

College of Engineering, Forestry & Natural Sciences

Conditions of Faculty Service Guidelines for Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

Approved by Vote of the CEFNS Faculty December 18, 2015; 74 yes, 11 no, 12 abstain

I. Principles and Values

This document describes the process of annual faculty review and promotion and/or tenure consideration within the College of Engineering, Forestry & Natural Sciences (CEFNS), acknowledging the diversity of our strengths and reflecting our individual, collegial and institutional values. In this context, the process of faculty reviews and evaluations within all CEFNS units shall include:

- clarity of expectations
- constructive, proactive evaluation and formative feedback
- objective appraisal by peers
- consistent and high standards.

CEFNS values diversity in the ways an individual faculty member develops excellence in his or her academic career and contributes to the collective success of the department and college. In particular, CEFNS encourages:

- an emphasis on students
- cross-disciplinary activities
- commitment to scholarship and professional involvement
- assessment for continuous improvement
- collegiality and professionalism
- service to the university and community.

II. General Process Guidelines for Academic Units of CEFNS

Academic units shall have written criteria for composition of faculty review committees, for submission of materials for evaluation, and for evaluating faculty performance, retention, promotion, tenure, and sabbatical applications. In particular, departments shall establish criteria for promotion for all ranks for which they would ordinarily employ faculty (e.g., assistant professor, assistant professor of research, assistant professor of practice, lecturer, etc.)

Departmental criteria will be submitted to the CEFNS Dean and the University Provost for approval. All evaluation processes shall follow the annual Personnel Action Calendar finalized and distributed by the provost's office.

Where criteria, process, or academic reporting structures have changed during the period of evaluation, the faculty member may explain in the submitted materials how his or her activities were shaped by previous expectations and how they relate to the new expectations.

Conflicts of interest between evaluators and evaluation subjects should be addressed formally in a document which describes the nature of the conflict and details a plan to avoid real or perceived conflict during the evaluation process. This document should be approved by the CEFNS dean and the provost.

III. Annual Evaluation Guidelines

These guidelines apply to all faculty of each department including non-tenure track lecturers, instructors, and visiting or research faculty. Part-time faculty will be evaluated according to the procedures established within the department. For split appointments, the SOE and procedures for faculty evaluation should be negotiated by the respective chairs or directors in consultation with the faculty member, and be reflective of the duties and responsibilities of the faculty member within each unit. The primary unit in joint appointments will be responsible for the evaluation submission.

The Statement of Expectations (SOE)

The SOE should be used as reference for the annual evaluation, in combination with the department's criteria for performance ratings. Thus, the SOE should be updated and modified as individuals' activities vary from year to year. This is done in Faculty 180 by April 1 of every year for the upcoming academic year. Each faculty member of the department, including non-tenure track faculty, shall have an SOE reflective of expected appointments and assignments in the upcoming year. Exceptions to this policy include part-time faculty. It is the responsibility of the department chair and faculty member to collaboratively construct an SOE that meets departmental goals and needs, while providing a pathway to success for faculty. The SOE should include all activities for which the faculty member expects to receive credit in the subsequent annual evaluation cycle. Examples of such activities include, but are not limited to:

Teaching and Student-Related Activities

- teaching of assigned courses
- providing for, and mentoring, undergraduate research experiences
- mentoring and advising of graduate students
- advising student professional organizations
- developing new curricula, refining existing curricula, or managing/leading existing programs
- implementing new pedagogical techniques
- assessing effectiveness of curricula, methodologies, and classroom activities

Scholarship/Research/Creative Activities; and professional development

- conducting scholarship
- disseminating scholarly results
- seeking funds for support of scholarly activities
- pursuing, gaining, and maintaining professional certification or registration (e.g. PE license)

Service Activities

- Participation in committee service at the departmental, college, or university level. Unusually demanding assignments such as committee leadership should be identified.
- Participation in recruiting, fund-raising, internationalization, or other development or outreach activities
- Active service to the broader community through membership on local boards and partnerships within one's professional areas of expertise
- Active service to the profession through membership on national or regional-level committees, sitting on proposal review panels, serving on editorial boards, reviewing articles for publication, etc.

Baseline Performance Expectations

An appendix to this document outlines the annual baseline performance expectations for all faculty of CEFNS to encourage a common culture of work across the college.

Annual Reviews

As required by the NAU CoFS, all full-time faculty who have less than full time administrative responsibilities will receive an annual review. All benefit eligible part-time faculty will also receive an annual review. All faculty are responsible for reporting their annual accomplishments in Faculty 180, including an Annual Faculty Performance Report; contents and format for this document will be outlined by each unit. Faculty should provide documentary evidence of effectiveness in all activities as outlined in the preceding SOE section. Performance will be evaluated overall and in each of the areas specified in the SOE: (1) teaching and student-related activities, (2) scholarship/research/creative activities; and professional development, and (3) service activities. The SOE and the unit criteria form the basis for evaluating a faculty member's performance in each area. A faculty member's percentage of effort in each area should be the basis for determining the overall rating. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness and student engagement will be based upon course evaluations by students and at least one other measure.

For the overall evaluation and each of the applicable three areas specified above, the department's appraisal should be one of the following: Highly Meritorious (4), Meritorious (3), Satisfactory (2), or Unsatisfactory(1). Split, mixed, or intermediate ratings (e.g., HM/M) will not be accepted. If the department's evaluation process results in a numerical score, there shall be an unambiguous assignment of scores to the HM/M/S/U system.

Disputes

In accordance with the NAU CoFS, the dean will normally have no active role in the annual evaluation of post-tenure faculty, unless the chair's review decision is appealed. Department performance ratings will be collected in the dean's office to be passed on to the provost; this is now done in Faculty 180. In cases where the department chair and the department FSC differ in their performance rating of a faculty member, the department chair's rating will be the official and reported rating, unless the faculty member has requested a formal reassessment by the dean, as specified in CoFS.

Retention and Renewal Reviews

Tenure Eligible Faculty

As outlined in the NAU CoFS (Section 1.4.6.1.2), annual evaluation for tenure eligible faculty must be augmented by a distinct and separate retention evaluation discussing the individual's progress to date toward meeting the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

Non-Tenure Faculty

Retention reviews for non-tenure faculty will take place every year unless they have multiple year appointments. In the case of multiple year appointments, the retention review should take place in the final year of their appointment. This review assesses the faculty member's potential for reappointment considering their performance and function served. This review should also discuss progress toward meeting the criteria for promotion if applicable.

Sabbatical

An individual who is on sabbatical leave during the period when annual performance reports are collected will be responsible for reporting the activities for the preceding academic year in the normal manner. The individual is also responsible for the creation of an SOE, in consultation with the unit chair, reflecting anticipated activities and effort allocation for the upcoming sabbatical, as outlined in the sabbatical proposal. Individuals should report on their sabbatical activities and outcomes during the annual performance cycle following the sabbatical leave, and must also comply with NAU sabbatical reporting requirements (i.e., written report and public presentation).

Leave Without Pay

Normally individuals on leave without pay will not be evaluated for the leave period. However, because of the possibility of performance distribution covering the leave period, advance arrangements for this situation should be approved by the CEFNS dean and provost prior to the leave period. A memo from the provost is the official determination of whether the period of leave will or will not count towards tenure, sabbatical, or merit.

Department Chair

Ordinarily department chairs have some fraction of their assignment to "faculty duties," allocated as a mix of instruction/student related responsibilities, scholarship, research, and/or creative activity; and professional development, and service outside of administrative duties as chair. The faculty portion of the chair's activities shall be reported to and evaluated by the department FSC in the normal way. For incumbent chairs, the FSC evaluation will go straight to the dean's office; for chairs who have just stepped down, the new chair shall evaluate the faculty activities of the previous chair following the FSC evaluation. In all cases the dean shall evaluate the administrative chair duties in a separate evaluation.

Split or Joint Appointments/Assignments

One unit, designated the primary unit, based on proportion of effort defined in the contract, takes the lead in evaluation. The chair/director of the secondary unit shall provide to the primary chair/director an evaluative letter highlighting and describing the significance of performance in the secondary unit. This letter should be included in the faculty member's file, for submission to the primary FSC. The evaluation then proceeds as normal with total overall performance evaluation provided by the chair in his or her review letter for the primary unit.

IV. Promotion and Tenure

Overall Process

The CEFNS Promotion and Tenure (P&T) process follows the structure and guidelines set forth in the NAU CoFS document and the CEFNS P&T Application Guidelines. The overall P&T review process consists of a series of reviews of the candidate's submitted application which is now completed in Faculty 180, culminating with a final decision by the NAU president. Specifically, the overall steps in the review process are as follows:

1. Candidate prepares and submits P&T application to unit chair by uploading the application into Faculty 180.
2. Unit chair reviews application for format and completeness.
3. Application is reviewed by unit's FSC, which produces an evaluative letter, including a specific recommendation regarding the promotion/tenure request, which is uploaded into Faculty 180.
4. Application is reviewed by unit chair, who produces an evaluative letter, including a specific recommendation regarding the promotion/tenure request, which is uploaded into Faculty 180.
5. Application is reviewed by CEFNS P&T committee, which produces an evaluative letter, including a specific recommendation regarding the promotion/tenure request, which is uploaded into Faculty 180.
6. Application is reviewed by CEFNS Dean, who produces an evaluative letter, including a specific recommendation regarding the promotion/tenure request, which is uploaded into Faculty 180.
7. Candidate's application is reviewed by the provost, along with evaluations and recommendations from previous levels of review. The provost produces a recommendation for action on the promotion/tenure request, which is uploaded into Faculty 180.
8. A final decision on the promotion/tenure request is made by the NAU president.

After each of the evaluative steps (3, 4, 5, 6) of the above process, candidates are able to view the evaluative letter in Faculty 180 and, if desired, have seven calendar days to submit to the next level of review an intent to respond, followed by a final submitted response completed within twelve (12) days of receipt of the initial recommendation which is done in Faculty 180. This response will become part of the candidate's application for consideration in subsequent steps of the review process. The timeline for the review process, including deadlines for each review stage, is set by the university provost.

The following paragraphs provide further clarification on key aspects of the review process.

Documentation: Candidate's Review Application

The candidate for promotion and/or tenure has the right and the primary responsibility to include documentation of performance and accomplishments relevant to all aspects of the unit's criteria, and to present the strongest possible case. (Please refer to the CEFNS P&T Application Guidelines for more specifics.)

- Tenure and promotion applications must adhere strictly to the content and formatting guidelines provided by the dean's office.

- Although the unit chair provides a formatting and content review, it remains the primary responsibility of the candidate to produce a complete and properly formatted application in Faculty 180.
- In addition to the submitted application, the departmental review committee, chair, college committee, and dean have the right to access the full Professional Review Materials in Faculty 180 for additional information relevant to faculty review.
- For split appointments, the primary unit takes the lead in the promotion and tenure process, i.e., preparation and presentation of the review and application. Evaluative contributions from the secondary unit chair/director shall be included, as described in Section III above.
- Review files will be considered “closed” at the time of submission to the FSC, i.e., at the start of the formal review process when workloads and applications are submitted in Faculty 180. This is actually locked in Faculty 180. It is incumbent on the candidate to submit a complete application; no addendums or amendments will be allowed after the review file is submitted via Faculty 180 to the FSC. The sole exception will be “late breaking news” that the candidate could not have knowledge of before the submission deadline, but had listed as submitted in review file, e.g., news of a grant award or paper acceptance. (Example – a grant proposal that was submitted was included in the file, but news of the award was not known when submitted.) The candidate may not introduce any brand new information once the promotion and/or tenure application is closed. Any “late breaking” addendums can only be included prior to the unit FSC completing their (first level) review.

Review Letters

Internal review letters may be an appropriate component of the review file, e.g., individuals with extensive intra-campus collaborations, or with particularly strong weighting of teaching excellence. Internal reviewers may include any colleagues, students or collaborators at NAU.

Candidates should submit a list of suggested internal reviewers to the unit chair by April 15 of the year the faculty member is planning to apply for promotion and/or tenure. The number of proposed internal reviewers should be agreed upon by the candidate and chair. The recommended number of internal letters is typically 3-5 depending on the position. Potential reviewers should be described briefly in terms of their ability to assess the candidate’s collaborative research contributions, instruction, and/or service; and in terms of their relationship with the candidate.

All review letters should be requested by the department or unit chair; letters should never be directly solicited by the candidate.

External review letters are a critical component of a P&T review file, and must be included in all cases. By definition, external review letters are those produced by reviewers not currently employed by or associated with NAU. Arm’s-length is defined as no current, or recent active association with the candidate. This means that reviewers are not close friends, family, current or recent collaborators, former supervisors, advisors or colleagues. Peers from the disciplinary community should be persons able to review the scholarly record (and pedagogical reputation, where appropriate). The reviewers will be from institutions and departments similar to the candidate’s own in terms of mission and expectations. The Chair is entitled to solicit additional letters, and will share these names of potential reviewers with the candidate.

Examples of who usually qualifies as an arm’s-length reviewer (these are only a few examples, this list is not all inclusive):

- Appeared on a panel at a conference with the candidate
- Served on a granting council selection panel with the candidate
- Editor of a publication in which the candidate has published or contributed more than 10 years ago
- The candidate is an editor of a publication in which the arm's-length reviewer has published or contributed
- Arm's-length reviewer has presented as a guest lecture at the candidate's university
- Co-author or research collaborator with the candidate more than ten years ago

Examples of who usually does not qualify as an arm's-length reviewer (again these are only a few examples, this list is not all inclusive):

- A previous colleague from any current or former institution
- A regular co-author and/or research, teaching or service collaborator of the candidate's, within the past ten years
- Any family/friend relationship with the candidate
- The doctoral and post-doctoral supervisor of the candidate

Faculty members should not contact any internal, external or arm's-length reviewer, they should simply provide a list of names of potential reviewers to the Chair/unit leader.

For promotion to associate professor, a minimum of three external review letters are required in the application; at least one letter shall be from an arm's-length reviewer capable of providing an objective evaluation.

For promotion to professor, professional reputation is a key review criterion. All such promotion requests must include a minimum of five external review letters, of which three are from arm's-length reviewers.

For promotions within non-tenure track ranks (research, clinical, lecturer, and professor of practice), external and arm's-length reviews may not be applicable but are required if a faculty member's workload in their SOE has a research expectation of 20% or above. The number will follow the above minimum guidelines. For faculty with less than 20% research expectation, then three letters of review are required and they may be from internal, external or external arm's-length reviewers.

Candidates will submit a list of suggested reviewers to the unit chair by April 15 of the year they are applying for promotion and/or tenure. The list should have at least two more arm's-length reviewers than the number needed as specified above. Potential reviewers should be described briefly in terms of their ability to assess the candidate's research, instruction, and/or service; and in terms of their relationship with the candidate.

The unit chair will develop a pool of potential reviewers based on the candidate's suggestions, as well as input from the FSC, and any added names will be shared with the candidate for comment. There should be an attempt to solicit reviews from those in "peer" departments or programs, i.e., similar to the home unit of the candidate. The candidate will not be made aware of those selected or not selected to act as reviewers.

All review letters must be requested by the department or unit chair; letters should never be directly solicited by the candidate. If at all possible, the requestor (department or unit chair) should not unduly influence the recommendation.

While external reviewers will ordinarily feel most comfortable commenting upon the research and scholarly record, they should be provided with enough background material (departmental mission, general expectations of faculty in the program, etc.) to place the candidate's research in context. Additionally, some reviewers are well qualified to evaluate aspects of a person's teaching and/or professional service; thus it is appropriate to include some portions of the application package documenting these activities in the materials sent to outside reviewers.

For arm's-length reviewers specifically, any relationship existing between the candidate and possible reviewer must clearly be identified by the candidate (PhD mentor, co-author, former student, etc.).

Internal and external reviews are confidential; these review letters should never be viewed by anyone outside the legitimate review process. All external letters will be returned to the dean's office. All review letters will be uploaded as part of each evaluation into the Faculty 180 system by the dean's office. Letters may not be introduced into the file once the review package is submitted to the FSC in the first stage of the review. Please see the CEFNS P&T Application Guidelines for complete information on confidential external and arm's-length reviewers and the process. Only letters solicited for the current review should be used. Letters previously submitted with earlier promotion and/or tenure applications may not be used again.

The unit chair should provide information to the dean's office as a preface to the review letters, which briefly describes the process by which reviewers were selected (e.g., which reviewers were suggested by the candidate vs. chair/FSC) and other details relevant to the provenance of review letters (e.g., known associations between reviewers and candidates, or a description of reviewers in terms of their familiarity with the kind of department and/or institution in which the candidate works).

The candidate shall have the opportunity to see the names of potential reviewers, but will have no knowledge of which reviewers are asked to provide letters and which actually do provide letters.

Along with the list of suggested reviewers, the candidate will provide the unit chair with a signed disclosure form indicating their understanding that these letters are confidential and waiving all rights to access the letters; a sample waiver form is included in the CEFNS P&T Application Guidelines packet.

As part of the formal review request and packet, reviewers should receive written confirmation of this confidentiality and the candidate's acknowledgment.

Review letters are solicited by the chair but are sent to the Dean's office and are added in Faculty 180 prior to the Chair's content and format review, before the candidate's application is made available to the FSC for review in Faculty 180. All reviewer letters received by the deadline must be included in Faculty 180 for the review. Such letters must then be removed from the faculty member's Faculty 180 information once the review is complete to ensure confidentiality.

College P&T Committee

The College P&T committee is typically constituted of representatives (one each) from all CEFNS academic units; committee representatives are chosen by the unit following procedures that the unit has approved. The Chair of the P&T committee is selected by the P&T committee annually at the first committee meeting.

- The representative from the candidate's home department shall not participate actively in discussion of the candidate's application, but shall stand ready to explain or interpret departmental practice and criteria, disciplinary practices or unique aspects of peer recognition and dissemination, etc. Such input will be provided only when specifically requested by other committee members.
- The representative from the candidate's home department shall not vote on the candidate's application, and shall not participate in drafting the committee's letter of review.
- All eligible P&T committee members must register a vote for each file reviewed; votes should be recorded as "strong yes", "yes", "no", or "abstain". The precise tally of votes should be clearly indicated in the committee's evaluative letter. Abstention is permitted only when the committee member had provided an internal review letter.
- Committee members absent for a vote due to special circumstances may, with the approval of the dean and committee chair, submit their votes in writing to the committee chair (assuming they have participated in discussion of the file). If no such arrangements have been made, absent committee members' votes are counted, by default, as abstentions.
- Evaluative letters produced by the committee must be reviewed and signed by all voting committee members prior to submission to the dean. The representative from the candidate's home department and any abstaining committee member cannot contribute to the evaluation letter and are not signatories to the letter.
- The final letter is uploaded into Faculty 180 upon evaluation completion.

Evaluation Outcomes: Letters

Formal evaluative letters should be produced at each stage of the review process, highlighting key factors in the evaluation, and providing a clear recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. Such letters should be more than a simple aggregation or accumulation of the annual appraisals; there should be explicit discussion of how specific elements in the documented record meet (or fail to meet) the unit's criteria. These letters are uploaded into Faculty 180.

Denial

If the application for tenure is denied at the president's level, the candidate will be informed of the decision and notified that he or she will be receiving a terminal contract for the following year. Candidates denied tenure at the president's level are not eligible to reapply. The candidate may have certain rights of appeal, as indicated in the NAU CoFS. If a candidate has applied for tenure earlier than the mandatory deadline, the candidate may choose to withdraw the case at any point prior to a final decision by the president.

If the department FSC, department chair or CEFNS dean makes a negative recommendation for faculty requesting promotion to professor status, the candidate will be allowed to withdraw the application instead of advancing it to the provost. The candidate may alternatively choose to proceed and to respond in Faculty 180 to the denial, according to procedures in the NAU CoFS document. Candidates who are denied promotion to professor may choose to reapply during a subsequent review cycle.

Appendix A – Baseline Performance Expectations

This appendix outlines annual baseline performance expectations for all CEFNS faculty, divided into the standard three categories of faculty responsibility. The faculty member's SOE will include additional expectations beyond this based upon the unit the faculty's position and the faculty member's role in that unit.

Student-Related Responsibilities

The *baseline performance expectations* in student-related responsibilities are:

Faculty must maintain a minimum level of effectiveness in teaching as judged by the following:

- The creation of course-specific syllabi that are provided to the department and to students on the first day of class, and comply with approved university format and content requirements (see UCC website), as well as with other content requirements established by the unit (e.g., course learning outcomes to support accreditation)
- The maintenance of clear records that support the assignment of final grades
- A professional classroom environment, supportive of the learning outcomes, which includes the presentation of current and relevant information
- The meeting of all scheduled classes (except for illness or prior notification of an absence approved by the department chair). Requests of Absence (eROAs) must be submitted and approved by the chair for all absences
- Holding a minimum appropriate number of office hours per week, as approved by the department chair and/or outlined by established departmental policy
- Adherence to course pre/co-requisite requirements

Faculty must provide a minimum level of effective academic student advising, as judged by the following:

- Holding the minimum office hours, as specified above
- Maintaining appointments with students
- Maintaining familiarity with current curricular and academic requirements of the department, college, and university; faculty knowledge must be adequate to accurately advise students where such advising is expected in order to understand where to refer students

Scholarship, research, and/or creative activity; and professional development

The *baseline performance expectations* in scholarship, research, and/or creative activity and professional development are:

- Specific scholarly and professional development goals, projects, milestones, and anticipated deliverables, clearly articulated in each SOE
- Dissemination of results to appropriate audience
- Maintaining currency in faculty member's area of specialty or research

Service

The *baseline performance expectations* in service are:

- For committee work, the faculty member is expected to:
 - Attend meetings on a regular basis
 - Be on time for the start of the meetings, and remain until the meeting is adjourned
 - Provide active and constructive input in committee discussions
 - Contribute to the committee deliverables
- Attend graduation ceremonies dressed in academic regalia
- Participate in NAU mandated activities in a timely manner, e.g., Preventing Workplace Harassment Training, Information Security Essentials, CERT and FERPA training
- The faculty member must actively support the unit's self-improvement and assessment activities, including:
 - Regularly attending and participating in department meetings
 - Developing and maintaining quality curricula to effectively and efficiently meet department, college, or university goals
 - Completing regular accreditation/certification tasks in a timely manner
 - Participating in assessment and improvement activities at all levels, e.g., course, curriculum, program