the start of a campus conversation around other teaching and learning issues.

Through new leadership and reorganization on campus in 2012, a recommendation was put forth by one of the reorganization committees to launch a faculty development center, which was well received by the campus. The eLearning Committee took this to heart and began developing plans that would bring together CERTI with educational technology to provide a teaching and learning center for faculty.

After a number of plans were unsuccessfully submitted to both the campus leadership as well as UM system leadership over several years, Provost Robert Marley convened a committee of faculty and administrators in late 2016 and charged them with developing the parameters and guidelines for a comprehensive faculty development center.

The original CAFE steering committee members and their titles at that time were: Anthony Petroy, assistant vice chancellor of Global Learning; Kate Drowne, associate dean of the College of Arts, Sciences and Business; Daryl Beetner, professor and chair of the electrical and computer engineering department; Mariesa Crow, vice provost of the Office of Sponsored Programs; Diane Hagni, CERTI coordinator; John Myers, associate dean of the College of Engineering and Computing; Melanie Mormile, associate provost for faculty affairs; Bill Fahrenholtz, Curators’ Distinguished Professor of ceramic engineering and director of New Faculty Programs; Jeff Schramm, associate professor and special assistant to the provost for eLearning; V.A. Samaranayake, Curators’ Distinguished Teaching Professor of mathematics and statistics; Caprice Moore, associate provost of administration; and Kris Swenson, professor and chair of English and technical communication.

This committee put forth nominees to the provost about who would lead the center in its inaugural year.

CAFE STAFF

The committee nominated Larry Gragg, Chancellor's Professor of History, to be the inaugural chair, and Wayne Huebner, professor of ceramic engineering, was tapped to be the assistant chair. It was crucial that the chairs represent both colleges. They were tasked with:

- determining what the specific challenges are for faculty development at S&T;
- determining how best to use center resources to address identified challenges;
- performing an exhaustive review of faculty development literature and best practices at other universities.

Responsibilities of the CAFE chair:

- Perform gap analysis of the campus' contributions to faculty education and development;
- Coordinate with existing faculty development and support offices;
- Work with deans and associate deans to apply cross campus and college-specific faculty development opportunities;
- Assume responsibilities of the early career faculty forum head;
- Identify new opportunities for faculty education and development, including external funding.

Responsibilities of the CAFE co-chair:

- Coordinate existing faculty development offerings;
- Provide oversight to:
 - Early Career Faculty Development
 - Teaching and learning programs (including e-Fellows)
 - Non-tenure track faculty development
 - CERTI;
- Serve as co-chair for 18 months, then chair for 18 months.

CAFE Support Staff

Diane Hagni, who served as the CERTI coordinator until fall 2017, retired from full-time work at the University and accepted the position of part-time administrative assistant for CAFE in November 2017. Abby Bigg was hired to replace Diane as the CERTI coordinator in November 2017. She transitioned into CAFE coordinator when CERTI merged into CAFE July 1, 2018.

Key Responsibilities of the Full-Time Coordinator:

- Collaborate with educational technology, the Committee for Educational Research and Teaching Innovation, and campus units to coordinate professional development events about teaching and learning for faculty;
- Develop a faculty professional development event calendar; coordinate, organize and advertise for all CAFE related professional development events
- Administer educational research mini grants, to include coordinating proposal review committee meetings, advertising grant program, updating program documents, collecting letters of intent and proposals, providing assistance to faculty in the program, creating

rubric to evaluate proposals, ensuring deadlines are met, ensuring IRB approval is obtained, updating website;

- Review, revise, and distribute New Faculty Handbook
- Create and distribute CAFE marketing materials
- Coordinate administration of CAFE funding opportunities, including the professional development travel grants for early career faculty, mini-sabbatical program, publishing results from past-mini grants, and special opportunity fund.
- Coordinate development of new CAFE programs such as Ten Steps to Teaching Success, Miner Master Mentors, Ten Steps to Research Success, and the Campus Faculty Awards Process.
- Compile and report bi-annual event attendance data, faculty participation summaries, and program participation numbers;
- Coordinate, organize, and advertise for the early career faculty forum series
- Serve as a liaison to all academic areas that have interaction with CAFE;
- Coordinate program evaluation, assessment and improvement efforts.

Key Responsibilities of Half-Time Administrative Assistant:

- Establish and maintain the CAFE website;
- Reconcile purchase orders, travel and misc. items and reconcile one cards; pay bills;
- Provide financial reports and spreadsheets to CAFE chairs;
- Purchase office supplies and supplies for faculty events;
- Greet visitors, answer phone and respond to email inquiries;
- Manage and maintain office supplies; create an inventory list;
- Schedule CAFE steering committee, staff meetings, retreats and telepresence meetings;
- Attend meetings, take minutes and type up reports;
- Edit content that is going out from CAFE;
- Create and maintain office records; manage office files; update and create new soft and hard copy files as needed;
- Assist in preparing chairs and coordinator for meetings and events with agenda, supporting documentation and correspondence to attendees including updates.

CAFE MISSION AND VISION

One of the first orders of business for the new staff was to develop mission and vision statements for CAFE:

Mission: The Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence promotes the success of Missouri S&T faculty as teaching-scholars at all stages of their careers.

Vision: The Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence will be the focal point for enabling faculty to achieve excellence in, and balance among, the teaching, research and service missions of Missouri S&T.

The CAFÉ Steering Committee approved the mission and vision statements in 2018.

GAP ANALYSIS REPORT

CAFE Chair Larry Gragg interviewed key people on campus who assess faculty performance: the president, chancellor, provost, deans, associate deans, department chairs, and a sample of faculty members who have served on the campus tenure and promotion committee. The chair also interviewed probationary faculty members, associate professors, full professors and non-tenure track professors to learn what they saw as the biggest challenges they faced as they progressed toward their professional goals. In total, more than 80 individuals were interviewed.

The final product of this extensive effort was a comprehensive gap analysis report to the provost on conditions at Missouri S&T and recommendations on how best to enhance faculty development at all stages of faculty careers.

Recommendations to the Campus from the Gap Analysis

1. All departments, if not currently revising expectations, should engage in revisions for tenure with promotion to associate professor and to full professor and expectations for non-tenure track faculty to reach associate teaching professor and teaching professor rank.
2. The campus, notably the senior leadership (and that of the UM System leadership), must make clear what the priorities are for faculty performance. Is the campus on a path to enhance dramatically graduate education and expenditures with accompanying increases in scholarly productivity, or does it intend to continue to be a campus with a balanced portfolio -- to improve undergraduate and graduate student success as well as it continues to improve its research record? Faculty members and department chairs need clear guidance to better utilize their resources. Some chairs indicated that confusion on the central direction the campus is heading has made it difficult to mentor their junior faculty.
3. The campus must do a better job in evaluating teaching effectiveness. As preliminary steps in that direction, the chair of CAFE was a member of a University of Missouri System ad hoc committee that produced a report at the end of the spring 2018 semester recommending an approach more comprehensive than relying upon student evaluations alone. The chair of CAFE has also convened a five-member campus ad hoc committee, which included both the chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Effective Teaching and the campus committee that selects the Outstanding Teaching Awards, to seek ways to improve the current process of student evaluations.
4. The campus would be well served to examine the questions posed in the section labeled *Evaluations of the Tenure and Promotion Process*. A good starting point would be to review "Missouri University of Science and Technology Promotion and Tenure Suggested Guidelines," produced by Dr. Nancy Stone on June 27, 2016.

5. Given the positive response to the question *Should Research in Pedagogy be a Path for Tenure-Track Faculty to Pursue Tenure and Promotion?* the campus should consider this as an option when making hiring decisions.

Actions CAFE Will Take:

1. To address the challenge of providing more effective mentoring, CAFE will establish a cadre of “Master Mentors,” accomplished and respected senior tenured and NTT faculty, to provide a resource for faculty beyond their departmental resources.
2. To address the clear need for more effective teaching dossiers, CAFE will establish a program called “Ten Steps to Teaching Success,” modeled on an effective program with a similar name pioneered at the University of Missouri-St. Louis.
3. To address the clear need to provide more help to probationary faculty as they develop a research record, CAFE will establish a program called “Ten Steps to Research Success” that will follow the “Ten Steps to Teaching Success” model.
4. To address the challenges faced by mid-career faculty, CAFE will establish mini-sabbaticals to fund three-to-four week opportunities to travel to other universities, research facilities, or industry to help faculty develop a new research program or to travel to workshops focused upon teaching for those seeking to develop new courses or ways of delivering those courses.
5. CAFE will continue to fund professional development grants for probationary faculty to augment start up packages for early career faculty to attend teaching or research conferences and continue to develop national and international networks.
6. CAFE will continue to fund the Provost’s eFellows program to encourage further development of new courses and course delivery methods drawing upon the expertise of staff in educational technology.
7. To promote the scholarship of teaching and learning, and continual inquiry into questions about student learning and success, CAFE will continue to fund the Educational Research mini-grants started by the Center for Educational Research and Teaching Innovation.
8. To improve the programs and services of the CAFE, CAFE staff will continue researching the “best practices” in faculty development across the nation.
9. CAFE will continue to host the new faculty orientation, including contingency faculty in the appropriate sessions, and continue the Early Career Faculty Forums to support early career faculty in their transition to Missouri S&T.
10. To support faculty who currently serve in, or aspire to a leadership position, CAFE will develop a leadership training summit, drawing upon the expertise of effective chairs at the Missouri S&T campus and in the University of Missouri System. Specifically, some department chairs requested training in the following:

Helping faculty members prepare effective tenure and promotion dossiers and craft effective cover letters and letters to external reviewers that clearly explain departmental expectations in research, teaching and service.

Help with doing a better job in mentoring faculty at all levels of their career.

Providing advice on what “carrots” exist to help chairs improve faculty productivity and ways to motivate faculty to have a meaningful impact on the campus.

Help in framing advertisements to attract the right faculty for their department and the best way to form an effective search committee.

FACULTY EVENTS

New Faculty Programs

The New Faculty Programs began in 2003 at the request of Chancellor Gary Thomas under the leadership of Dr. Ron Bieniek, professor of physics. The provost's office provided funding for faculty salary and a small budget for food. There was a one- or two-day orientation the week before classes started for new faculty, and then regular monthly meetings during the faculty member's first year, called the Freshman Faculty Forum, featuring different offices on campus.

Dr. Bill Fahrenholtz took over the program in 2013 and worked closely with CERTI and educational technology to provide more hands-on activities and networking both at the orientation and the monthly forums, increasing the regularity of the latter to two per month. He felt that the Office of Sponsored Programs at that time was reaching out adequately to new faculty, so he wanted to put more focus on helping faculty with teaching.

Fahrenholtz also instituted a travel grant fund (through funding from the provost's office) that allowed new faculty to receive up to \$1,000 to travel to a conference or meet with fund managers.

Fahrenholtz stepped down from this position in 2017, and the decision was made by the provost's office to bring New Faculty Programs under the auspices of the newly formed Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence. Larry Gragg and Wayne Huebner coordinated the two-day orientation and the bi-weekly forums throughout academic year 2017-2018, expanding them to include all pre-tenure and pre-promotion full-time faculty, both tenure-track and non-tenure track. The program name was changed to Early Career Faculty Forums to reflect this wider accommodation.

Early Career Faculty Forum

The CAFÉ team established the forum schedule based on successes experienced by previous Freshman Forums and surveys with new faculty. Forums were held

every other Wednesday from 4PM-5PM during the academic year. Presenters across campus were chosen by the CAFE team for each topic.

Fall 2017 Early Career Faculty Forum Schedule and Attendance

Date	Topic	Number of Attendees
August 23	Finding a Mentor	8
September 6	University of Missouri Research Board	10
September 20	Advising 101 - The Basics of Advising Students	11
September 20	New Faculty Reception with the Chancellor @ 5:30PM	
October 4	Scholarly Communications: Spreading the Word	7
October 18	Proposal Budgeting and Cost Sharing	13
November 1	Grant Award Management	10
November 15	Setting Clear Expectations for Your Class	7
November 20	Walking Through Promotion & Tenure at Missouri S&T - 10AM - 2:30PM	16
December 6	The A, B, C's of Distance Education	11

Spring 2018 Early Career Faculty Forum Schedule and Attendance

Date	Topic	Attendance
January 24	Technology Transfer, Intellectual Property & Entrepreneurship	6
February 7	The Role of Research Centers on Campus	9
February 21	Faculty Ethics in Research & Teaching	8
March 7	Managing Classroom Challenges	7
March 21	History of MSM, UMR & S&T - Dinner	16
April 4	What Can Marketing & Communications Do for You?	9

April 18	What's Important in Service?	8
May 2	Promotion & Tenure at Missouri S&T	9
May 15	Getting Started with Canvas	5

Attendance at Forums

Forty-four unique individuals attended at least one forum; 16 individuals attended at least five forums over the academic year, and the average attendance for all forums was 10 people.

Evaluation of Early Career Faculty Forums

After the fall semester, a Qualtrics survey was sent out to all early career faculty who participated in at least one forum to gather feedback on what went well and what could be improved. Survey results (n=11) indicated that 100% of faculty were “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with the events they attended; 82% indicated they would recommend the forums to their colleagues.

After the Spring 2018 semester, the CAFE coordinator conducted a focus group with six of the faculty most active in attending the early career faculty forums over the academic year, including 4 assistant professors (3 from CEC and 1 from CASB), and 2 assistant teaching professors (both representing CASB). This proved a valuable assessment which guided the formation of the format and schedule of the forums for the 2018-2019 academic year. A summary of the results include:

- There was a shared sense of gratitude and appreciation for the forums by all faculty, as colleagues from other institutions do not have such support;
- The most helpful sessions were hands-on, where individual work products were developed out of the session for immediate use by the faculty;
- New faculty indicated that they would like to attend both the forums and the new faculty orientation again next year to make up for sessions they missed, and to reinforce important concepts;
- Several faculty are experiencing sticking points with MyVita and the annual review process;
- Mentoring is a great need. Several faculty have strong mentoring cultures in the department, yet crave a more structured support system.

CERTI and CAFE Faculty Events

In addition to the New Faculty Orientation and the Early Career Faculty Forums, CERTI, CAFE and educational technology partnered to offer many other professional development events for faculty throughout the 2017-2018 academic year. These included:

Event Name	Date & Time	Number of Attendees
Career Path for Non-Tenure Track Faculty	September 12, 3:30-5 PM	19
Curators' Teaching Summit: Teaching Undergraduate & Graduate Students, What's the Difference?	September 26, 12:15 - 1:45PM	46
Conversations at Work: A Faculty Workshop	October 11, 12:00 - 1:00PM	34
Troubleshooting Teams: A Faculty Workshop	October 23, 3:00 - 4:30PM	32
Auto Access Workshop	November 15, online	6
Building Blocks for Course Design Workshops	January 9 & 11, 9:00AM - 2:00PM	26
Webinar: Creating & Maintaining a Robust Faculty Mentoring Program	January 18, 2:00 - 3:30PM	21
What is CAFE? An Informational Session	January 22, 12:00 - 1:00PM	40
Student Engagement at a Distance	February 1, 12:15 - 1:45PM	40
Webinar: Student Mental Health Awareness	February 6, 3:30 - 5:00PM	19
Conversations at Work: Conference Connections Part 2	February 14, 12:00 - 1:00PM	34
Auto Access Webinar	February 27, 10:00 - 11:00AM	18
Encouraging Student Entrepreneurship: A KEEN Sharing Event	February 28, 3:00 - 4:00PM	18
Non-Tenure Track Faculty Affairs - Sharing on CRRs	March 9, 12:00 - 1:30PM	31
Proposal Writing Boot Camp	March 15, 9:00AM - 4:00PM	47
Celebration for Dr. Harvest Collier for the Creation of CERTI	May 11, 3:00 - 4:30PM	30

A complete breakdown of participants by department and college can be found in the appendix.

CERTI AND CAFE MERGER

On July 1, 2018, CERTI officially merged into the CAFE. This merger occurred to provide high quality, coordinated faculty professional development in teaching as well as research, service, leadership and career advancement. CAFE will continue the programs offered previously through CERTI, including the Educational Research Mini Grants program, Curators' Teaching Summit workshops for faculty, and other teaching workshops. All the resources on the CERTI website were integrated into the CAFE website at cafe.mst.edu to provide a one-stop shop for faculty development needs. The CERTI email address was deactivated and any emails sent to certi@mst.edu will receive an automated response directing the sender to cafe@mst.edu. The CAFE office is in the same location as the CERTI office, so no location change occurred.

CAMPUS FACULTY AWARDS PROGRAM

In the spring of 2018, CAFE took over responsibility for the coordination of the Campus Faculty Awards Process. In an effort to enhance the process, a new timeline for the awards was developed with culmination in an Awards Banquet in early December. Resources for the awards process can be found on both the CAFE website and the provost's website where they previously resided. An email was sent to chairs and faculty mid-June 2018 to describe the new streamlined process and earlier timeline, followed by advertisement via the employee eConnection and the student eConnection.

NEW PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

Grants

CAFE developed or renewed a number of grant programs in 2017-2018.

Renewed grant programs

Programs that were renewed through CAFE were the Educational Research Mini-Grant Program, which provided five grants at a funding level of \$24,962 in 2018, and the eFellows grant program, which funded seven faculty members at \$5,000 each (\$35,000 total) to redesign their courses for blended or fully online delivery for the 2019 cycle.

The Early Career Professional Development Travel Grant program was expanded to assist 32 early career faculty with \$31,115 in funding. The typical amount each faculty members was funded was \$1,000, which was leveraged, thus far, into 12 faculty reporting new collaborations developed; two invitations to speak; four opportunities for publications; three opportunities to write joint proposals; three opportunities to speak with program managers, and one new research project involving several hundred thousand dollars' worth of funding coming to campus. One-page reports on what transpired as a result of the grants can be found on the CAFE website at <http://cafe.mst.edu/fundingprograms/professionaldevelopmentgrants/>.

Newly developed grant programs

The new programs developed by CAFE in AY 2017-2018 included the Special Opportunity Fund, which assisted three faculty members with \$3,069 total thus far; the Mini-Sabbatical Grant, which provided opportunities for six faculty (two associate professors, three assistant professors and one professor) to take mini-sabbaticals, with funding of \$40,068; and the Publishing Past Results grant, which helped one faculty member with \$1,000.

In total, \$135,214 was awarded in grants through the various programs.

Other ways that CAFE assisted in faculty development through funding was a \$1,000 committed to the 2018 UMSL Focus on Teaching and Technology Conference (which waives the conference fee for all S&T faculty and staff); \$3,000 to CASB to help the departments that use SPSS software be able to obtain that license for a year since it was no longer funded through IT; and \$5,000 to Global Learning for study abroad course development fund.

CAFE awarded \$9,000 to academic units during the 2018 fiscal year. In total, \$144,000 was provided to faculty or departments to assist in faculty development.

Miner Master Mentors

The gap analysis research revealed that the quality of mentoring varied among departments and, specifically, more mentoring was needed for post-tenure faculty. As a result, CAFE will launch the Miner Master Mentors (M³) program in fall 2018 to provide confidential mentoring by a cadre of accomplished and respected Missouri S&T faculty. Master Mentors is a completely voluntary program and confidential for mentees. The mentors are available as a resource to all tenure-track, tenured, non-tenure track, and contingent faculty beyond their S&T departmental resources. The Master Mentors have a collective breadth of expertise to provide meaningful and accurate advice and information regarding all aspects of faculty professional development, including but not limited to:

- Research
- Teaching
- Service & Leadership
- Promotion and Tenure
- Non-Tenure Track Faculty Affairs
- Service Learning
- Early Career Challenges

The inaugural Master Mentors are: Mariesa Crow, Xiaoping Du, Bill Fahrenholtz, Stephen Gao, Irina Ivliyeva, Merilee Krueger, Scott Miller, Melanie Mormile, Dan Reardon, Joan Schuman and Bob Schwartz. The CAFE chairs will also serve as Master Mentors.

Ten Steps to Teaching Success

The gap analysis research revealed a clear need for more effective teaching dossiers. As a result, CAFE is developing a program called “Ten Steps to Teaching Success,” modeled on an effective program with a similar name pioneered by Andy Goodman, Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. The main purpose of the program is to provide a path for all tenure-track and non-tenure track professors to try new teaching strategies, explore best teaching practices, and practice reflective teaching. This program is designed to be completed over a five year period.

It includes both required and optional components, for a total of ten experiences. The required components are:

1. Building Blocks workshop for course alignment with Educational Technology instructional designers (5 hour workshop)
2. Digital Literacy Lightning Rounds (1 hour workshop)
3. Mid-Semester Feedback conducted through Educational Technology
4. Teaching Partners Program or two classroom observations with reflection
5. A comprehensive teaching philosophy

Option components include attending general or disciplinary teaching conferences, attending other S&T teaching workshops conducted by CAFE or Educational Technology, participating in the Educational Research Mini-Grant program, the Provost eFellows program, or a diversity and inclusion mini-grant; as well as the Accent Modification Program, the Experiential/Service Learning Symposium, or classroom observation.

Currently this is a working draft that will be reviewed by department chairs and campus constituents to be revised. The goal is to roll out the program spring semester of 2019.

Ten Steps to Research Success

In order to maintain balance between services provided for teaching and research, CAFE is developing a Ten Steps to Research Success program to parallel that of the Ten Steps to Teaching Success program.

It includes both required and optional components, for a total of ten experiences. The required components are recommended to be:

1. Development of a one- or two-page white paper or book prospectus
2. Proposal Writing Boot Camp
3. Marketing Ideas Through Oral Communication seminar
4. Identifying Research Sponsors seminar
5. Pre-Award Processes seminar
6. Post-Award Processes seminar

Similar to the Ten Steps to Teaching Success, the program will be vetted through the department chairs and other campus constituents before being launched.

PROMOTIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR CAFE

A number of promotional items were developed to help get the word out about CAFE, including creating a logo, printed brochures, event banners, a website (cafe.mst.edu), a faculty lunch event entitled, "What Is CAFE?" coffee mugs, an online newsletter and polo shirts for staff.

In April 2018, the CAFE staff visited UMSL Center for Teaching and Learning and met with director Andy Goodman and staff.

In May 2018, staff members Abby Bigg and Diane Hagni attended the Celebration of Teaching Conference at University of Missouri-Columbia and attended a workshop on the STEM classroom as well as heard keynote speaker Dr. Eric Mazur.

In June 2018, Abby Bigg attended the Association for the Assessment of Learning in Higher Education in Salt Lake City.

FUNDING

In October 2017 the Provost asked the CAFE leadership to develop a white paper for a potential donor to CAFE. CAFE chairs submitted a white paper to the provost's office regarding an endowment for CAFE. See the appendix for more information.

Appendices

Appendix A: Gap Analysis Report

June 15, 2018

Prepared by Dr. Larry Gragg
Chair

Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence

Gap Analysis on Faculty Development at Missouri University of Science and Technology

The most critical element in the first year of the Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence (CAFE) has been the completion of a gap analysis regarding campus support of faculty development. What has Missouri S&T done well and where has the campus fallen short? What should CAFE do to enhance the performance of faculty?

This report, a response to those questions, is based largely upon 80 interviews. Thirty-one of the interviews were with those who assess faculty performance, ranging from University of Missouri President Mun Choi, Missouri S&T Interim Chancellor Chris Maples, and Provost Robert Marley down through deans, associate deans, department chairs and the four faculty members who last chaired the campus tenure and promotion committee. The rest of the interviews were with full-time faculty at all ranks, including non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty. In addition, three surveys of campus faculty have been helpful: a 2015 NTT survey, a 2016 Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey, and a 2017 campus climate survey.

Expectations for Tenure and Promotion

The interviews and survey results demonstrate that probationary faculty generally have a fair grasp of their department's expectations in teaching, research and service for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

In research, they know that it is essential to maintain an active and consistent research agenda. However, they do not always have a sense of the specific metrics they need to hit for the annual average of sponsored research or in the average number of articles needed each year. Faculty in the disciplines requiring the publication of monographs in addition to journal articles do understand the necessity of publication of at least one book in a university press and several articles by their tenure year. In most disciplines the faculty understand the imperative of obtaining external grants to support their research agenda although the precise average figure per year is not clear. Clarity is least evident in those departments without written expectations, those that have experienced recent changes in department chairs, or those that are engaged in revising their written expectations.

In teaching, the workloads, which varied among the campus departments, were mostly stable for probationary faculty. As to quality of their teaching, most understand that they must exhibit continuous improvement in student learning and, in some cases, they understand that their student evaluation averages must be at or above the department and campus average.

In service, most faculty had minimal expectations so that they could enhance their research record.

Similarly, most assistant teaching faculty have a clear sense of expectations for them.¹ The typical teaching load for NTT faculty is three courses per semester, along with other duties that range from advising students and running laboratories to assuming accreditation responsibilities and serving on select department and campus committees.

While assistant professors and assistant teaching professors believe that they understand what is expected of them, at all levels of administration there are concerns with departmental expectations for teaching, research and service for probationary faculty. Some departments have crafted clear expectations for all three areas; others have not. That has led to a sense that the campus is suffering from inconsistency in the rigor of expectations. Complicating this problem is the belief that some who serve on the campus tenure and promotion committee too often evaluate dossiers through the lens of their department's expectations. This has made it imperative that department chairs craft cover letters that help both campus committee members and those who write external evaluation letters understand what the expectations are in teaching, research and service in their respective departments.

¹ Missouri University of Science and Technology Campus Climate Research Study, (Rankin and Associates, September 2017), 177. The COACHE survey results indicated that faculty saw "Expectations for Tenure" as a strength for the campus. See "Tenure and Promotion," Results of the COACHE Survey, 2016.

The widely held belief among associate professors, evidenced by both interviews with them and survey responses, is that departments have done a much better job of identifying expectations for mandatory tenure cases than for full professor cases. In many departments, there are no metrics to enable faculty members to gauge their progress. While it is evident that their research record will count the most, several faculty members indicated that there are increasing expectations for teaching. For example, departments expect them to develop new courses to enhance the curriculum of their majors while they maintain good student evaluation scores. In addition, there is a greater advising load once faculty become associate professors. Some explain that their department's expectations are evolving in the wake of the developing workload models.

Still, there was a general agreement that successful candidates for full professor must develop *independent, internationally recognized* records of research. There was also agreement that successful cases are inevitably built upon the research record of the candidate. Outstanding teaching will not suffice, but a poor teaching record could prevent campus committee approval. As one faculty member explained, "Great teaching cannot save you, but poor teaching can kill you."

Evaluation of Third-Year Reviews

All who assess faculty performance believe that there is value in a careful review of probationary faculty members beyond their annual reviews within their departments because such a process provides the perspectives of the dean or associate dean of the College and that of a member of the campus tenure and promotion committee. Most perceive the process is one that leads to helpful feedback for the faculty member under review. However, there is concern, particularly in the College of Engineering and Computing, that having the review in the third year is too late to benefit a probationary faculty member. They explain that it is difficult for many to catch up on sponsored research or to get a Ph.D. student at that stage. Those critical of the third-year review argue for a sequence of reviews in the second and fourth years. The first should be a "counseling" session -- one that acknowledges the progress that the candidate has made in teaching and research -- but also provides specific advice in areas that require improvement. For those who fall short of expectations, the department and College should offer appropriate mentoring and resources. The second session should be one that results in a frank assessment of the candidate's prospects for a successful mandatory tenure year. However, in the College of Arts, Sciences, and Business, three department chairs opposed the idea of a second-year review. They pointed out that in their disciplines two years is insufficient to gain a sense of a researcher's potential because some journals have a review process that is often quite lengthy with multiple revisions of manuscripts required. In addition, it usually takes a professor in the humanities more than two years to complete a monograph.

Most faculty who recently completed their third-year reviews, despite some reservations about some aspects of the process, saw it as helpful in their progress toward the mandatory tenure year. In particular, they appreciated the specific feedback the committee provided, which

they saw as fair. For example, in some cases, the committee recommended that the faculty member not pursue multiple service activities or teach fewer courses to enable them to focus on their research efforts. In another case, the committee recommended that the candidate pursue external funding to support their research agenda. Some had accurately anticipated the outcome of the review because of the extensive annual reviews done by their department chairs. One faculty member was concerned going into the process because this person had heard that the outcomes tended to be negative and was pleased to discover the contrary. In one case, the faculty member was confused because the chair's letter was more negative than the tone of the discussion in the meeting. Those who had an opinion were split on whether the third or fourth year was the best for such a review. On balance, almost all saw the process as constructive, a useful way to learn about their strengths and areas needing work.

Evaluation of the Tenure and Promotion Process

The tenure and promotion process, at best, is challenging for all involved because there are separate deliberations at the department, area and campus levels. The area and campus committees include faculty from multiple departments who regularly see research dossiers in areas of specialization for which they have little or no familiarity. In some cases, faculty members participating in the process exercise three votes on an individual case -- at the department, area and campus levels. Once a case reaches the campus tenure and promotion committee, the faculty members involved are heavily reliant upon the department chair's cover letter and the external letters. Increasingly, they are also drawing upon the various recently developed metrics such as, h-index, Scopus, and Academic Analytics to assess the developing national reputation of a candidate.

Many concerns and questions emerged about the process:

1. There is not always a clear link between the written tenure and promotion policy and the decision reached by a department.
2. There may be too-heavy a reliance upon h-index, Scopus, and Academic Analytics as a short cut in assessing research records.
3. Department chairs' cover letters must be clear to external letter writers and campus committee members what the expectations are in their department for teaching, research and service accomplishments.
4. Should a faculty member have more than one vote in the tenure and promotion process? Would it be better to permit a faculty member to be part of the process at more than one level, but with only one vote? **In February 2018, Faculty Senate members voted to keep the current process permitting a faculty member to vote at each level of consideration in the tenure and promotion process.²**
5. There is little common ground for judging research records in the different disciplines.

² Faculty Senate Minutes, February 8, 2018, 6.

6. Departments, in some cases, are not getting “appropriate” people to write letters. Some are from institutions that have much higher expectations for tenure. It is not always clear what the relationship of the letter author is to the candidate. Some letters are too short to help the committee understand the candidate’s national standing.
7. It is not clear in some cases what the importance of the order of authors represents in cases. Is it more important to be first author or last author? Also, in too many cases, committee members could not discern what contribution the candidate was making to the scholarly output when there were papers with multiple-authors making up the research dossier.
8. Some are concerned with candidates publishing in new or relatively new journals just to increase the number of publications. There is also a concern with journals which require a payment to publish.
9. Some dossiers do not include an explanation of the relative importance of conference papers v. journal articles v. books. This is critical because their importance varies among academic disciplines.
10. Candidates’ statements and CVs do not always explain clearly what they have done since they arrived at S&T or what they have done since they became an associate professor.

Evaluation of Teaching and Teaching Dossiers for Tenure and Promotion Cases

Satisfaction varies considerably with the quality of teaching dossiers in tenure and promotion cases because there is no widely accepted definition of effective teaching nor widespread agreement on how to measure teaching effectiveness. Most faculty members argue that the campus does a poor job on both counts, but largely they are critical because of the heavy reliance upon student evaluation scores. As one faculty member explained, the student evaluation scores, at best, measure how students view a professor’s work, but they do not demonstrate how effective a professor is in helping students learn more effectively. The low response rates on the student evaluations exacerbate the situation. There is also some concern that a few professors “game” the situation with incentives to students as well as the contention that the current instrument does not ask the right types of questions. On balance, most who assess faculty performance are dissatisfied with the teaching dossiers that come forward for third-year reviews and tenure and promotion cases.

Those who assess faculty performance have identified elements that would contribute to good teaching dossiers, documents that include a multi-dimensional inventory of activities. Beyond a complete inclusion of student evaluations, they include many of the following: a clear departmental statement of expectations in teaching; a clear assessment of goals and approaches in teaching by the candidate; peer assessment letters that address both mastery of content and capability in pedagogy from several semesters, not only from the previous year; a thorough report from a departmental teaching mentoring team; a record of frequent participation in

workshops both on campus through the Committee for Educational Research and Teaching Innovation (CERTI) and Educational Technology or the annual Teaching and Learning Technology Conference, and off-campus teaching workshops; examples of trying new teaching methods and technologies that led to greater student success; surveys of alumni or employers; and the implementation of service learning into one's courses. In all, a good teaching dossier demonstrates an engagement with the learning process, an engagement that has led to student success.

A minority view emerged that regardless of discipline, probationary faculty should not focus upon teaching because a strong research record is much more important. Strength in one's research record will make one's name known beyond the campus; rarely will an excellent teaching record do that unless the person engages in research in pedagogy.

Evaluation of Research Productivity on Campus

A majority of department chairs are pleased with the research dossiers in their department for third-year reviews and tenure and promotion cases, but others acknowledge that their faculty are neither attracting an adequate level of external support nor publishing an adequate number of articles in the appropriate journals. A few who look across campus at the faculty's research record are concerned that expectations in some departments are too low and that too often there is a willingness to accept a weak research record, fearing a loss of a faculty line. Those who monitor external funding conclude that the percentage of faculty without sponsored research is between 50 and 60 percent.

There are several views on how to increase sponsored research and publications that will enhance both a faculty member's national reputation and the visibility of the institution. These include: changing the culture in each department to one with ever-higher expectations; upper administration backing department chairs who push their faculty to reach higher research expectations; encouraging new faculty to engage less in peer mentoring on grant proposals and focus upon consulting experienced senior faculty for assistance; and providing more incentives on campus for outstanding scholarly achievement, such as better raises for the "rising stars."

As with teaching, it is not always clear that those assessing faculty performance, particularly on the campus tenure and promotion committee, understand the challenges of research in each department. Too often members of that committee examine research productivity of a candidate through the lens of their own discipline rather than respecting the particular expectations of that candidate's discipline and department. For example, some faculty members pointed out that not all departments have Ph.D. programs and thus faculty members in those departments lack the assistance that graduate students provide, but are often compared to departments that do have Ph.D. programs.

The most common criticism, however, at all three ranks of professors, is that there is too much emphasis placed upon expenditures and not enough on publications, in particular, the quality of the publications not necessarily the number of publications. A common concern is that the campus is moving away from valuing the quality of candidates' scholarly work and its

impact. To be sure, the campus uses a number of metrics: number of Ph.D. and M.S. students graduated, presentations at conferences, number of journal articles and books, and number of citations of a faculty member's work. However, collectively, some argue that these metrics do not address scholarly excellence, and those faculty members rely more upon external letters to draw conclusions about excellence.

Some chairs, while acknowledging the need for better research productivity, worry that the current focus on increasing sponsored research will harm the long tradition of the campus' commitment to quality undergraduate teaching.

Barriers in Progress to Tenure and Promotion

Among probationary faculty, only one mentioned that he or she had yet to encounter barriers. However, most noted two or more barriers to their progress. They ranged from lack of adequate lab space, large classes and classroom management challenges to conflicting goals of campus and UM System leadership. The most common perceived barriers for probationary faculty were more help in preparing proposals to NSF and NIH and the need for a stronger pool of Ph.D. students.

Associate professors identified several barriers, including an absence of a culture in the department that promotes the success of all faculty; heavy teaching loads; too few or no teaching assistants; an inadequate infrastructure to support research; too little time to devote to research; too few qualified Ph.D. students; having enough time to be successful in multiple research, teaching, and service projects; dealing with a frustration that excellence in teaching does not lead to promotion to full professor; and a perception that gender, race and religion has hindered some faculty. Almost one-third of the associate professors indicated that the chief barrier was their own choices. Rather than aggressively pursuing a research agenda, they found greater professional satisfaction in improving their courses and taking on substantial service obligations for the department and campus, including outreach activities.

Almost half of the full professors explained that had encountered no barriers, and that faculty members at times were responsible for not gaining promotion to full professor because they did not take the initiative in developing an appropriately strong scholarly record.

Quality of Mentoring on Campus

All who assess faculty performance acknowledge the importance of mentoring for faculty, particularly for probationary faculty, however, the approaches to mentoring vary across the campus. In some departments the chair is the critical figure, making clear to new faculty members their departmental expectations and consistently monitoring faculty performance. Other departments utilize an informal process encouraging new faculty members to engage with a number of senior faculty members on questions and concerns dealing with both teaching and research. A few departments have a formal mentoring process including a teaching mentoring team and a research mentoring team. Both provide annual reports to the department chair.

Although there were a few notable exceptions, the majority of faculty members interviewed agreed that they had the benefit of feedback from their departments on their progress or lack thereof toward tenure. Beyond these efforts, some probationary faculty take the initiative to seek either teaching or research mentors outside of their department both on and off campus.³ Nearly 60 percent of those responding to the 2017 campus climate survey either “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they “felt supported and mentored during the tenure-track years.”⁴

Although most faculty conclude that mentoring is largely effective for probationary faculty, they argue that there is little help for associate professors to better prepare them to build an appropriate case for full professor.⁵ Associate professors who experienced formal feedback identified the department chair as the key individual. These chairs normally, in their annual reviews of faculty, explained what associate professors needed to do to be successful; for example, increase the number of publications or the number of grants. Others indicated that annual reviews were of slight help -- just a pat on the back that they were meeting expectations -- but not indicating if the faculty member was on track to a successful promotion case. A clear majority indicated that they never had formal feedback on their progress to full professor. However, for several, informal mentoring from senior colleagues was quite helpful. In a handful of cases, probationary faculty members reported no feedback at all, formal or informal.

Nature of Assistance from Departments, Colleges, Campus and UM System

Departments have assisted virtually all probationary faculty with limited teaching and service loads, adequate start-up packages, funds for travel or new software, and good labs. In one case, a faculty member benefited from having both a teaching mentoring team and research mentoring team. A few noted that they had not had help from either their College office or the campus. However, most noted the College’s role in their start-up package, or in providing seed money for grant proposals, or for funding undergraduate research, or for travel funds for a class trip. Most acknowledge the campus’s role in helpful CERTI workshops, teaching mini-grants, and the assistance of educational technology. Several have grants or are applying for grants from the UM System Research Board.

Almost all associate professors identified help from their department, their College office, the campus, or the UM System in their quest to become a full professor. Department chairs were noted as being most helpful in providing reduced teaching loads, funds for travel, or endorsing sabbatical leaves. Deans have helped with course buy-outs and funds to offset

³ One among those who assess faculty performance noted a concern that too often probationary faculty seek mentoring advice from peers rather than from senior faculty particularly in grant preparation. Another has observed that there too often is a lack of urgency among assistant professors in addressing the challenges in meeting the requirements for tenure.

⁴ Climate Research Study, 171.

⁵ “Tenure and Promotion,” COACHE results indicated that this was a concern for expectations as a teacher, a scholar, an advisor and a colleague.

publication costs and to support travel. CERTI, educational technology, and the Teaching and Learning Conference have been significant for some. The UM System Leadership Development Program and the New Faculty Scholars program also played a role for a few. A couple noted little or no help from the College office or the campus, but, as one faculty member explained, they expected none.

Most NTT faculty have had various types of support from their departments: clear policies and expectations, funds for travel to workshops, informal mentoring from senior colleagues, and freedom to experiment with courses. In some instances, College offices have assisted NTT faculty with some limited travel funds. Campus support, through CERTI, educational technology, eFellows, and mini-grants has been substantial for NTT faculty. Most importantly, a majority of NTT faculty have been treated well by their departmental colleagues and have not been viewed as “second class” citizens.⁶

The Challenge of the Mid-Career Professor

All agreed that the campus has several faculty members who have hit a point in their career where they are no longer making progress toward promotion to full professor. A few characterize them as running out the clock, or just hanging on, however, most see their colleagues as faculty members who want to continue making a contribution to their department and the campus.

Many offered explanations:

1. Some associate professors have misconceptions about what is needed to achieve full professorship.
2. Some associate professors have unrealistic understandings of how they are doing, not understanding that their record does not measure up to the achievements of full professors in their department.
3. There appears to be little mentoring for those seeking promotion to full professor.
4. Some are exhausted after the stressful mandatory tenure year.
5. Funding sources they had depended upon are no longer available.
6. Some feel underappreciated, particularly in compensation, become demoralized, and give up. Seeing new assistant professors coming in at higher salaries exacerbates the problem.

Suggested ways to address the situation are as various as the explanations for why it happens:

1. A department chair or a mentor could prevent some of these issues by meeting with a faculty member soon after they have gained tenure with promotion to associate professor and help them develop a plan to help make promotion to full professor. Newly minted associate professors are

⁶ The 2015 NTT Survey indicated that those faculty perceived that segments of the campus valued them differently. 83% felt respected by their students, 57% believed that department colleagues valued them, but only 31% felt that the campus administration valued them. See Executive Summary of Questionnaire for Non-Tenure Track Faculty, 2015.

often too ambitious. They may want to have an opportunity for leadership positions, but neglect to do the things essential to achieve that -- developing a record that will gain them promotion to full professor. They need mentoring to help them plan how to realistically realize their goals.

2. For those who make little progress, despite such mentoring, it must be made clear that they are the ones who must take the initiative. It cannot and should not be imposed by a department chair because they have little leverage to force faculty members to make meaningful changes.

3. Once a faculty member expresses an interest in moving forward, it is essential to determine what makes them passionate about their work -- research, teaching, service, or leadership. One approach could be to ask such a faculty member what campus or UM System award -- teaching, research, or service -- appeals to them and then help them work toward that goal.

4. A chair could provide release time and resources to help them “jump start” their research.

5. A chair can help by re-assigning duties. If that reassignment moves them from significant research, there must still be a possibility for rewards from the department and the campus.

Examples of meaningful activities include helping a department prepare for an accreditation review, working with student design teams, assisting with an organization like Engineers without Borders, taking the lead in the department’s assessment review, chairing significant searches, serving as an associate chair, or becoming a mentor to junior faculty. Regardless of what it may be, most faculty members want to make an “authentic contribution” to their department and the campus.

Finally, some concluded that they saw no problem with faculty members retiring as associate professors as long as they continued to make valuable contributions to the success of their students and colleagues.

Should Research in Pedagogy be a Path for Tenure-Track Faculty to Pursue Tenure and Promotion?

While it is not unanimous, there is strong sentiment for this as an option for tenure-track faculty. However, those who support it quickly add that such a faculty member would have to replicate what traditional tenure-track faculty members have done. That is, they would have to demonstrate a national reputation for their research. The ways this could be demonstrated might include publishing the results of their research in the appropriate, top peer-reviewed journals on pedagogy in their field; securing funding for their research; developing digitally assisted learning approaches; organizing teaching workshops; giving plenary talks at national meetings, or developing successful study abroad opportunities. In other words, faculty members taking this approach must demonstrate that they are contributing new knowledge and that they have developed a national impact through their research.

Having such a faculty member in a department would be one meaningful way to enhance instruction, because this faculty member could provide guidance on best practices in their particular discipline. Some chairs, however, cautioned that providing such an opportunity for faculty would require a cultural shift in some, if not most, departments and would require

substantial backing from the administration. A few of the faculty members who supported the idea worried that there may not be an adequate number of journals to provide an outlet for research in pedagogy. Others were supportive as long as the faculty member pursuing this path devoted part of their research time to traditional research in their particular discipline to better inform their research in pedagogy. Still, almost all endorsed the idea. As one professor noted, there are professors at Purdue, North Carolina State, Florida, and Colorado State in engineering who have successfully adopted this approach.

Interest in Seeking an Administrative Position

Faculty members at all levels are almost equally split on this. The positions that most attracted those who have an interest in serving in an administrative role are those that advance student success or the possibility of becoming a department chair, associate dean or dean. Most agreed that the campus provides little support or training for those considering seeking an administrative position. Further, one faculty member worried that if the campus did invest resources in training people for administrative positions, the few opportunities for leadership on the campus might lead to the departure of some talented people.

Departmental Cultures

There is a great range of department cultures on the campus. In some departments there is an almost toxic culture where promotions to full professor are rare, or there is a sense that associate professors have been mistreated, or there is a perception that the current senior faculty have raised expectations higher than those they had faced when seeking promotion to full professor. It is no surprise that associate professors in those departments are intensely bitter and no longer make the effort required for promotion. Most faculty, however, point out that their department “definitely” or “absolutely” has a supportive culture. In those departments, it is an expectation that associate professors will move forward successfully. Chairs do all that they can and senior colleagues are excellent mentors in those departments. The chances of such a culture existing largely is reliant upon who is serving as chair and the quality of recent faculty hires. However, there are departments where, despite an encouraging culture, some associate professors have not made sufficient strides in developing international reputations.

Recommendations

Based on these findings, the CAFE makes the following recommendations to improve support for faculty at Missouri S&T:

1. All departments, if not currently revising expectations, should engage in revisions for tenure with promotion to associate professor and to full professor and expectations for non-tenure track faculty to reach associate teaching professor and teaching professor rank.

2. The campus, notably the senior leadership (and that of the UM System leadership), must make clear what the priorities are for faculty performance. Is the campus on a path to enhance dramatically graduate education and expenditures with accompanying increases in scholarly productivity, or does it intend to continue to be a campus with a balanced portfolio -- to improve undergraduate and graduate student success as well as it continues to improve its research record? Faculty members and department chairs need clear guidance to better utilize their resources. Some chairs indicated that confusion on the central direction the campus will be heading has made it difficult to mentor their junior faculty.
3. The campus must do a better job in evaluating teaching effectiveness. As preliminary steps in that direction, the chair of CAFE is a member of a University of Missouri System ad hoc committee working to produce a report at the end of the spring 2018 semester recommending an approach more comprehensive than relying upon student evaluations alone. The chair of CAFE has also convened a five-member campus ad hoc committee, which included both the chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on Effective Teaching and the campus committee that selects the Outstanding Teaching Awards, to seek ways to improve the current process of student evaluations.
4. The campus would be well served to examine the questions posed in the section labeled **Evaluations of the Tenure and Promotion Process**. A good starting point would be to review “Missouri University of Science and Technology Promotion and Tenure Suggested Guidelines,” produced by Dr. Nancy Stone on June 27, 2016.
5. Given the response to the question **Should Research in Pedagogy be a Path for Tenure-Track Faculty to Pursue Tenure and Promotion?**, the campus should consider this as an option when making hiring decisions.

Actions CAFE Will Take

1. To address the challenge of providing more effective mentoring, CAFE will establish a cadre of “Master Mentors,” accomplished and respected senior tenured and NTT faculty, to provide a resource for faculty beyond their departmental resources.
2. To address the clear need for more effective teaching dossiers, CAFE will establish a program called “Ten Steps to Teaching Success,” modeled on an effective program with a similar name pioneered at the University of Missouri-St. Louis.
3. To address the clear need to provide more help to probationary faculty as they develop a research record, CAFE will establish a program called “Ten Steps to Research Success” that will follow the “Ten Steps to Teaching Success” model.
4. To address the challenges faced by mid-career faculty, CAFE will establish mini-sabbaticals to fund three-to-four week opportunities to travel to other universities, research facilities, or industry to help faculty develop a new research program or to fund three- to four-week opportunities (including NTT faculty) to travel to workshops focused upon teaching for those seeking to develop new courses or ways of delivering those courses.

5. CAFE will continue to fund professional development grants for probationary faculty to augment start up packages for early career faculty to attend teaching or research conferences and continue to develop national and international networks.
6. CAFE will continue to fund the Provost's eFellows program to encourage further development of new courses and course delivery methods drawing upon the expertise of staff in educational technology.
7. To promote the scholarship of teaching and learning, and continual inquiry into questions about student learning and success, CAFE will continue to fund the Educational Research mini-grants started by the Center for Educational Research and Teaching Innovation.
8. To improve the programs and services of the CAFE, CAFE staff will continue researching the "best practices" in faculty development across the nation.
9. CAFE will continue to host the new faculty orientation, including contingency faculty in the appropriate sessions, and continue the Early Career Faculty Forums to support early career faculty in their transition to Missouri S&T.
10. To support faculty who current serve in, or aspire to a leadership position, CAFE will develop a leadership training summit, drawing upon the expertise of effective chairs at the Missouri S&T campus and in the University of Missouri System. Specifically, some department chairs requested training in the following:
 - Helping faculty members preparing effective tenure and promotion dossiers and crafting effective cover letters and letters to external reviewers that clearly explain departmental expectations in research, teaching and service.
 - Help with doing a better job in mentoring faculty at all levels of their career.
 - Providing advice on what "carrots" exist to help chairs improve faculty productivity and ways to motivate faculty to have a meaningful impact on the campus.
 - Help in framing advertisements to attract the right faculty for their department and the best way to form an effective search committee.

List of Interviewees

To those who graciously agreed to be interviewed for this project, my thanks. They understood that I would list their names in the report, and I assured them that I would not link their names to any of the comments above.

Mun Choi
 Chris Maples
 Robert Marley
 Richard Brow
 Steve Roberts
 Daniel Forciniti
 Cihan Dagli
 David Duvernell
 Kate Drowne
 Bruce McMillin

Yinfa Ma
 John Myers
 John McManus
 George Markowsky
 Jerry Cohen
 Joel Burken
 David Borrok
 Muthana Al-Dahan
 Braden Lusk
 Jim Drallmeier

Shannon Fogg
 Susan Murray
 Keng Siau
 Kris Swenson
 Audra Merfeld-Langston
 Greg Hilmas
 Matt O'Keefe
 Richard Wlezien
 Steve Clark
 Dan Waddill

Lu Yiu
Yishu Zhou
Jason Murphy
Justin Pope
David Samson
Daozhi Han
James Musser
Michelle Schwartz
Alanna Krolkowski
Clayton Price
Terry Robertson
Scott Miller
Christi Luks
Rachel Schneider
Katie Shannon
Amardeep Kaur
Cheng Wang
Kate Sheppard
Joshua Schlegel
Petra DeWitt
Jonghyun Park
Fateme Rezaei
Julie Semon
Ana Ichim
Nathan Twyman
Hongxian Zhang
Dan Reardon
Steve Raper
David Wright
Ron Frank
Klaus Woelk
Shari Dunn-Norman
David Enke
Shoaib Usman
David Westenberg
Doug Ludlow
Doug Bristow
Francisca Oboh-Ikuenobe
Mariesa Crow
Kelly Liu
Michael Davis
Thomas Vojta
Gayla Olbricht
Diana Ahmad
Nancy Stone
Fiona Nah

Melanie Mormile
Mark Fitch
Richard Hall

Appendix B: Spreadsheet of Attendance

Event Name	Fall 2017 Attendance by Dept																								
	College of Engineering and Computing							College of Arts, Science and Business																	
Attendance total	CEC	Care	Chemical/bi	Chem Eng	Comp Sci	ECE	EMSE	GGPE	MAE	MNE	MSE	CASB	ALP	Biological	BIT	Chemistry	Economics	English/Tech	Comm	History/Political Sci	Math	Physics	Psychological	Teacher Ed	Other/Admin
Career Path for Non-Tenure Track Faculty	19	8	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	1
Curators' Teaching Summing: Teaching Undergraduate and Graduate Students - What's the Difference?	46	32	2	3	3	2	5	5	7	5	11	1	3	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	2		3	
Conversations @ Work: A Faculty Workshop	34	11	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	19	4					10	10	1	1	1	2	1	4	
Troubleshooting Teams: A Faculty Workshop	32	19	3	1	1	2	3	3	3	2	7	3	1				2			1				6	
Auto Access Webinar	6	2					1			1	4	1		2	1										
Walking Through Promotion and Tenure	28	13		2	1	1	1	5	4	4	15	2	2		1		1	1	1	2	1	4	1		
Fall 2017 Semester Total Occurrences by Department	165	85	10	5	4	8	5	11	16	11	66	11	4	5	5	2	15	2	15	5	5	3	8	3	14

Spring 2018 Attendance by Department

Event Name	College of Engineering and Computing										College of Arts, Science and Business														
	Attendance Total	CEC	CAFE	Chemical/biochem Eng	Comp Sci	ECE	EMASE	GPPE	MAE	MNE	MSE	CASB	ALP	Biological	BIT	Chemistry	Economics	English/Tech Comm	History/Political Sci	Math	Physics	Psychological	Teacher Ed	Other/Admin	
Building Blocks (2 sessions)	26	10	2	1	2	2	3				11	4	1						1	1	1	2	1	5	
Using iThenticate	9	5			2				1	2	1	1												3	
Webinar: Creating & Maintaining a Robust Faculty Mentoring Program	21	7	1	3	1	1				1	11	1	2		1			3		2	1	1	3		
What is CAFE? An Informational Session	40	15	3	2		1	4	3		1	14	2	2		1		1	4	2	2	1	1	11		
Student Engagement at a Distance	40	19	4	1		1	7	2		2	9			2			1		1	2	3		12		
Webinar: Student Mental Health Awareness	19	6	1	1			1	2			8	1	1		1		2	2					1	5	
Conversations at Work	34	11	3		2	2	1	1		2	17	6	1		1		4	2			2	1	6		
Encouraging Student Entrepreneurship	18	9	1					2		2	7	1	2	2	1		1						2		
AutoAccess Webinar	18	3	2							1	6		2	1						1			2	9	
Non Tenure Track CRRs Discussion	31	11	1	2	2	1	1	2		1	19	2	2	2	2		2		4	3	1	1	1		
Proposal Writing Bootcamp	47	32	4	4	2	4	5	7	3	1	13	2	1	1	4		1	1	2		1		2		
Provost's Assessment Working Lunch	43	18	1	4	2	2	1	3	1	3	14		2	3	2	2	1	1	2		1		11		
Spring 2018 Semester Total Occurrences by Department	235	92	22	8	5	11	6	16	10	1	13	87	16	14	9	4	0	9	12	4	6	9	4	56	

Appendix C: White Paper for Endowment



Joe and Mary Miner
Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence

Purpose

The Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence (CAFE) is a resource for all Missouri S&T faculty to provide professional development from "hire to retire" in the areas of teaching and pedagogy, research and scholarship, service and leadership. CAFE coordinates numerous activities throughout the year, including the two-day New Faculty Orientation held in August, and the Early Career Faculty Forum, a series of biweekly seminars and workshops throughout the year focused on matters important to tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. CAFE is also home to the Center for Educational Research and Teaching Innovation, a resource whose mission is to foster faculty contribution to the continual improvement of the Missouri S&T learning environment through programs that emphasize collaborative, experiential, and technology-enhanced teaching as well as educational research. In essence CAFE is dedicated to facilitating faculty to sustain and enhance Missouri S&T's reputation of delivering the best hands-on education in the world to the students.

Establishing the Joe and Mary Miner Center for Advancing Faculty Excellence at this time would bring particular focus on the importance of achieving excellence in, and maintaining balance between, the teaching, research and service missions of the university. Missouri S&T alumni are unique in their dedication to the faculty and departments that helped them succeed. Naming CAFE would be a highly visible way to recognize this dedication across the entire campus, and facilitate faculty and student success across all disciplines.

Uses of the Endowment

Most CAFE activities that occur on campus use existing faculty and administrators to provide the expertise of the particular workshop/seminar. Endowment proceeds would facilitate bringing an external component to many activities such as:

- travel grants for faculty to attend teaching workshops, meet with funding agencies, attend professional society meetings, participate in technology roadmap panels;
- mini-sabbaticals to learn new technologies to develop a new course, or build a relationship to pursue funding, and
- experts to lecture on faculty development issues.

On-campus use of endowment proceeds would also facilitate:

- developing new courses that require technology, software or supplies/materials that are currently unavailable;
- encouraging faculty to develop new technologies or research-based educational strategies that help other faculty become more effective educators and improve student learning;
- inviting special guest lecturers to classes;
- assisting with publication costs, and
- organizing symposia and workshops at Missouri S&T.

Student success is Priority #1 for faculty who choose to call Missouri S&T their home. The Joe and Mary Miner Center for Faculty Excellence inspires faculty to do this, and importantly, gives them the requisite tools for both faculty and student success.

Appendix D: Promotion & Tenure Suggested Guidelines

Missouri University of Science and Technology

Promotion and Tenure Suggested Guidelines

June 27, 2016

Table of contents

Collected Rules and Regulations (CRRs)

Reason for Tenure

Process of Review

Levels

Procedures

Checklist on Clarity

Independence of Reviews

Voting Process

Committee Letters in Review Process

Membership of P&T Committees

Recusal of Members

Individuals Ineligible to Serve on P&T Committees

Training of P&T Committee Member and Department Chairs

Training for P&T Committee Members

Confidentiality

Consistency

Training for Department Chairs

Materials in Dossier

External Reviewers

Number of Letters Needed

Preparing List of Potential Reviewers

Eligible and Ineligible External Reviewers

Letter Soliciting External Review

Expectations for Promotion and Tenure (Asst to Assoc; Assoc to Prof)

General Expectations

Collegiality Expectations

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Characteristics of an Associate Professor

Scholarship/Research

Teaching

Service

The career Associate Professor

Associate Professor to Professor

Characteristics of a Professor

Scholarship/Research

Teaching

Service

Metrics of Teaching, Research, and Service (should have multiple measures)

Scholarship/Research Metrics

Teaching Metrics

Peer Review of Teaching

Service Metrics

Mentoring of Untenured & Associate Tenured Faculty (Asst to Assoc; Assoc to Prof)

Assistant to Associate

Associate to Professor

Freshman Faculty Forum

Faculty Orientation (2-day event before start of fall semester)

Freshman Faculty Forum Fall Activities (from 2015-2016 topics)

Freshman Faculty Forum Spring Activities (from 2015-2016 topics)

Establish, and Adhere to, Timelines

Policies and Procedures for Stopping Tenure Clock (links provided to info)

COAHE Benchmarks

References

Color Coding Key of Comments

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comment
(<https://www.aaup.org/file/1940%20Statement.pdf>)

American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors, and United Educators Insurance (2000). *Good practice in tenure evaluation: Advice for tenured faculty, department chairs, and academic administrators.*
<https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/Good%20Practice%20in%20Tenure%20Evaluation.pdf>

Career Leadership & University Excellence (CLUE) Planning Group on Promotion and Tenure (2012). University of Albany.
http://www.albany.edu/academics/files/CLUE_PT_Full_Final_Report.pdf.

Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education. (2014). *Benchmark Best Practices: Tenure & Promotion.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.
<http://coache.gse.harvard.edu/files/gse-coache/files/coache-tenure.pdf?m=1447624426>

Recommended best practices in reappointment, promotion, and tenure processes (2003).
Georgia Institute of Technology.

<http://www.advance.gatech.edu/archive/ptac/RPTBestPracticesFinalOct03.pdf>

Best practices for tenure and promotion review. U of Alaska, Fairbanks:

<https://www.uaf.edu/files/provost/Best-Practices-Document-2014.pdf>

UNC report: <http://provost.unc.edu/files/2012/10/Taskforce-on-Future-Promotion-and-Tenure-Policies-and-Practices-FINAL-REPORT-5-8-09.pdf>. Briefly discusses joint appointments and interdisciplinary work.

Western Kentucky University Faculty Handbook, 21st ed. (2015).

<http://www.wku.edu/academicaffairs/>

DRAFT

Collected Rules and Regulations (CRRs)

The following are the relevant CRRs related to tenure and promotion.

Chapter 300: Faculty Bylaws

300.030 Faculty Bylaws of the Missouri University of Science and Technology

https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected_rules/faculty/ch300/300.030_faculty_bylaws_missouri_university_of_science_technology

Chapter 310: Academic Tenure Regulations

- [310.010 Academic Freedom and Economic Security of Academic Staff](#)
- [310.015 Procedures for Review of Faculty Performance](#)
- [310.020 Regulations Governing Application of Tenure](#)
- [310.025 Extension of Probationary Period for Faculty on Regular Term Appointment](#)
- [310.030 Notice of Appointment or Resignation](#)
- [310.035 Non-Tenure Track Faculty](#)
- [310.040 No Impairment of Rights of Tenure](#)
- [310.050 Faculty Committees on Tenure](#)
- [310.060 Procedures in Case of Dismissal for Cause](#)
- [310.070 Notice](#)
- [310.075 Negotiated Faculty Retirements and Resignations](#)
- [310.080 Regular Faculty Workload Policy](#)
- [310.090 Instructional Workload](#)

320.035 Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected_rules/faculty/ch320/320.035_policy_and_procedures_for_promotion_and_tenure

Reason for Tenure (sources: AAUP 1940 Statement, GA Tech, WKU, 1940 Statement)

When aspiring to be the top technology-oriented (STEM-focused, but comprehensive ☺) institution in Missouri, we must attract and retain individuals of increasing competence, faculty who are experts in their fields achieving national and international recognition, that raises the visibility and stature of Missouri University of Science and Technology. Therefore, tenure is awarded only to individuals who demonstrate outstanding performance.

“We value assistant professors, who bring freshness and the potential to develop and recreate the institution over a long career; associate professors, who are seasoned scholar teachers with an expanding university vision, and who thus provide a reliable core; and full professors, who manifest excellence in the attributes that define a university faculty, as well as ongoing strength in all areas of responsibility. In this mix, full professors serve as disciplinary and institutional leaders” (from U of Wyoming *Best Practices for promotion to full professor: Philosophy, standards, strategies, and best practices for candidates*, p 2, in University of Albany CLUE report, p. 57)

Although untenured faculty are guaranteed academic freedom, the awarding of tenure is to ensure the protection of academic freedom. Academic freedom includes the following (direct quote from p. 14 of 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comment, <https://www.aaup.org/file/1940%20Statement.pdf>):

1. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.
2. Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment.
3. College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

Process of Review

Levels

Department Level (committee and chair, independent reviews)

Unit review (e.g., social sciences, humanities)

College Level

Campus Level

Provost

Chancellor

Consider combining / removing one

Could consider restructuring the committees at the college (e.g., disciplinary representation – sciences, social sciences, and humanities – not department representation, reducing size of committees; would have to categories engineering areas) and campus level would remove the issue of multiple votes at these higher levels.

Procedures

- Will materials after application deadline be considered.(yes, see CRRs)
- What do if individual charged with misconduct or other negative events? (recommend seek legal advice before completing tenure process)

Follow the procedures EXACTLY!

Create a checklist.

(ACE, AAUP, & UE, 2000):

Checklist on Clarity (best to have written statements, [ACE, AAUP, & UE \(2000\)](#)):

- The tenure policy should clearly state the criteria for tenure and should encompass all the major factors actually relied upon in evaluating tenure applications.
- Evaluators at all stages of the tenure process should know and apply the criteria appropriate to the candidate.
- The tenure rules should clearly explain whether evaluators will consider positive events subsequent to the submission of the tenure application—such as acceptance of a manuscript for publication—in making their evaluations.
- The institution should formulate a plan for handling allegations of misconduct or other negative information that may arise during the tenure process.
- A senior faculty member who serves on a college-wide tenure committee should know, in advance, whether he or she should vote on a tenure candidate in the department, at the college-wide level, or both.
- The institution's rules should address what weight, if any, decision makers should give to informal and unsolicited opinions they receive about tenure candidates and whether candidates should be informed about such unsolicited communication.
- All evaluators should know and apply the criteria (not unstated ones)

Independence of Reviews (just for department P&T?)

The department chair should have no communication with the department P&T committee during its deliberations, unless the committee requests clarification of information regarding the candidate. The department chair head should not serve on the P&T committee as a regular or ex-officio member. (GA Tech)

Voting Process

- Communication of vote (at each level?) in letter?
- Abstentions?
 - Need reason? How many allowed?
- Address voting protocol (issue of clarity)
 - Can someone who disagrees with a vote contact others at different levels to try to sway the decision? Should the candidate, dept., (i.e., various levels) be informed? (ACE, AAUP, UE, 2000)
- What is the voting protocol when a P&T Committee member serves at more than one level of review (e.g., department and college, college and campus)?
 - Consider, for example, a full professor in biology who serves on the college-wide review committee. If an assistant professor in biology has applied for tenure, would the senior colleague vote only within the department, only on the college-wide committee, or at both levels? Smaller institutions may face this question most often. There is no single correct answer. The best approach is to anticipate

the situation, address it through clear written policies, and then follow the policies consistently.”

Committee Letters in Review Process (see below for external reviewer letters)

The committee letter should state, for example:

- If refereed conference proceedings or refereed journals are the "norm" for archival publication.
- If a particular journal is among the top journals in the discipline or sub-discipline.
- If the level of research funding is above or below average for the discipline.
- If the number of conferences attended or performances given and their venue is above or below the standard for that field.
- If some award is a premier award in the field for a faculty member at a given career stage.

In other words, the first-level peer review and unit RPT committee letters should go beyond general comments and compliments to provide estimates of normative measures of performance to assist in interpretation and comparative discussions further along in the process.

All members of review committee should sign. Votes and dissenting opinions should be included without attribution. Note all members and indicate committee chair (U of AK, F)

- Are votes by secret ballot (at all levels of the review process)?

The department/division's Promotion Committee reviews all evaluation materials, votes on the candidate, and provides a written recommendation to the department head. This recommendation must include the actual vote count and may also provide additional information deemed relevant to the committee's decision. The department head also reviews all relevant evaluation materials and produces an individual written recommendation. The contents of any accompanying materials — for example a letter of appointment and workload assignments — used in the committee's deliberations and of all materials accompanying its recommendation shall remain strictly confidential, except as they are conveyed to members of the faculty and administration whose duties require knowledge of the information. The department head's/division chair's recommendation, the Promotion Committee's recommendation, and all evaluation materials are forwarded to the college dean.

Membership of P&T Committees (main sources: GA Tech; ACE, AAUP, & UE, 2000)

- How many on department committees?
 - department/unit – at least 5, with at least 3 at prof level – U of AK, Fairbanks
 - At or above rank sought.
- How many on unit/college committee?
- How many on the campus committee? Have disciplinary representation, not each department?
- Can someone with an unsatisfactory post-tenure review serve?

- Does a P&T member need to be graduate faculty?
- Voting protocol (how many need to vote – not abstentions?)
- Can a member serve on multiple levels of the P&T review process (e.g., department, college, campus)? (see note under voting)

Recusal of Members

Except for departmental committees, a person from the same department will recuse his or herself from any deliberations and votes at all other levels of the review process (e.g., college, campus). Can the person be queried for information?

Individuals Ineligible to Serve on P&T Committees

Committee members who are candidates for promotion are not permitted to be present during deliberations on their rank.

Any faculty member having a conflict of interest as defined in ~~Section II.X~~ is explicitly excluded from service on the promotion committee.

No individual who serves as the head of another department within the candidate's college may serve on a promotion committee for such a candidate.

Any university official with a subsequent role in the promotion process (the dean of that college, the provost, the chancellor), and any individual with an executive/administrative appointment who reports directly to one of those individuals, is excluded from service on a promotion committee.

Training of P&T Committee Members and Department Chairs

- What is confidential?

Training for P&T Committee Members:

As the Executive Board ad hoc committee states in its “best practices report” in 2000, “In all of its procedures and recommendations, the committee must act honorably and with dignity. Not only is this the behavior one expects from a first-rate academic institution, it is the behavior that is imperative in today’s litigious society. Every committee member must clearly understand what is inappropriate for deliberation because it violates either law or administrative rules regarding various forms of discrimination.”

Whenever a committee of faculty provides input or a recommendation in the P&T process, the committee should clearly understand its three distinct responsibilities:

- The committee is obligated to treat the candidate with respect, and to strive to reach an accurate and wise conclusion in evaluating the candidate’s credentials;
- Recognizing its obligation to the candidate, the committee is obligated to act in a way that is consistent with the beliefs, goals, and best interests of the unit; and

- The committee is obligated to ensure that its every action, including the presentation of its conclusions, reflects honorably upon the Institute.

Any faculty review committee is obligated to resolve any ambiguity or lack of clarity that it may find in a candidate's documentation. If there is doubt, for example, regarding the significance of the candidate's contribution to a publication or a research project, a unit-level committee must obtain specific clarification via communication with the unit head rather than directly with the candidate or making assumptions regarding the candidate's contributions.

Dealing with Rumors:

As a matter of principle, information that cannot be confirmed by other individuals on the committee, based on *independent sources* of the information, should be considered as rumor and should not be woven into the tapestry of a discussion that affects job performance and career advancement.

Advocacy

If advocates are used to present P&T cases to a/the committee, the advocate should seek to present a balanced and objective view of the strengths and weaknesses of the case. Hence, advocacy is essentially synonymous with intense preparation of and intimacy with the case. The advocate should develop a detailed understanding of the documentation, letters of reference, annual letters of review, etc., and present these in organized fashion.

Confidentiality

As the Executive Board ad hoc committee states in its "best practices report" in 2000, "Every committee member must clearly understand that all evaluative information received by committee and all deliberations are to be held in confidence and not communicated inappropriately outside of the committee. Faculty members (and others providing inputs to the process) have a reasonable expectation that their input will be treated confidentially, except as otherwise provided for by law, particularly the Georgia Open Records Act."

The contents of any accompanying materials — for example a letter of appointment and workload assignments — used in the committee's deliberations and of all materials accompanying its recommendation shall remain strictly confidential, except as they are conveyed to members of the faculty and administration whose duties require knowledge of the information.

5. Colleagues on campus, in the profession and in the community provide letters evaluating the candidate's service. (These letters are treated as confidential unless writers indicate otherwise.)

6. Outside reviewers provide: letters evaluating the candidate's research. (These letters are treated as confidential unless writers indicate otherwise.)

Consistency

Need to apply consistency over time (and departments) when review dossiers. [ACE, AAUP, & UE \(2000\)](#):

Checklist on Consistency

- Ensure that tenure decisions are consistent over time among candidates who have different personal characteristics that are legally protected such as race, gender, disability, ethnic origin, and religion.
- Ensure that the formal evaluations of untenured faculty and what they are told informally about the quality of their work are based on a consistent set of expectations. A negative tenure decision should not be the first criticism of the individual's performance.
- The department should provide advice to faculty during the probationary period that is consistent with its and the institution's expectations for tenure. Departments should be cautious about conveying excessive optimism about prospects for tenure.
- The tenure application dossier should include all required materials and exclude items that the institution has not used for other candidates.
- Administrators should take special care, when reviewing candidates in their own disciplines that they not depart from standard tenure processes.
- All reviewers should scrupulously follow tenure procedures. Deviations can be used as evidence that the institution breached its obligation to conduct a fair review.

Training for Department Chairs:

“Conduct workshops for department chairs on the appointment and evaluation of tenure-track faculty. Cover topics such as the importance of following institutional procedures, communicating well with tenure-track faculty, and preparing and retaining appropriate documentation. Possible presenters include experienced chairs and administrators, legal counsel, and outside experts. This report could serve as a basis for discussion.

Encourage faculty and chairs to attend external programs on evaluation and tenure practices. Some ongoing workshops are listed in the bibliography. Disciplinary association meetings also sponsor occasional sessions. To compound the benefit of external programs, ask the attendees to share the insights they learn with others back on campus. Institutions often overlook the steps of sharing information and promoting campus dialogue with people who return from external programs.

Have a small working group analyze situations of tenure denial that have occurred in the recent past and formulate recommendations for improvement. Don't limit the recommendations just to revising the wording of campus policy. Also address the behavioral issues of how candidly and consistently the evaluators apply tenure standards.

- If lawsuits or other disputes have occurred, learn from those experiences and make appropriate changes. Calculate the intangible and tangible costs of dispute and devote comparable resources to preventing the next problem that might otherwise occur.
- Engage in a dialogue with tenure-track faculty about their perceptions of the tenure process. Ask about their understanding of the tenure standards and procedures, as well as the quality of the ongoing evaluations they are receiving. The information could be solicited informally through conversations or more formally through surveys. Use your findings to identify areas for possible improvement.”

- Regular workshops on how to prepare a promotion and tenure package and how to encourage and ensure mentoring of junior faculty should be provided for all department chairs and school deans.

New faculty members will be given information about the tenure review process and grievance appeal process at the beginning of the first year of employment at WKU. These processes are described at the University level in this Handbook, and in the guidelines for tenure and promotion issued by the faculty member's department.

a. In addition to the regular annual evaluations of all faculty members, tenure-eligible faculty members will be evaluated each year on their progress toward tenure. The purpose of this evaluation is to determine whether there has been sufficient progress toward tenure to justify continuation of the faculty member.

Each year, from the first year of appointment through the year preceding the mandatory year for tenure consideration, tenure-eligible faculty will submit continuance materials to the department head for consideration by the continuance committee. The requirement for submission of continuance materials also applies to tenure-eligible faculty members who anticipate applying for tenure prior to the mandatory year.

Materials shall be submitted by January 30 of the first year of appointment and by September 1 for each subsequent year.

Materials in Dossier

The tenure application dossier should include all required materials and exclude items that the institution has not used for other candidates.

- *Lack of clarity in listing papers in preparation or submitted for review with those that are in press or already published* – papers in preparation should not be listed; papers submitted should be listed in another section, with papers accepted (in press) or already published in yet a separate, distinct section. Contributions to books should be clearly identified as "contributed chapter," "edited/co-edited," or "authored/co-authored."
- *Relative importance of conference proceedings* – the 2003 survey of academic faculty perceptions showed wide variation in the value of the number of conference proceedings as a measure of research productivity among colleges, with only the College of Computing considering them to be "very effective"; of the remainder, only 40% viewed conference proceedings as even "slightly effective". On the other hand, quality of conference articles (however judged) was deemed much more effective as a means of gauging research productivity.
- *Lack of clarity in listing papers appearing in refereed proceedings versus those appearing in refereed archival journals* – many evaluators, perhaps even at the unit-level, will not be intimate enough with a given field or sub-field to judge the rigor of the review process in refereed proceedings relative to widely recognized archival journals; written unit-level guidelines can clarify this issue by cataloging respected venues for publication by sub-field, as well as by invoking first-level peer review committees comprised from faculty experts in the particular sub-field of relevance to each case. However, the candidate should presume that reviewers will want to clearly distinguish refereed

proceedings from refereed archival journals and therefore should clearly distinguish them in the vita.

...regarding preparation of documentation with “high” information content, i.e., ensuring that they put their “best foot forward” by clearly explaining their role in co-authorship of scholarly articles, their role in collaborative research efforts, entrepreneurial activities, development of new innovative educational programs or research initiatives, involvement in societies and other leadership opportunities, and so on. It is a good practice to consider how one’s resume will be read by those unfamiliar with his/her case, rather than assuming that every evaluator will either have first-hand knowledge or be led by another to understand nuances that inevitably arise when faculty omit additional information to clarify the significance of their work. ~~Moreover, (i) selection of top five intellectual products and (ii) suggested list of references by the candidate are absolutely crucial elements in each case, not only by virtue of their particular content, but perhaps just as importantly by virtue of what these choices convey regarding the sense of the candidate’s understanding of what quality means and whether this resonates with the faculty at large. On this basis, Selection of unpublished manuscripts/reports or obscure, incoherent materials for top five intellectual products can generate unnecessary negative “vibes.”~~

Example 1:

II. Sources of material in the file

From the candidate

1. Copies of all publications and work in progress. (For materials to be sent to outside reviewers, the candidate provides multiple copies.)
2. Copies of all syllabi and other selected teaching materials.
3. Three statements, one each that summarizes the candidate’s research, teaching and service accomplishments and goals for the future.
4. Names of persons who can be asked for letters on service, former students who may be asked to write letters, and names of persons who should not be asked to serve as outside reviewers.

From others

1. The department provides the candidate’s student evaluations and grade distributions for all courses she/he has taught with comparative information for the department and an explanation of leaves and/or tenure clock stoppages.
2. The department’s three member evaluation committee provides: a report evaluating the candidate’s research, teaching and service to the department and a report on faculty observation of the candidate’s classroom performance.
3. The department Chair provides: a letter discussing the case, reviewing the department’s meeting and vote, and presenting her/his own evaluation of the case
4. Undergraduate and graduate students provide letters evaluating the candidate’s teaching and advising. (Letter writers will be informed that these letters are not confidential. No letters from current students will be solicited.)
5. Colleagues on campus, in the profession and in the community provide letters evaluating the candidate’s service. (These letters are treated as confidential unless writers indicate otherwise.)
6. Outside reviewers provide: letters evaluating the candidate’s research. (These letters are treated as confidential unless writers indicate otherwise.)

Your research portfolio: From U of WY report (p. 5, see U of Albany CLUE report, p. 60)

- Include all published research
- Explain your collaborations, your specific contributions (in GA Tech paper, too)
- Note student accomplishments
- Link grants and awards to scholarly productivity
- Show how membership on boards, etc., related to scholarship and recognition beyond university.

Your teaching portfolio: From U of WY report (p. 5, see U of Albany CLUE report, p. 60)

- Evaluations
- Syllabi
- Peer evaluations
- Explain course successes, problems, potentials
- Explain teaching philosophy
- Gather info on student achievements
- Have faculty observe teaching
- Seeking collaboration in teaching
- Have mentors evaluation your helpfulness
- Record and evaluation any non-traditional activities (e.g., honors program)
- Document if worked with outcomes assessment
- Try to get outside peer review of teaching

Your service portfolio: From U of WY report (p. 5, see U of Albany CLUE report, p. 60)

- Make sure service is strong, documented, and recognized

External Reviewers (sources: CLUE, GA Tech, U of AK, Fairbanks)

- How many needed? How many sought to achieve required/necessary number? (ask for credentials – U of Alaska, Fairbanks (and others))
- Guidelines for selecting appropriate external reviewers (avoiding conflict of interest)
- What is the involvement of the candidate in the selection of external reviewers? Should the candidate approve everyone?
- What is a conflict of interest (which would invalidate a letter)? Will the letter be objective? Letters from the chair and committees should make statements of reviewers' disinterestedness (or lack thereof) explicit.
- What are the guidelines for external reviewers (in request letter)? **Questions/letters to external reviewers (what letters should address): independence, quality, ...**

Number of Letters Needed

Five or six external reference letters should be expected.

At least four such letters must be included (two from persons named by the candidate and the other two from individuals named by the program director), and up to six such letters (three from

persons named by the candidate and three persons named by the program director) may be included. The unit head(s), or the dean should convey the letters with an explanation of why those persons were selected in terms of their general qualifications in the field, as well as their specific contributions to this review.

5. The Chair will contact potential outside reviewers until six or seven have consented to serve. They are sent copies of the candidate's publications along with the c.v. and research statement. The Chair will take care to ensure that outside reviewers have no close associations with the candidate. A deadline of mid-August is set for submitting evaluation letters.

Preparing List of Potential Reviewers

- Assist the protégé in identifying colleagues at other institutions who might eventually serve as external reviewers for promotion and/or tenure.

4. The members of the internal committee, in consultation with other senior faculty (and if there are no other senior faculty in this field?) in the candidate's field, will generate a list of ten to twelve potential external reviewers of the candidate's scholarship that will be submitted to the Chair. As indicated in the University guidelines, candidates will be asked to identify potential referees who for personal reasons ought not to be consulted.

Candidates should have an opportunity to recommend external reviewers, and also to request that specific individuals not be solicited. It is, of course, the prerogative of the unit-level review committees, in collaboration with the unit head, to determine who will be solicited. The set of reviews should typically include individuals beyond the list suggested by the candidate.

"...insistence on peer review at the most rigorous levels" (from U of WY best practices in CLUE). The individuals from whom letters are sought should be clear leaders in the field. Along with the letters, brief biographical sketches of these individuals should be included in the materials submitted for consideration as well as the letters received.

The list of individuals from whom letters are to be obtained should be jointly developed by the candidates for promotion and/or tenure and the unit head(s). The final decision regarding who shall be selected to provide recommendations from the list shall rest with the unit head(s) and the faculty committee. ~~It is appropriate to use the same letter for two consecutive years of the process.~~

Eligible and Ineligible External Reviewers (from CLUE report, part from Grant Proposal Guide)

Selection of prior advisors, co-authors, collaborators as references does not necessarily convey a sense of independent acknowledgment of scholarly potential or achievement.

Recognizing that academic and professional fields can be more or less small and restricted, and that it is in fact desirable that tenure and promotion candidates have established some prominence and corresponding relationships in their fields, professional associations—such as having contributed to the same edited volume or journal special issue, or having presented papers

on the same panel at a conference, for example—do not necessarily disqualify a reviewer, unless an identifiable conflict of interest can reasonably be assumed.

Case reviewers should be from the same field as the candidate, but a diversity of reviewers is also necessary. In other words, reviewers should represent both peers who have no identifiable, close connection with the candidate, and peers who may have some connection, such as those outlined above. Tenure and promotion review committees should then weigh all letters together in considering carefully whether any evaluations are compromised by a potential conflict of interest.

Letter Soliciting External Review

The **letter of solicitation** sent by the unit head shall be worded to request an evaluation of the quality of contributions to the fields, not of the quality of the individual. A copy of the individual's resume and other relevant materials should accompany the letter of request. The referees should be asked to be specific and to comment on particular aspects of the candidate's creative contributions and provide an assessment of impact on the field, and where possible, to provide a comparison of the candidate's work to that of others in the field at the same stage of their career at comparable institutions/in comparable programs.

The external reviewers shall not render a judgment as to the question of promotion or tenure, but rather on the value of the work itself. ...purpose of external review is to provide an independent assessment of the intrinsic merit of the creative work of the individual, its value to the professional and academic communities, and to the public at large specifically target the following information:

- Candid assessment of the creativity, impact, productivity, and promise of the candidate's creative contributions, along with any knowledge of other contributions.
- Comments on particular aspects of the candidate's creative contributions in research and scholarship and an assessment of impact on the field.
- Comparison of the candidate to the leaders, by name, in their field of creative contribution at a similar career stage.
- Brief vita of the referee.

In terms of quality of research, we expect that candidates, by the time they come up for tenure, will be conducting work that is generally recognized as being significant and innovative by their peers. External reviewers are heavily relied upon to evaluate this aspect of excellence in research. But quality is also indicated by the majority of publications in tier one or tier two journals in the candidate's discipline or field of study, as well as by evidence that the candidate is beginning to make a name for him/herself, which may include invited presentations, participation on grant review panels, membership on journal editorial boards, etc. It is not expected that candidates will have a national reputation at this stage, but it is expected that candidates will be beginning to be recognized within their specific field for their work.

Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

- Consistency of application of expectations is critical (*Good Practice in Tenure Evaluations*)
- Consistency (GA Tech)
- Clarity of criteria (best to have written statements)

Department Level (must meet or exceed CRRs and College expectations)

What is “scholarship?”

Part of annual reviews

Relative to peers and aspirational peers.

General Expectations

Promotion decisions at every rank are based on sustained achievement appropriate for that rank in the areas of teaching effectiveness, research/creative activity, and University/public service. Sustained achievement in the candidate’s entire body of work is considered, but only as it is relevant to the individual’s area of professional competence. Further, an emphasis is placed on contributions since the last set of successful promotion materials were submitted for consideration. It is the responsibility of the candidate seeking promotion to provide promotion committees with the appropriate evidence on which to base a decision. Departments/divisions will develop specific quantitative and qualitative criteria appropriate to their disciplines in the areas of teaching effectiveness, research/creative activity and University/public service. Evaluation of all areas, both at the departmental levels and at the academic deans’ levels, will take these criteria into consideration.

Collegiality Expectations

Collegiality: Cumulative reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions determine the future directions that the unit will take, and to a large extent, the nature of the work environment within the unit. Thus, faculty review committees have an obligation to consider impact of decisions on a stable, supportive work environment. The review committee must carefully consider both the intellectual contributions the candidate is likely to make in the future and the impact the individual’s presence will have on others in the unit. However, if an individual’s personality is factored into an evaluation, it should be done so explicitly, rather than implicitly affecting the assessment of other objective performance measures. In addition, such considerations of “collegiality” should enter into the process broadly on the basis of peer committee reviews, rather than reviews of individual unit heads, in order to decouple potential personal conflicts from best interests of the Institute. There are differing views on the consideration of collegiality as a criterion for tenure and promotion, as reflected in these websites:

- Collegiality: we are a community of scholars
<http://www.infotech.monash.edu.au/aimsvalues/values/collegiality.html>
- Academe - Does collegiality count?
<http://www.aaup.org/publications/academe/01nd/01ndcon.html>
- AAUP: Collegiality as a criterion for faculty evaluation
<http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/collegia.html>

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Characteristics of an Associate Professor:

- a) Academic Experience: normally, a minimum of five years' service at the rank of assistant professor.
 - b) Sustained achievement appropriate to discipline for this rank in teaching effectiveness, research/creative activity, and University/public service.
 - c) General Criteria: The candidate must show excellence in research and teaching, together with evidence of substantive contributions in service
-
- a) b. Promotion to Associate Professor:
 - i. Teaching Effectiveness: a tangible record of excellent performance according to department standards.
 - ii. Research/Creative Activity: a tangible record of exceptional and high-quality performance as described in Section III.D.3.b.
 - iii. University/Public Service: a tangible record of excellent performance.

Define what is "sustained achievement" for each level.

Scholarship/Research

GA Tech:

Scholarship in teaching must be evidenced by archival journal articles or other highly regarded, referenced and persuasive instruments that portray exceptional innovation and significant impact on the U.S. and international educational enterprises.

Example 1 (History Dept):

- For promotion to Associate Professor we expect the candidate to have made a distinct and substantial contribution to the discipline in at least one of the following ways:
 - a book published by a reputable press,
 - a book manuscript accepted for publication by a reputable press,
 - an equivalent body of articles in journals,
 - articles in edited collections,
 - production of original historical research in other media (such as public exhibitions, hypermedia productions, film documentaries, aural documentaries)
- The candidate's scholarly work, regardless of genre, must be subject to peer review. Evidence of work on a well-defined future project is expected. Publication varies in history because the discipline encompasses so many geographical, topical, and methodological fields; thus a strict quantitative standard is impossible to define and apply.

Example 2 (Health Policy, Management, and Behavior Dept)

- Excellence in research is indicated by (1) independence as a scholar, (2) quality of research, (3) research productivity as measured by quantity of peer-reviewed publications, and (4) an appropriate trajectory of external funding and external funding attempts. These indicators are further described as follows.
- The overarching expectation is that there will be convincing evidence of independence as a scholar. This independence is indicated by:

- Scholarly work that is innovative and thematically independent from the work led by one's mentor or other collaborators;
- A preponderance of first-author papers, especially as one moves closer to the tenure review period;
- Sole-authored publications (although it may be the norm in some fields that coauthorship of papers is a more regular occurrence);
- Publications without a graduate school mentor as a co-author;
- Programmatic scholarly work that is centered around a small (1-3) number of thematic areas;
- At least some meaningful external funding that in which the candidate functions as the Principal Investigator or strong evidence of attempts to obtain funding as PI
- In terms of quality of research, we expect that candidates, by the time they come up for tenure, will be conducting work that is generally recognized as being significant and innovative by their peers. External reviewers are heavily relied upon to evaluate this aspect of excellence in research. But quality is also indicated by the majority of publications in tier one or tier two journals in the candidate's discipline or field of study, as well as by evidence that the candidate is beginning to make a name for him/herself, which may include invited presentations, participation on grant review panels, membership on journal editorial boards, etc. It is not expected that candidates will have a national reputation at this stage, but it is expected that candidates will be beginning to be recognized within their specific field for their work.
- In terms of quantity, we generally expect a fairly consistent pattern of 2-3 publications per year, with at least 12-15 total publications by the time one submits the tenure package. The candidate should be first or senior author on a high proportion of these. The total number of publications would be expected to be higher if a candidate had a significant number of publications prior to their UAlbany employment. In addition, the total number of expected publications is slightly dependent upon both the candidate's efforts in pursuing external funding, and the type of research the candidate conducts. For example, the lower range noted above might be appropriate if the candidate has had relatively more success gaining external funding, or conducts research which necessitates either the pursuit of external funding or time intensive primary data collection.
- With respect to external funding, we expect successful candidates for promotion and tenure to demonstrate a trajectory of funding success and funding attempts that provides convincing evidence of future success in attracting meaningful, consistent external funding. This trajectory should demonstrate the receipt of small seed funding (e.g. internal UAlbany pilot grants), as well as publications and larger grant proposals stemming from this seed funding. Ideally, candidates will have been successful in receiving Federal, foundation, or corporate funding as a PI, but because of the growing competitiveness of funding, and the economic reality of some funding institutions, this is not a strict condition for tenure and promotion. At the very least, however, there should be evidence of appropriate effort at seeking substantial external funding (competitive and peer-reviewed), and evidence of positive reviews of such attempts.

Teaching

Example 1 (History Dept):

- Candidates are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. We expect that all faculty members will teach well-organized courses that expose students to the current state of historical knowledge at levels appropriate for those students. We also expect faculty to offer graded assignments that challenge students at appropriate levels. We recognize that the large numbers of undergraduate history majors and of non-majors who take history classes will influence the pedagogy and the kind of work faculty can offer in many courses.
- We also expect faculty members to play some role in advising masters and doctoral students and serving on comprehensive examination committees.
- Teaching evaluations of candidates will be based on course materials, grade distributions, course ratings and qualitative evaluations, and faculty classroom observation, and may also be based on student letters. We interpret those ratings in conjunction with our evaluation of course materials and also recognize that candidates may contribute by developing new courses for the department or beyond the department.

Service

- Because we expect assistant professors to devote most of their time and effort to developing their research agendas and to teaching, our requirements for service in those years are not as great as for senior faculty. We do, however, expect candidates to be “good departmental citizens” by carrying out tasks and committee service assigned to them by the Chair.
- We expect candidates to play a more limited role within the University at Albany beyond the departmental level and recognize that faculty at this level generally do not play leadership roles in service to the discipline. We do expect faculty to play some role at that level, however, for example by reviewing for academic journals or book publishers, by organizing panels at meetings, or by serving on committees or holding secondary offices in the discipline’s national, regional, or specialty organizations. We also recognize contributions to the community related to the candidate’s area of professional expertise.

The career associate

- No intention to work toward Professor
- Responsibility to maintain active scholarly career and to bring new knowledge into the classroom is not diminished.

Associate Professor to Professor

Characteristics of a Professor

- a) **Academic Experience:** normally, a minimum of five years’ service at the rank of associate professor.
 - b) **Sustained achievement** appropriate to discipline for this rank in teaching effectiveness, research/creative activity, and University/public service.
- b) **Promotion to Professor:**
- i. **Teaching Effectiveness:** a sustained record of exceptional and high-quality performance according to department/division standards.

- ii. **Research/Creative Activity: a tangible record of exceptional and high-quality performance**
- iii. **University/Public Service: a tangible record of exceptional and high-quality performance.**

Scholarship/Research

GA Tech:

Scholarship in teaching must be evidenced by archival journal articles or other highly regarded, referenced and persuasive instruments that portray exceptional innovation and significant impact on the U.S. and international educational enterprises.

Example 1 (History Dept):

General Criteria: the candidate must show excellence in research and teaching, and sustained contributions to service (as defined below). The candidate must show evidence of continued major contributions since promotion to associate professor.

- For promotion to Full Professor we expect the candidate to have established an international or national reputation in the discipline based on a body of scholarship that is recognized as making a significant contribution to the field. We expect the candidate to have made a distinct and substantial contribution to the discipline in at least one of the following ways:
 - a second book published by a reputable press,
 - a second book manuscript accepted for publication by a reputable press,
 - an equivalent body of articles in journals,
 - articles in edited collections,
 - production of original historical research in other media (such as public exhibitions, hypermedia productions, film documentaries, aural documentaries)
- The candidate's scholarly work, regardless of genre, should be subjected to peer review.
- Publication varies in history because the discipline encompasses so many geographical, topical, and methodological fields; thus a strict quantitative standard is impossible to define and apply.

Teaching

Example 1 (History Dept):

- Candidates are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. We expect that all faculty members will teach well-organized courses that expose students to the current state of historical knowledge at levels appropriate for those students. We also expect faculty to offer graded assignments that challenge students at appropriate levels. We recognize that the large numbers of undergraduate history majors and of non-majors who take history classes will influence the pedagogy and the kind of work faculty can offer in many courses.
- We also expect faculty members to play a significant role in advising masters and doctoral students, including chairing committees, and serving on comprehensive examination committees.
- Teaching evaluations of candidates will be based on course materials, grade distributions, course ratings and qualitative evaluations, and faculty classroom observation, and may also be based on student letters. We interpret those ratings in conjunction with our evaluation of

course materials and also recognize that candidates may contribute by developing new courses for the department or beyond the department.

Example 2 (Health Policy, Management, and Behavior Dept)

- We expect teaching to be excellent. This translates to SIRF scores near or above our department averages (which are generally around 4 out of a possible 5). In the case of lower SIRF scores, there should be evidence of explicit efforts aimed at improving courses and teaching quality (e.g. consultations with ITLAL, professional development activities related to teaching, significant course revisions to address deficiencies) and subsequent improvements in SIRF scores.
- Teaching excellence also means a commitment to quality improvements in teaching. For example, we expect that course content will be revised to remain current in their content, new courses will be developed as appropriate, and qualitative course evaluations will be utilized for course revisions.

- *Service*

Example 1 (History Dept):

- We expect that, normally, candidates will have served in one of the major posts in the department, either as director of graduate studies or director of undergraduate studies, or provided other significant service; that candidates will have been regular contributors to the department through continuing service on one or more of the department's committees; that candidates will have played leadership roles in service beyond the department, including both serving on and chairing college and/or university committees or councils. We also expect faculty members to play a significant and ongoing role in service to the discipline in such activities as reviewing for academic journals or book publishers, organizing panels at meetings, or holding offices in the discipline's national, regional or specialty organizations. We expect faculty at this level to be showing evidence of sustained leadership in professional activities. We recognize contributions of service to the community related to the candidate's area of professional expertise.

Example 2 (Health Policy, Management, and Behavior Dept)

- We expect junior faculty members to be meaningfully engaged in service to the institution. This means meaningful contributions to the work of committees they serve on, and not mere presence on the committee. We expect that in the early years, service will be mostly at the local department and school level, and that there should be at least some level of university service by the time of the tenure review.
- Professional service should also reflect meaningful engagement with their field.

Metrics of Teaching, Research, and Service (should have multiple measures)

Scholarship/Research Metrics

- Quantity of publications
- Quality of publications
 - Prestige and selectivity of venues (get from editors, possibly – U of AK, F)
- Impact of scholarship

- Analytics (e.g., *h*-factor) should be used with caution (and generally not across disciplines/fields)
 - External funding
 - How competitive the funding agencies are
 - Creative activity (Exhibitions, plays, reviews of works (e.g., in the arts))
- a) **Research/Creative Activity:** Evidence in these areas may include, but is not limited to, the following:
- i. Publication of books, monographs, articles, maps, bibliographies, indexes, catalogs, textbooks, and papers in professional journals; production or direction of non-print media work; reports to federal, state or local agencies; cases.
 - ii. Presentations of papers, cases, and media productions at professional and other scholarly meetings.
 - iii. Participation in studies, programs, and creative activity supported by extramural funds.
 - iv. Production and display of musical compositions, paintings, sculpture, ceramics, weaving, photographs, graphics and other works of art; recitals, choreography, stage design and construction, costuming, direction; production of film and videotaped materials.
 - v. Inventorship or co-inventorship leading to U.S. and/or other patents.
 - vi. Participation in the development of innovative curricular materials, such as curriculum guides, computer-assisted instruction, online resources, software, lab equipment, audiovisual materials, manuals, workbooks, tools or models which break new ground and successfully advance concepts, ideas and approaches that transcend ordinary instructional material.
 - vii. Invitations to conduct research at other universities or research-oriented agencies; to prepare questions for professional examinations.
 - viii. Continuation of current research or other creativity not yet resulting in publication, performance, or display.
 - ix. Involvement of students in faculty research or creative activity.
- Each academic unit should review its personnel documents to ensure that they explicitly address questions of interdisciplinary research and teaching. Questions such as how review committees should be constituted in the case of jointly appointed faculty and in the case of interdisciplinary faculty whose work might involve publication and evaluation in venues different from those typically seen in that unit should be answered.
 - For fields in which scholarly publications with multiple authors are atypical, the personnel documents should also address how multi-authored works are to be evaluated. For academic units in which scholarly publications are in different formats (e.g., some faculty members publish books and others journal articles), personnel documents should also address how these different formats will be evaluated. The continued emergence of new forms of scholarly communication as discussed above compounds the need for academic units to consider how interdisciplinary work will be evaluated.

C. Interdisciplinary faculty in a single academic unit

Faculty are at times hired into an academic unit in response to an advertisement for a position intended to be interdisciplinary, and in other cases a faculty member might be interested in

exploring interdisciplinary activities after being hired. An interdisciplinary faculty member in a tenure-track position in a unit that does not have a history of interdisciplinary scholarship can be vulnerable to either overt or subliminal messages that discourage such scholarship. In the worst cases, tenure could be denied because the department's faculty who vote on tenure do not value the interdisciplinary work or do not know how to evaluate it. In fields that would require a considerable investment of a faculty member's time to explore interdisciplinary opportunities, the relatively short tenure clock itself could be a significant barrier to pursuing such opportunities.

Recommendations:

- If a faculty member is hired in response to an advertised position that is intended to be interdisciplinary, a copy of the position advertisement should become part of that faculty member's permanent file and should accompany all documents that are part of the promotion and tenure evaluation process.
- An MOU should be developed between the unit and the interdisciplinary faculty member. The MOU should specify the process that will be followed in promotion and tenure evaluations, including details relevant to the particular appointment that would not otherwise be addressed in the unit's personnel documents.
- Consideration should be given to creating an opportunity for an untenured faculty member to request a one-year leave to explore an interdisciplinary opportunity. If granted, the leave period should not count towards the tenure clock.

Teaching Metrics

- Student evaluations
- Peer assessments/observations
- Syllabi
- Thesis/dissertation evaluation, pedagogical innovations/contributions (U of AK)

Peer Review of Teaching

- Try to get outside peer review of teaching

- b) Teaching Effectiveness: evidence in this area includes, but is not limited to the following:
- i. An evaluation of both the systematic organization of appropriate materials for presentation and communication to students of course objectives, plan of study, and means of student performance evaluation.
 - ii. An evaluation of the effectiveness of presentation by lecture, discussion, assignment and recitation, demonstration, laboratory exercise, practical experience, consultation, field trips, computer-assisted instruction, reading lists, audiovisual materials, simulations, and games.
 - iii. An evaluation of assessment procedures such as tests, grading practices, and clinical performance.
 - iv. An evaluation of professional responsibilities such as in meeting classes; holding office hours; providing academic advising to students; returning materials in a timely fashion; making clinical assignments; supervising students; and treating students in a fair, impartial and respectful manner.

- v. An evaluation of the effectiveness with which students are stimulated to develop critical and/or creative abilities and intellectual curiosity by such means as independent study or thesis projects.
- vi. An evaluation of the knowledge of recent discoveries and literature in the field; the use of the latest scientific/technological innovations; participation in professional activities, such as training programs, technical seminars and self-study programs.
- vii. Student feedback from course appraisals; student performance on departmental exams; comments from peers, students and alumni.
- viii. An evaluation of cooperation in developing, scheduling, and teaching general undergraduate and graduate courses on and off campus.
- ix. An evaluation of the development of textbooks, workbooks, manuals, tapes, slides, online materials, other print and non-print learning resources developed primarily for classroom use.
- x. An evaluation of the success of students on uniform examinations, in acceptance to graduate and professional programs, in winning awards, in job placement, or in other highly significant achievements.
- xi. Documentation of direct assistance in helping students find appropriate employment.
- xii. Development or use of web-based courses, study abroad and other international academic programs.
- xiii. An evaluation of student engagement involving classroom, laboratory or clinical instruction.

Service Metrics

- Different levels (department, college, university, professionally, internationally)
 - Doing something besides sitting in meetings
 -
- c) University/Public Service: Evidence in these areas may include, but is not limited to, the following:
- i. Service on departmental, college, and University committees, councils, and senates; in appropriate professional organizations as officers, editors, or referees; to local, state and/or national governmental and advisory boards, agencies, commissions; to business and industry or private citizens as technical expert or member of policy advisory committees; as organizers/directors of seminars, workshops and/or other conferences.
 - ii. Participation in meetings, symposia, conferences, workshops; in radio and/or television by developing and presenting materials for public awareness; conducting or performing.
 - iii. Work with schools through contact with teachers, administrators, and students; through participation in science fairs, college day programs, lectures, performance, in-service programs; through advising on curricular matters, and pedagogy.
 - iv. Direction of internships, cooperative education, practicals; learning laboratories; professional clubs and other organizations.

- v. Advisement to student organizations.
- vi. Preparation of grant proposals for instruction, research, and administrative support activities.
- vii. Provision of professional services to individuals, groups, and the community.
- viii. Involvement of students in any of the above activities.

Mentoring of Untenured & Assoc, Tenured Faculty (Asst to Assoc; Assoc to Prof)

- Training of mentors?
- Annual workshops on process and expectations
- Training of chairs on best practices (communicating expectations, ...)
- Freshmen Faculty mentoring practices (notes from meeting with Bill Fahrenholtz)

ACE, AAUP, & UE (2000):

Candor of review/evaluation of progress toward tenure/promotion

Every tenure-track faculty member deserves:

- A clear explanation of the requirements for reappointment and tenure, including any criteria specific to the department or school.
 - Periodic evaluations of his or her progress in meeting the requirements.
 - Candor in all evaluations.
 - Specific examples that illustrate the quality of his or her performance.
 - Constructive criticism outlining any potential areas for improvement.
 - A review covering the entire evaluation period, not just the recent past.
 - An evaluation in plain English.
 - Practical guidance for future efforts to meet the requirements, without promises or guarantees that the institution may not be able to honor.
 - An understanding of how a review (or reviews) during the probationary period differs from a later tenure review.
- Regular workshops on how to prepare a promotion and tenure package and how to encourage and ensure mentoring of junior faculty should be provided for all department chairs and school deans.

UNC:

Ensure good mentoring of faculty

- a. All academic units that grant tenure and promotion should have a mentorship plan in place that is filed with the Provost's office. The plan should ensure that each junior faculty member has at least one senior faculty mentor.
- b. Mentorship training for promotion and tenure should be provided to all department chairs and school deans.
- c. Senior faculty should be provided regular university-wide workshops on mentoring.
- d. Mentorship should be part of the post-tenure review evaluation. In the Provost's document, "Dossier: Format for Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty Review," the section that provides guidelines for the formatting of the *chair's letter* should be revised to instruct the chair to address the faculty member's mentorship as part of his or her service to the academic unit or larger university community.

- e. Mentoring awards should be instituted by the University, College, schools and departments.
- f. A regular survey of junior faculty (perhaps in their fourth or fifth years) should be conducted to determine the state of mentorship on campus as well as the mentorship needs and expectations of junior faculty.

Interdisciplinary:

Recommendations:

- For a faculty member hired into an interdisciplinary position, the MOU that formed the basis for the initial agreement should be reviewed in annual evaluations conducted by the unit head with the faculty member. An opportunity should be provided to update or revise the MOU by mutual agreement.
- The nature of an interdisciplinary faculty member's scholarly work should be considered during faculty meetings in which the progress of junior faculty members is discussed.

1. The Functions of a Mentor

(a) Developing an academic identity and a body of scholarship

(b) Introduction to the institutional culture

(c) Networking and establishing linkages

2. Mentorship Best Practices

The chair or dean has the responsibility to ensure that all junior faculty develop clear plans leading to promotion and tenure.

- The chair or dean should provide all junior faculty, in writing, with a timetable showing when reviews will occur and what steps the junior faculty member must take to succeed at each review stage.
 - The chair or dean should convey to the junior faculty member, in writing, what the department's or school's expectations are for a successful third-year and tenure-promotion review in the faculty member's discipline or field.
 - The chair or dean is responsible for ensuring all paperwork is complete and deadlines met.
- The chair or dean is responsible for creating an organizational culture that encourages junior and senior faculty to develop mentoring relationships and rewards effective mentorship.

Recommendation:

Each department or school should have a mentoring plan. The plan should ensure that each junior faculty member has at least one senior faculty mentor.

Among the elements that a mentorship plan might include are:

- Informal opportunities for junior and senior faculty members to interact with and get to know one another, such as coffees and lunches, to pave the way for development of mentoring relationships.
- A faculty research venue in which both junior and senior faculty members present their work in progress and share research ideas.

Writing groups among the faculty, small groups of faculty members who meet regularly to share what they have written, critique one another's work, offer each other advice, guidance and encouragement.

- Periodic teaching colloquia at which faculty are brought together to discuss issues related to effective teaching and/or explore new ideas and teaching techniques.
- A plan for regular peer teaching reviews of junior faculty by senior faculty.
- Junior faculty development workshops, addressing such issues as how to get funding, write grant proposals, select an appropriate journal or publisher for your work, obtain invitations to speak at conferences, etc.

- Sessions for senior faculty that focus on how to be a mentor, what constitutes successful mentorship, the value of mentorship for junior faculty members, senior faculty members, and the institution.
- Recognition of and rewards for mentoring, e.g., recognizing mentoring as important departmental service, establishment of a mentor-of-the-year award, recognition of a mentor's contributions when acknowledging the success of a junior faculty member (similar to the way in which dissertation advisors are recognized). Ultimately the success of a mentoring relationship depends on the commitment of the individuals involved. A good mentor does some or all of the following:
 - Meet regularly with his or her mentee.
 - Act as an advocate for the mentee.
 - Assist the mentee in developing a professional plan of action.
 - Provide advice and support on grant-writing and publication.
 - Introduce the mentee to colleagues both on and off campus.
 - Invite the mentee to collaborate on projects that might result in publication and/or grants or paves the way for the mentee to collaborate with others.
 - Provide teaching advice and guidance, volunteer to observe the mentee's classes and provide feedback, share teaching materials, invite the mentee to serve on graduate and/or undergraduate honors committees.
 - Make sure the mentee is aware of the many resources available on campus, such as the Center for Faculty Excellence, the Provost's Website with critical promotion and tenure information, junior faculty development grants, etc.
 - Recommend the mentee for activities that will help him or her establish a national reputation, such as speaking at conferences and participating in symposia workshops.
 - Help the mentee determine which types of service activities are best to undertake at each stage of his or her career.
 - Assist the mentee in identifying colleagues at other institutions who might eventually serve as external reviewers for promotion and/or tenure.
 - Provide advice on the composition and compilation of the mentee's promotion and tenure dossier.

Recommendations:

- Regular workshops on how to prepare a promotion and tenure package and how to encourage and ensure mentoring of junior faculty should be provided for all department chairs and school deans.
- Each academic unit should have a mentorship plan in place. Campus-wide mentorship programs and workshops for senior faculty should be provided.

GA Tech:

a *personal development plan* is a tool for individual faculty to guide their goal setting and allocation of effort. A personal development plan could be developed independently by the candidate, or in collaboration with colleagues or unit heads. Each untenured faculty member should draft a personal development plan, delineating specific areas in which the candidate plans to make recognizable creative contributions, outlining a research plan, identifying the major conferences and professional meetings targeted for attendance, identifying journals appropriate for the candidate's publications, suggesting a set of courses to be taught, innovative educational

materials to be developed, and setting goals regarding student advising, publication, and proposal development. This personal plan should serve as a “roadmap” for the individual to assist in prioritizing activities and setting timelines and benchmarks. ...reviewed annually by the unit head and the unit RPT committee, regardless of when the case formally comes up for evaluation. To prepare his/her case for evaluation, faculty should begin in their first year to draft a "three-page narrative" for reappointment and tenure documentation. Of course, the initial version of this narrative is likely to be somewhat skeletal. This documentation package will be updated each year and will become part of the third-year reappointment documentation, and the promotion and tenure documentation for the faculty member. The three-page narrative should contain information about the faculty member's "five most important intellectual accomplishments" as is currently the practice in most units. In the early years, it should not be expected that the candidate will necessarily list five significant accomplishments – this exercise should assist the faculty member in identifying areas of strength and weakness to be addressed. However, it should be broadened to discuss the goals and objectives in creative contributions to teaching and research that the faculty member has for their academic career at Georgia Tech as well as a brief summary of the candidate's plan for achieving these goals. As in the case of the lists of publications, etc., this document should be updated from year-to-year. Faculty should seek feedback on this three-page narrative and on their selection of top creative contributions from colleagues, mentors and unit heads. According to Section 3.2.5 of the Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook, examples of creative contributions that may be appropriate at this institution include:

- Publications: Research papers in scholarly journals, literary publications, and books.
- Unpublished Writings and Creative Work of Limited Circulation: Technical reports, engineering and architectural designs, grant applications, inventions leading to patents, and presentations at conferences and meetings.
- Creative Educational Contributions: Innovative teaching methods, research in instructional techniques, and textbooks.
- Artistic Creations: Paintings, sculpture, and music.
- External Recognition of Creative Work: Prizes and awards, invited presentations, and consultancies.

Faculty should construct lists of references early in their careers, well in advance of formal evaluation, to assure that their references will be knowledgeable in their field, will appreciate the intellectual products in the candidate's vita, and will also be viewed as “arms length” evaluators (see comments in earlier section on *Clarity of Contributions as Expressed in Documentation*).

...It also may be useful for the unit head, perhaps together with the chair of the unit RPT committee, to meet with all untenured faculty members in the late spring to review the RPT results for the year, and provide a forum for questions and discussion of the process. Of course, discussion of specific individual cases would not be appropriate

Your scholarly career: From U of WY report (p. 5, see U of Albany CLUE report, p. 60)

- Use the discipline, not your department, as your standard
- Be innovative
- Be versatile

- Research of pedagogy must be beyond just reflecting on teaching, but must be scholarship that impacts peers and the connections between disciplinary knowledge and student learning.
- If collaboration in field: make substantial contributions; quality matters and its crucial contribution.
- With grants, what really matters is the accomplishment the grant supported (e.g., papers).
- Expand intellectual community.
- Connect to your S&T colleagues
- Remember your students are part of the community – need to build up students as high as possible.

Your teaching career: From U of WY report (p. 5, see U of Albany CLUE report, p. 60)

- Teach creatively
- Teach at the highest level available (e.g., bachelors, masters, Ph.D.)
- Teach at all levels
- Teach in all venues (online, F2F, public, ...)
- Mentor students
- Mentor faculty
- Be a curriculum leader
- Demonstrate your commitment to teaching - Write relative to teaching (e.g., textbooks)

Extension?

Your contribution to service: From U of WY report (p. 5, see U of Albany CLUE report, p. 60)

- Service to the discipline
- Service to the university
- Service to the state
- Administration

Freshman Faculty Forum (notes from discussion with Bill Fahrenholtz)

No handouts, but discussions with faculty. Covers the basics.

Mentions

- Teaching Partners
- Peer observation
- Finding a mentor, who are good mentors, peer mentoring
- Service expectation

Presenters include

- Current campus P&T individuals from the different subcommittees (try to get one from each)
 - Discuss differences between disciplines
 - Discuss quantity vs. quality
 - Service expectation (“department citizen”)

Melanie Mormile’s half-day workshop for preparing individuals for the third-year review should be included.

Faculty Orientation (2-day event before start of fall semester)

- One day, CERTI and Ed Tech present on Teaching Strategies, Resources, and Techniques with a networking reception with the Curators’ Teaching Professors.
- On the other day, there is an Introduction to Sponsored Research (Matt O’Keefe spoke in 2015), Tracy Primich (Library Director) spoke about teaching and research resources in the library, the Associate Deans for Research and External Affairs (Ma and McMillan) spoke, and there was a networking reception with the Curators’ Professors.

Freshman Faculty Forum Fall Activities (from 2015-2016 topics)

Finding a mentor

University of Missouri Research Board

Learning Styles

Proposal Budgeting and Cost Sharing

Grand Award Management

Course Design and Learning Objectives

Distance Education

Freshman Faculty Forum Spring Activities (from 2015-2016 topics)

NIH Proposal Development Workshop

Building Blocks: Structuring Your Course for Success

The Role of Research Centers on Campus

Time Management for Early Career Faculty

Role of Service in Faculty Professional Development

Assessing Student Learning
Tenure and Promotion at Missouri S&T

Establish, and Adhere to, Timelines

Departments should establish their own to fit with college and campus timelines.
Based on departmental timelines, where should someone be by third-year review?

Example 1:

PROCEDURES

Timing and initiation of file

1. For assistant professors the department chair initiates the process. In most cases the process begins at the end of the spring semester of the candidate's fifth year. In some cases where the record justifies it, the process may begin in an earlier year.
2. To initiate consideration of candidates for promotion, the head/chair of the department/division annually informs all faculty members that a promotion review is forthcoming and invites candidates to supply all relevant information by a specific date if the candidates believe they qualify for consideration under the criteria stated above.
3. For associate professors, the candidate wishing to come up for promotion to full professor initiates the process in consultation with the department chair.
4. Once a candidate has elected to be considered for promotion (or in the case of assistant professors, has reached the year when the department and university are obligated to consider their case), the timing of the process occurs as follows:

Late Spring

1. The candidate submits copies of all of her/his publications and of works in progress to the department Chair along with an up-to-date c.v.
2. The department Chair, in consultation with faculty members, selects a three member committee of tenured faculty to write a report for the department that will evaluate the candidate's research, teaching and service. If there is no department member in the candidate's immediate field, the Chair may ask an affiliated faculty member in another department to serve on the committee.
3. If there are candidates for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the academic department establishes a Promotion Committee consisting of all tenured members of the department with rank higher than that of the candidate, excluding those ineligible to serve
4. If there are candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor, the department establishes a Promotion Committee composed only of tenured Professors, excluding those ineligible to serve.
5. All promotion committees considering applications for the rank of Professor must have at least five (5) members. For departments with fewer than five tenured Professors, the dean

will add tenured Professors from other departments to bring the membership to five. These additional members need not be the same for each candidate for promotion.

6. The dean, in consultation with the department head, will develop a list of tenured Professors eligible to serve, the number of which shall be two (2) more than the number of additional members necessary to bring the Promotion Committee membership to five. Unless necessitated by an insufficient number of individuals with the rank of Professor within the candidate's college, no more than two individuals on this list may be from a department outside the candidate's college. The candidate may eliminate one name, and the dean makes the final appointments from the remaining names in order to bring the committee membership to five.
7. In selecting individuals to bring the committee membership to five, the dean must consider those with the best fit for the specific candidate in order to enhance the promotion process.
8. Each Promotion Committee elects a chair. The department head serves as an ex-officio, non-voting member of each committee, except in cases where the department head is a candidate for promotion.
9. The candidate provides the Department Chair a statement summarizing her/his research accomplishments and plans for future research, including an assessment of progress on new research projects. (Additional statements on teaching and service accomplishments and goals for the future may be delayed until late summer.)
10. The members of the internal committee, in consultation with other senior faculty in the candidate's field, will generate a list of ten to twelve potential external reviewers of the candidate's scholarship that will be submitted to the Chair. As indicated in the University guidelines, candidates will be asked to identify potential referees who for personal reasons ought not to be consulted.
11. The Chair will contact potential outside reviewers until six or seven have consented to serve. They are sent copies of the candidate's publications along with the c.v. and research statement. The Chair will take care to ensure that outside reviewers have no close associations with the candidate. A deadline of mid-August is set for submitting evaluation letters.
12. External evaluations from outside the Institute shall be solicited by the unit head(s) and supplied to the office of the dean. These letters shall be solicited with the understanding that, insofar as possible, access to them will be limited to persons involved in the promotion/tenure decision.

September

1. The candidate submits to the Chair of the evaluation committee copies of all of her/his syllabi and other selected teaching materials.
2. The member of the evaluation committee responsible for teaching solicits letters evaluating the candidate's teaching from former undergraduate and/or graduate students the candidate has taught or advised, as suggested by the candidate. These letters are treated as nonconfidential, and the writers are so advised.

5. The member of the evaluation committee responsible for service solicits letters evaluating the candidate's service from selected persons on campus, in the profession, and in the community as suggested by the candidate. The candidate has the option of soliciting additional letters from colleagues who can evaluate the candidate's service. Additional (non-solicited) letters from current or former graduate or undergraduate students, if received, will be placed in the file and treated as non-confidential. The writers are so advised.
6. Members of the committee will observe the candidate's classes, in consultation with the candidate, and write an evaluation of classroom performance that will be part of the candidate's promotion file.
7. The department compiles the candidate's student evaluations and grade distributions for all courses she/he has taught, as well as comparative information for the department.
8. In late September, the committee submits its report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service to the department. The Chair will let the department faculty know that the outside letters, the faculty committee's report and copies of all research, teaching and service materials, including the candidate's three statements, are available for the faculty to review.
9. **III.F.1. Application:** Faculty members are given the opportunity to apply for promotion in September with a deadline of October 1 for application. Faculty members holding the rank of assistant professor and applying for tenure must also apply for promotion in that year and may not, even in the case of a negative recommendation at any level, withdraw their promotion application.

October-Early November

1. By mid-October the department will meet to discuss and vote on the candidate's promotion case.
2. Within one week of the meeting minutes will be available for review by the faculty for accuracy. Any faculty corrections are incorporated into the final version of the minutes.
3. The Chair will write a letter discussing the case, reviewing the department's meeting and vote and presenting her/his own evaluation of the case.
4. Following University guidelines, portions of the file are available for the candidate's review.
5. In early November, the entire case file is forwarded to the College of Arts and Science's Tenure and Promotion Committee.
6. These dates are subject to change in accordance with changes in College and University guidelines.
7. **III.F.2. Department Recommendation:** Departments heads are to make recommendations to their respective deans by November 1. In the case of a negative vote by the departmental promotion committee, the faculty member has the option of withdrawing the application or allowing the application to proceed to the department head. If the department head concurs with the negative committee recommendation, the faculty member may withdraw the application or allow the application to proceed to the college level.

December

III.F.3. Dean Recommendation: Deans will make their recommendations to the Provost by December 1. In the case of a negative recommendation by the college dean, the faculty member may withdraw the application or allow the application to proceed to the Provost.

February/March

III.F.4. Provost/President Recommendation/Board Approval: The Provost will make recommendations to the President by February 1. The Provost will inform the candidate of the recommendation by February 1 and the President shall do likewise by March 1.

In the case of a negative recommendation, the faculty member may withdraw the application or request a review of his or her credentials and a written explanation of the negative recommendation. The President will send recommendations for approval to the Board of Regents – typically, at its April meeting.

Notifications in May

Candidates will be notified of the final decision by May 15.

If a candidate's promotion is not recommended to the Board of Regents and he or she believes that the decision was arbitrary or capricious, violated standards of academic freedom, or was based on considerations that violate protected rights or interests (e.g., consideration of race, sex, national origin, exercise of free speech, association, etc.), a complaint may be filed as described in Section V. of this Handbook.

The faculty member also has the option to file a formal grievance, after all reviews and appeals have been exhausted, in accordance with the procedures outlined in this Handbook.

Tenure at hire:

GA Tech:

The following best practices are recommended:

- Input should be obtained from a first-level peer review committee, in addition to the unit-level RPT committee, unless the latter has qualification to judge creative contributions of the candidate
- All levels of the normal process should be followed, albeit in accelerated fashion, to the extent practical given time constraints; steps should be taken to ensure that time constraints do not compromise thoroughness of the review or integrity of the process
- Any “two-body problem” (e.g. spouse or partner) should not affect deliberations on the merit of any specific individual case

Policies and Procedures for Stopping Tenure Clock

See [310.025 Extension of Probationary Period for Faculty on Regular Term Appointment](#)

See [340.070 Faculty Leave](#) (if gone 30 days or more, leave of absence)

See <http://hr.mst.edu/rewards/benefits/> for FMLA information

COACHE Benchmarks

COACHE tenure-track faculty satisfaction benchmarks related to tenure and promotion

Benchmark Specific Dimensions

Tenure Practices

- tenure process; tenure criteria; tenure standards; tenure body of evidence; sense of achieving tenure; consistent messages about tenure from tenured colleagues; tenure decisions based on performance; periodic, formal performance reviews; written summary of performance reviews; upper limit on committee assignments

Clarity of Institutional Expectations for Tenure

- as a scholar; as a teacher; as an advisor; as a colleague in department; as a campus citizen; as a member of community

Work and Home

- paid/unpaid personal leave; child care; stop-the-clock; spousal/partner hiring program; elder care; modified duties for parental or other family reasons; part-time tenure-track position; institution makes having children and tenure-track compatible; institution makes raising children and tenure-track compatible; colleagues make having children and tenure-track compatible; colleagues make raising children and tenure-track compatible; colleagues are respectful of efforts to balance work/home; ability to balance between professional and personal time

Climate, Culture, and Collegiality

- formal mentoring; informal mentoring; peer reviews of teaching or research; fairness of immediate supervisor's evaluations; interest tenured faculty take in your professional development; opportunities to collaborate with tenured faculty; value faculty in your department place on your work; amount of professional interaction with tenured

colleagues; amount of personal interaction with tenured colleagues; amount of professional interaction with pre-tenure colleagues; amount of personal interaction with pre-tenure colleagues; how well you fit; intellectual vitality of tenured colleagues; intellectual vitality of pre-tenure colleagues; participation in governance of institution; participation in governance of department; on the whole, institution is collegial

Benchmark Best Practices: Tenure and Promotion

This series of white papers is offered freely to member institutions as part of our project's three-year support and engagement plan.

Direct inquiries, feedback, and requests for reprint to:

The Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) Harvard Graduate School of Education

8 Story Street, Suite 5-3

Cambridge, MA 02138

Email: coache@gse.harvard.edu Web: www.coache.org Voice: 617-495-5285 Fax: 617-496-9350

Suggested citation:

Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education. (2014). *Benchmark Best Practices: Tenure & Promotion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.

© Copyright 2014, The President & Fellows of Harvard College. All rights reserved.

COACHE Benchmarks

Our surveys of college faculty produce data that are both (a) salient to full-time college faculty, and (b) actionable by academic leaders. The survey items are aggregated into 20 benchmarks representing the general thrust of faculty satisfaction along key themes.

The COACHE benchmarks are:

NATURE OF WORK: TEACHING

NATURE OF WORK: RESEARCH

NATURE OF WORK: SERVICE

INTERDISCIPLINARY WORK

COLLABORATION

MENTORING

TENURE POLICIES

TENURE CLARITY

TENURE REASONABLENESS

PROMOTION

FACILITIES & WORK RESOURCES

PERSONAL & FAMILY POLICIES

HEALTH & RETIREMENT BENEFITS

SENIOR LEADERSHIP

DIVISIONAL LEADERSHIP

DEPARTMENTAL LEADERSHIP

DEPARTMENTAL COLLEGIALLY

DEPARTMENTAL ENGAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL QUALITY

APPRECIATION & RECOGNITION

What is measured in these benchmarks? (Only those benchmarks in **bold** above).

TENURE POLICIES

Clarity of:

- The tenure process in my department
- The tenure criteria (what things are evaluated) in my department
- The tenure standards (the performance thresholds) in my department
- The body of evidence (the dossier's contents) that will be considered in making my tenure decision
- My sense of whether or not I will achieve tenure

Agreement (or disagreement) with the following statements:

- I have received consistent messages from tenured faculty about the requirements for tenure
- In my opinion, tenure decisions here are made primarily on performance-based criteria (e.g., research/creative work, teaching, and/or service) rather than on non-performance-based criteria (e.g., politics, relationships, and/or demographics)

TENURE CLARITY

- Clarity of tenure expectations as:
 - A scholar
 - A teacher
 - An advisor to students
 - A colleague in your department
 - A campus citizen
 - A member of the broader community (e.g., outreach)

PROMOTION

Clarity about:

- The promotion process in my department
- The promotion criteria (what things are evaluated) in my department

References

- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comment (<https://www.aaup.org/file/1940%20Statement.pdf>)
- American Council on Education, American Association of University Professors, and United Educators Insurance (2000). *Good practice in tenure evaluation: Advice for tenured faculty, department chairs, and academic administrators*. <https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/Good%20Practice%20in%20Tenure%20Evaluation.pdf>
- Career Leadership & University Excellence (CLUE) Planning Group on Promotion and Tenure (2012). University of Albany. http://www.albany.edu/academics/files/CLUE_PT_Full_Final_Report.pdf.
- Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education. (2014). *Benchmark Best Practices: Tenure & Promotion*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education. <http://coache.gse.harvard.edu/files/gse-coache/files/coache-tenure.pdf?m=1447624426>
- Recommended best practices in reappointment, promotion, and tenure processes (2003). Georgia Institute of Technology. <http://www.advance.gatech.edu/archive/ptac/RPTBestPracticesFinalOct03.pdf>
- Best practices for tenure and promotion review*. U of Alaska, Fairbanks: <https://www.uaf.edu/files/provost/Best-Practices-Documents-2014.pdf>
- UNC report: <http://provost.unc.edu/files/2012/10/Taskforce-on-Future-Promotion-and-Tenure-Policies-and-Practices-FINAL-REPORT-5-8-09.pdf>. Briefly discusses joint appointments and interdisciplinary work.
- Western Kentucky University Faculty Handbook, 21st ed. (2015). <http://www.wku.edu/academicaffairs/>
- Reviewed, but not included:
- Lehigh paper <https://www.lehigh.edu/~inprv/pdfs/BestPracticesforTPCommittees081210.pdf> . Based off of ACE, AAUP, & UE (2000) *Good practice in tenure evaluation: Advice for tenured faculty, department chairs, and academic administrators*.
- Faculty Promotion and Tenure: Eight Ways to Improve the Tenure Review Process at Your Institution*. Magna Publications: <http://www.facultyfocus.com/free-reports/faculty-promotion-and-tenure/>. Dealt with similar issues as others, provided ideas for alternative paths to tenure, and discussed changing criteria for on-line instructors.