

Faculty Annual Review and Promotion & Tenure Documents Criteria, Standards, Processes Compiled: May 2021

Table of Contents

<i>Candidate Requirements</i>	3
Instructions to the Candidate	3
Candidates Needs/Document Checklist	3
Form: P&T Application Faculty Information	4
Professional Statement	4
Teaching (Student-Related Activities).....	4
Scholarship and Creative Activities.....	5
Service	6
<i>College of Social and Behavioral Sciences</i>	8
Faculty Performance Review & Evaluations.....	8
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	17
Evaluation Criteria and Indicators of Faculty Performance	17
Standards for Promotion to Specific Ranks.....	22
Letter from Chair to solicit external reviewers	27
<i>Applied and Indigenous Studies</i>	28
Annual Review	28
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	41
<i>Anthropology</i>	52
Annual Review	52
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	58
<i>Criminology and Criminal Justice</i>	64
Annual Review	64
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	76
<i>Ethnic Studies</i>	85
Annual Review	85
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	88
<i>Geography, Planning, and Recreation</i>	98
Annual Review	98
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	115

<i>Politics and International Affairs</i>	125
Annual Review	125
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	136
<i>Psychological Sciences</i>	143
Annual Review	143
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	156
<i>School of Communication</i>	168
Annual Review	168
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	178
<i>Sociology</i>	220
Annual Review	220
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	230
<i>Social Work</i>	237
Annual Review	237
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	245
<i>Sustainable Communities</i>	246
Annual Review	246
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	251
<i>Women's and Gender Studies</i>	260
Annual Review	260
Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria	264

Candidate Requirements

Instructions to the Candidate

The foundation of your application packet is the curriculum vita (aka Standard CV) in FAAR. Workload documents and reports submitted every semester provide base information. Faculty must make sure all activities are appropriately entered using the "Workload" form. This includes attaching any supporting documentation (e.g. conference proceedings, manuscripts, acceptance letters etc.). You can check the "Activities" section to make sure all work is up to date **prior** to submitting application.

Use the activities section or workload form in FAAR to build your vita. Please note the following:

1. Attachments to scholarly products are linked in FAAR, not RPT. Upload specific documents using the workload form.
2. Make sure to use the "Manage Status" button on the edit screen of an activity to add (rather than overwrite) a new status (e.g. submitted, accepted, published or in service when inactive on a committee).

After any changes are made in FAAR, regenerate your vita by clicking Regenerate in the Actions column of the Faculty180/FAAR Vita section in RPT. This should be done prior to the deadline for submission to make sure the most up to date information is in your application.

Candidates Needs/Document Checklist

Document	Requirements (see below for further information)
Form: Application Information	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Upload unit criteria for promotion (will be provided to candidate)2. Upload official Letter of Appointment (approving prior credits, if applicable)3. Forms: P&T Application Faculty Information (pop-up box)<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Rank applying forb. Semester/Year started at NAUc. Years in current rankd. # of prior credits
Professional Statement	Professional statement
Teaching (Student-Related Activities)	Narrative of Student-Related Activities
Scholarship and Creative Activities	Narrative of Scholarship
Service	Narrative of Service
Vita Regeneration Confirmation	Candidate confirms that vita has been regenerated from FAAR to reflect any new edits before submitting case in RPT.

Form: P&T Application Faculty Information

Instructions: Enter your promotion and/or tenure action requested (select both tenure and rank box if both are applicable), semester and year started as faculty at NAU, years in current rank, and, if applicable, number of prior credit years. Prior credit years must be supported with uploaded documentation.

Professional Statement

The candidate must write and upload a **professional statement** with their file. This shall include a statement of professional goals related to student-related responsibilities, scholarship where appropriate, and service; a research plan and overview of scholarship; teaching philosophy and an overview of accomplishments; and career goals and vision for the future. Generally, this overview can be achieved in no more than 2-3 pages. Candidates are strongly encouraged to provide a summary of specific expectations of rank, and synopsis of how those criteria have been met or exceeded.

The following sections in the application should relate clearly to the statements you make here. Those sections (on Overviews of teaching, scholarship & service) allow you to amplify what you have outlined in this professional statement, and to document your performance and achievements in more detail. Use these sections as the opportunity to synthesize your activities into a holistic story of contributions.

Teaching (Student-Related Activities)

Upload a **narrative** of student-related activities particularly addressing the extent to which unit criterion for promotion/tenure has been met/exceeded. According to a longstanding ABOR requirement the evaluation of teaching effectiveness and student engagement should be based upon at least one additional measure beyond course evaluations. Provide this additional evidence of effectiveness, which is normally determined at the department level. Your department may opt for a reflective summary that takes the form of what is being required here in this dossier.

Suggestions for the additional measure includes: an objective review of an actual class conducted by a peer or a faculty development consultant, objective peer evaluation of course materials, collated data and insights from a student focus group, a well-constructed teaching portfolio with reflection, or a demonstration of continuous improvement fostered by participation in teaching-related workshops, etc.

Other captured self-assessments that might apply are:

- A before and after course self-assessment and journaling.
- The assessment techniques you've used to examine course effectiveness.
- The leadership roles you've played in curriculum development, etc. (This is particularly important for applicants to full professor.)
- The impact of your teaching beyond your own students and classroom, which might include articles, presentations, outreach, and development work.
- A description of how your teaching activities contribute to the missions of the department, college, and university.
- A description of your efforts in extraordinary teaching environments such as field-based instruction, problem-based learning, distances delivery, etc.

Advising

If applicable, please provide a narrative of your major advising duties, which could include: undergraduate academic and career advising, graduate student advising in research and/or teaching, and club or student professional society advisement. Make sure to indicate your time commitment to each major advising activity. Take care to describe your role in each activity and the impact of your involvement. Describe special accomplishments such as mentoring students, supervising internships, supervising student workers, facilitating student opportunities, serving on

graduate student committees, etc. With respect to graduate students: name these students and identify those who have completed degrees under your direction.

Additional information for Promotion and/or Tenure: Teaching and Advising

The Conditions of Faculty Service document and College policy dictate that teaching effectiveness shall be evaluated by a number of criteria, only one of which may be the scores of course evaluations. We recommend that you ask your mentor or a member of the FSC to sit in on and evaluate several of your classes.

We also suggest including as many of the following documents in your file as you feel will support your application:

- Written evaluations from class evaluations: A spectrum of comments is useful. Please use moderation in compiling the evaluations, and include negative constructive comments that have shaped your teaching. Please comment on how your teaching has been changed by positive and negative evaluations.
- Documentation about how you have improved a class, developed a class, or used innovative approaches.
- Research is a powerful teaching tool, and some department's award teaching credit to faculty who conduct seminars with their research group. Please make it clear which classes are "general" classes to a broad range of students, and which are research seminars.
- Ask your Chair to provide results of exit interviews they conducted with graduating seniors.
- Advising can be difficult to document. Please highlight important aspects, which may include:
 - advising a high number of students relative to others in your department;
 - participation in previews on a regular basis;
 - mentorship, including mentoring clubs or in other specific activities with students;
 - advising graduate students who are not discussed in the context of teaching or research.

Scholarship and Creative Activities

Attach a summary **narrative** of scholarly activity, particularly addressing the extent to which unit criteria for promotion/tenure have been met/exceeded. Describe and document your accomplishments as a scholar. What do you consider to be your most important achievements and contributions to your discipline? How does your work demonstrate that you have met the scholarship expectations of your department and the university? How has your scholarly work grown and developed over the period evaluated here?

Note: The vita will list all efforts (including unfunded grants) that are added using the workload form in FAAR. Make sure this is complete including attachments (manuscripts, abstracts, conference proceedings – refer to the FAAR handbook for directions).

IMPORTANT ELEMENTS TO INCLUDE

- your time commitment and effort for scholarly activities, including percent of time spent on research grant management and actual research work.
- your publications and scholarly disseminations (remember that most of the reviewers of your package will be from different disciplines, so explain anything you'd like them to understand, such as the relative selectivity or impact of a particular journal, or the fact that proceedings in a specific conference are peer-reviewed).
- if appropriate, your role and percent contribution on jointly prepared proposals and co-authorship of publications.
- peer recognition in its multiple forms, including invited presentations, leadership roles or elected positions in professional organizations, work as a reviewer of proposals or of manuscripts, or selection for editorial boards and review panels.
- accomplishments in the area of intellectual property and/or technology transfer (e.g., invention disclosures, patent applications or patents).

Additional information for Promotion and Tenure: Scholarly Activity

One particularly difficult aspect of evaluating a candidate's research file is understanding their contribution to a multi-author paper. You are encouraged to communicate this aspect of your research in any way that is clear, but the committee must be able to understand your part. Please include a brief statement at the beginning of the section explaining how you express your contributions.

You may want to follow one of these suggestions:

1. Provide a statement regarding the relative importance of authors. For example, in some fields, the chief contributions are made by a lab director who puts their name at the end of the list of authors. In others, the first author has made the most important contribution. In still others, the corresponding author has made the greatest contribution, but is not necessarily first or last author.
2. Number your publications, and in the general research statement at the beginning of the research section, discuss your research interests and which papers highlight your major accomplishments in the different areas.
3. Next to each paper reference, put the relative percentage of your contribution in parentheses.
4. Put stars or some other demarcation by the papers in which you had major contributions.
5. Involving students in research is highly valuable, and we suggest that you highlight student co-authors (putting a student's name in italics is a good way to do this). If graduate and undergraduate students are important to your research effort, discuss how many students you supervise and what their contribution is.
6. Many reviewers of your file will come from outside your discipline, and hence they will not be familiar with the publication in your field. Therefore, it is essential to separate refereed publications from non-refereed publications.

Please follow the same guidelines for proposals and grants. In many cases it may be easiest to list the relative percentage of your contribution.

Knowing the level and persistence at which you have sought external funding is important to the committee; list unsuccessful as well as successful proposals. Reviews from these proposals may give the committee insight into funding difficulties in your field. In all cases, please list the amount of the proposal.

Service

Attach a summary **narrative** of service, particularly addressing the extent to which unit criteria for promotion/tenure have been met/exceeded. Include descriptions of your service role's impact on the department/college/university/community. If you have developed leadership roles, please describe them here. Make sure to describe your level of contribution and effort, which could include details on the time committed. For promotion to full professor, document your leadership and the impact of your service to various communities. Note that in the past college committees and others have expected significant service beyond the department as a criterion for promotion to full professor.

A note for those with some administrative duties: Consistent with the NAU COFS, your promotion and/or tenure case will be evaluated only on the merits of your activities in student-related responsibilities, scholarship and research, and service.

Additional information for Promotion and Tenure: Service

Service should be clearly divided into service to the department, college, university, community, and profession. Promotion and tenure are not awarded on the basis of service alone, but your service to the university at all levels and the recognition you bring to the university through professional activities are very important. You may find it easiest to make a table showing committees or activities and your contribution to them. Please describe (briefly) all activities.

Attachment to specific service activities should be attached in FAAR on the Workload or Activities section.

WHAT TO DO

Log on to FAAR, select link to promotion application

Regenerate CV

Add all attachments (narratives)

Regenerate CV one last time!

Verify CV regeneration

Submit all

RPT TRAINING VIDEO

[Provost's website](#) provides Instruction guides (right hand side) and a [video link](#).

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Faculty Performance Review & Evaluations

Adopted April 2019

The College of Social & Behavioral Sciences strives to create an environment in which faculty will have opportunity to develop and reach the highest level of accomplishment in their field, as is fitting with the nature of appointment and mission of the academic unit. The College values learning, discovery, and application that addresses human and social development, significant problems facing societies throughout the world, improves the vitality and sustainability of communities, advances justice and equity, and advances professional practice.

Faculty are first, and foremost, educators who design and facilitate learning. The impact of effective teaching is reflected in varied student outcomes. All faculty are scholars in the sense of sustained engagement with a field so as to inform teaching and curriculum development. Faculty who have appointments with expectations for scholarship contribute meaningfully to knowledge, theory, and creative or professional practice in their fields. Scholarship is evaluated by peers and disseminated formally through diverse channels, most importantly peer reviewed publication and juried exhibition. Research and creative scholarly efforts are directed toward outcomes that will have the most substantial impact and visibility in the faculty's area of expertise and be reviewed by their peers. Our endeavors are inherently collective—faculty collaborate to design curricula, develop policies, and refine practices in pursuit of common goals. Thus, all faculty are expected to be high level contributors to the many joint activities that sustain academic units and programs.

Evaluation policies guiding annual, tenure, and promotion reviews of faculty set out expectations for faculty performance in relation to benchmarks distinguishing high levels of contribution and achievement in the primary areas of effort—teaching and student related responsibilities, scholarship, and service. **Expectations reflected in policies and practices for faculty review, are calibrated to distribution of effort. SBS faculty have different configurations of assignments depending on rank and/or career phase. Consequently, application and weighting of criteria for evaluation vary accordingly. Evaluation outcomes also influence workload assignments. In this way, the Statement of Expectations and faculty review are inextricably linked.**

Each academic unit in the college will have in place policies for annual, tenure and promotion review approved by the dean and provost. While unit level policies vary in accordance with disciplines/professions, mission and goals of programs, departments and schools, they have in common four attributes: 1) they set out high expectations; 2) criteria and indicators for different levels of performance are rooted in a shared conception of a highly performing/contributing faculty member, with consideration to expected evolution of contributions with advancing rank/seniority; 3) assignment of effort for individual faculty are dynamically tied to performance evaluation, as is fitting with appointment and rank; 4) evaluative criteria set out absolute standards that do not constrain attainment on the basis of distributional parameters.

Within this context, peer and leadership reviews of faculty should be conducted with integrity to high expectations, honoring varied fields and assignments. The primary objective of annual reviews is to inform decisions about retention, provide formative assessment that supports faculty development, and recognize accomplishments over the prior year. For these purposes, honest appraisal of strengths as well as weaknesses is required. Promotion and tenure reviews are conducted for the purpose of determining qualification for an elevation of rank within tenure or non-tenure eligible tracks. In both cases, peers evaluate evidence of impact on learning, scholarly, creative or professional achievements, and contributions to the unit, college,

university or professional/academic organizations. Faculty are responsible to compile a professional record that is mindful of expectations and criteria.

What follows is a framework for the on-going development of unit level policies within the College of Social & Behavioral Sciences. This is intended as philosophical and epistemological guidance that ensures consistency/equity in practice among diverse units and fields and promotes excellence across the college.

Teaching and Student-Related Activities

Faculty teaching is evaluated on qualitative and quantitative dimensions, which include the evaluation of teaching-related materials, descriptions and evidence of teaching and mentoring activity, and description and evidence of teaching activity aligned with best practices in the scholarship of teaching and learning. In compliance with ABOR policy, all evaluations of teaching performance must include opinions and feedback from the students.

Qualitative Contributions: Student opinion surveys of a course should NOT be the only evidence of teaching effectiveness considered in the annual evaluation. Each unit should also specify other types of evidence that will be considered, and should be provided by the faculty member evaluated. The faculty member should submit a self-assessment and description of the course and its delivery and other student mentoring activities. Additional evidence documenting the quality of teaching may include (but is not limited to): peer evaluations, teaching awards, awards won by supervised students, teaching-related grants, instructional evaluation documents, unsolicited written statements from students, teaching materials including syllabi, tests, quizzes, homework assignments, handouts, graded papers, or contents of a teaching portfolio, professional development related to teaching, and any other teaching-related evidence of quality of instruction or student learning processes or outcomes.

Thus, the overall goal is for the faculty member to provide evidence (through these various forms of information) that characterizes the attitudes and aptitudes that go into creating an outstanding teaching experience (e.g., course content, faculty's mastery of the material, ability to communicate, ability to motivate, organization of material, clarity of learning goals, expectations, and assessment of those goals, development of or first-time application of new techniques, etc.). Furthermore, since the objective of good teaching is student learning, all faculty members are accountable for documenting the degree to which department learning goals have been met in their courses, an activity undertaken as a normal part of the assessment process.

Quantitative Contributions: When faculty make contributions to the unit's teaching mission that exceed the expectations in their SoE, or, when the particular activity requires an unusually high level of effort, the additional quantitative aspect should be taken into account. Exceptional contributions to the teaching mission may include, for example: larger courses, where faculty can document the additional time/effort required to teach larger number of students, new course preparation (as compared to a course previously taught), major revisions to a course, large graduate courses or graduate courses that require additional time/effort, unexpected increases in student enrollment, core course (rather than elective), more contact or credit hours (compared to fewer) if not accounted for in SoE, supervision of numerous teaching assistants (or insufficient support), evidence of flexibility and accommodation to departmental requests, devoting extra time on professional development of teaching effectiveness, particularly robust and innovative teaching techniques, and/or other 'teaching' related evidence of extra quantity.

Taken together, the assessment of faculty teaching and student learning are essential components of what is understood as the evaluation of "teaching and student-related activities." Each faculty member is responsible for providing the evidence to support their evaluation.

Student-Related Activities

Student-related activities extend beyond the classroom, are enumerated in the faculty member's Statement of Expectations, and may include one or more of the following: advising undergraduate or graduate students (Master's or doctoral), directing undergraduate or graduate student research, graduate thesis/dissertation committee member, supervising undergraduate or graduate teaching assistants, and directing internships. The evaluation of these activities will be in line with percentage allocated in SoE. For any activity, adequate documentation of the activity, self-assessment of the effectiveness of the activity to meet departmental goals, and any evaluation of those activities.

Teaching allocation

Typically, most NTT faculty will have an 80% allocation to teaching and student related activity. Most tenured/tenure track faculty will have teaching allocations between 50-80%. Teaching allocations should be calibrated based upon department needs, rank, and other faculty activities. Evaluation of teaching and student related activities is not based upon the quantity but rather on quality of the activity.

Samples of Different Levels of Evaluation

Satisfactory Rating:

Faculty member teaches the assigned courses and engages in student-related activities (as documented by SoE). There is no evidence of unsatisfactory performance. Data from student opinion surveys are the only source of external evaluation. A self-evaluation of teaching and mentorship (e.g., student-related activity) is included, but the self-assessment does not explicitly tie teaching efforts to overarching philosophy of teaching and department learning goals. Syllabus and other forms of course materials are provided, but the syllabus and other documented activities do not reflect sufficient detail to evaluate the quality of the material or its delivery, or if materials are sufficiently detailed, the materials do not reflect high quality instruction or provide sufficient indices of best pedagogical and discipline-specific material. The faculty member provides little to no evidence regarding the success of student learning.

Meritorious Rating:

Faculty member teaches the assigned courses and engages in student-related activities (as documented by SoE) and utilizes the department-approved learning goals. Data from student opinion surveys are NOT the only source of external evaluation, but additional forms of evaluation are minimal (but valued). Syllabus and other forms of course materials are provided and the syllabus and other documented activities (including mentoring student- related activities) reflect sufficient detail to evaluate the quality of the material or its delivery, as well as evidence that the faculty member is providing high quality instruction as evidenced by best pedagogical and discipline- specific material. The faculty member provides evidence regarding the success of student learning (e.g., specific to learning goals) for the teaching and/or mentoring activities.

Highly Meritorious Rating:

Faculty member teaches the assigned courses and engages in student-related activities (as documented by SoE) and utilizes the department-approved learning goals. Multiple forms of evaluation are provided about the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. Evidence of students' mastery of learning goals is provided and sufficiently detailed. Syllabus and other forms of course materials are provided and the syllabus and other documented activities reflect sufficient detail to evaluate the quality of the material or its delivery, as well as evidence that the faculty member is providing high quality instruction as evidenced by best pedagogical and discipline-specific material. Faculty include innovative teaching techniques in their syllabi. There is additional evidence of teaching and student-related activity quality (see list above), including evidence of practices that reflects a scholarly approach to teaching. A highly meritorious rating would require evidence of work that exceeds the expectations outlined in the faculty member's SoE (as listed above).

Faculty Evaluation: Scholarly and Creative Activity

Evidence of research effectiveness can be demonstrated through a variety of different products including: peer-reviewed publications (books and articles, creative work), non-peer-reviewed publications (technical reports, white papers, non-peer reviewed articles, books¹, and creative works), extra-institutional grants and contracts, conference professional presentations and participation (invited or non-invited)², invited research talks, and research in progress. A faculty member is evaluated both quantitatively, i.e., based upon the number of these products they produce and qualitatively based on factors such as the impact and/or influence of the scholarly or creative product on the faculty member's field.

It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide evidence (self-review, citations, impact factors, reviews, etc.) to make a case for the impact and/or influence of their scholarly and/or creative activities. In addition, it is the faculty member's responsibility to explain why a particular outlet (conference, journal, publisher, show location, news outlet, etc.) was chosen for their work and why this is the most appropriate outlet for said work.

While all research and creative activity is valued, we acknowledge that not all activity requires the same amount of effort or produces the same influence on a field. In general, there are two types of research activities, those that are externally reviewed/judged in some way and result in a completed work and those that are not externally reviewed and/or works in progress. We acknowledge that even within these categories the degree of efforts varies (for example, a peer reviewed research article requires a higher level of effort than a peer-reviewed book review) and unit criteria and evaluation should be calibrated accordingly. We expect that faculty will have work at various stages of production and documented effort should be valued as faculty move their work through the production process.

Completed reviewed research and creative activities include: published peer reviewed articles, published peer reviewed book chapters, published/completed peer-reviewed/adjudicated creative works, awarded outside grant funding or contracts, peer-reviewed published books³, and peer-reviewed published book review or creative review, awarded grants⁴.

Non-reviewed and non-completed research and creative activities include: book contracts (even if peer reviewed), conference participation (see Note 2), invited research talks, submission or R&R of peer reviewed article or creative work, submission of outside grants, field work, non-peer reviewed publications/reports, and professional development related to research.

We also acknowledge that not every faculty has the same level of expectations related to research and scholarly work. Generally speaking, tenure stream faculty will have at least a 20% allocation to research. Non-tenure track faculty, with terminal degrees, can be assigned 10% to the area of research/scholarly activities. Evaluation of faculty achievement in research /creative activity should be calibrated to their assigned level of effort.

A **low** research allocation is 5-19%

A **medium** research allocation is 20-34%

A **high** research allocation is 34-49%

A **very high** research allocation is 50% and above.

1 - Publication through self-publication or "vanity" presses is not considered active research participation for faculty. There is recognition that non-peer reviewed works that influence the public discourse are important for faculty in their roles as public intellectuals.

2 - In most instances, conference participation indicates active participation. This means engaging in a conference role that requires engaged participation such as roundtable participation, conference panel participant presenting a paper or creative work, and conference panel discussant, discussing papers or creative works. Generally, chairing a panel and simply attending a conference does not constitute active participation.

In most cases, it will be highly unusual to have a research allocation above 50% without the faculty buying out their time through external funding. Additionally, we acknowledge there is variation within these ranges and units should calibrate their expectations based upon where faculty fall within the ranges.

Satisfactory Performance

We expect that all faculty with research assignment are achieving a **satisfactory** level of effort related to research and scholarly activity. A faculty member working at a satisfactory level of performance is an active scholar in his/her field, with no evidence of unsatisfactory performance. The faculty member engages in at least some research or scholarly activity during the review cycle commensurate with the assigned effort.

In most instances⁵:

A faculty with a **low** assignment to research/creative activity would be expected to engage in one non-reviewed, non-completed activity.

A faculty with a **medium** assignment to research/creative activity would be expected to engage in at least two non-reviewed, non-completed activities.

A faculty with a **high** assignment to research/creative activity would be expected to engage in more than two non-reviewed, non-completed activities.

A faculty with a **very high** assignment to research/creative activity would be expected to engage in at least one reviewed/completed activity and more than one non-reviewed, non-completed activities.

A faculty member (no matter their level of effort) with a satisfactory rating demonstrates little impact of these activities in their field. It should be noted, that a tenure stream faculty working at a satisfactory level for multiple years before tenure and/or promotion could be in jeopardy of not meeting minimum departmental or college standards for promotion and/or tenure in the area of research.

Meritorious Performance

A faculty member who achieves a **meritorious** level of performance is a strong and active researcher in their field doing above and beyond what is expected on a yearly basis for faculty with research/scholarly expectations.

In most instances:

A faculty with a **low** assignment to research/creative activity would be expected to engage in at least two non-reviewed, non-completed activities.

A faculty with a **medium** assignment to research/creative activity would be expected to engage in at least three non-reviewed, non-completed activities.

A faculty with a **high** assignment to research/creative activity would be expected to engage in more than three non-reviewed, non-completed activities or one completed activity.

A faculty with a **very high** assignment to research/creative activity would be expected to engage in at least one reviewed/completed activity and more than two non-reviewed, non-completed activities.

The faculty member justifies the outlet for his/her work showing that it is the most appropriate outlet for the work and demonstrates impact/influence in his/her field.

3 - It is accepted that a peer-reviewed book is the equivalent of three peer-reviewed articles.

4 - Faculty should be rewarded for seeking outside funding. We recognize that often first grant attempts are not successful. Grants also have differing levels of effort, and units need to calibrate their review and expectations accordingly.

5 - We acknowledge that this document provides ideal-type scenarios. Faculty may deviate from these scenarios and unit and college level peer evaluators have the responsibility of determining equivalencies in review. Faculty as well have the responsibility, in their self-evaluations, of making a case for how their level of assignment corresponds to level of review.

Highly Meritorious

A faculty member who achieves a **highly meritorious** level of performance is truly working at an exceptional level and influencing the direction of their field or public discourse. In most instances, we would expect the faculty has a completed work product to achieve this level of review.

In most instances:

A faculty with a **low** assignment to research/creative activity would be expected to engage in at least three non-reviewed or non-completed activities or have one completed reviewed activity. A faculty with a **medium** assignment to research/creative activity would be expected to engage in more than three non-reviewed or non-completed activities, or one reviewed/completed activity and one non-reviewed or non-completed activity.

A faculty with a **high** assignment to research/creative activity would be expected to engage in at least one reviewed/completed activity and more than two non-reviewed or non-completed activities.

A faculty with a **very high** assignment to research/creative activity would be expected to engage in one to two reviewed/completed activities and more than two non-reviewed or non-completed activities.

Note: a peer-reviewed book would be considered equivalent to three peer-reviewed articles for these purposes. In addition to the quantitative output, the faculty member clearly demonstrates the impact and influence of their work is of a high level through citations, impact factors or other measurements of quality of their choosing and provides ample justification for the outlets used for their work. This justification clearly demonstrates that the outlet is the most appropriate outlet to disseminate the faculty member's work.

Faculty Evaluation in the Area of Service

The NAU Conditions of Faculty Service policy states that, "For the evaluation of service (including a faculty member's administrative service duties), the faculty member will supply a list of their service activities (including service to the profession, department/school/ college/university, and to the community as these activities relate to the mission of the university) as defined in a faculty member's Statement of Expectations and any other relevant materials selected by consensus within the unit."

The SBS P&T document states that "Service activities include participation in committee work and administrative tasks within the University (at Department/School, College, and University levels), leadership and/or participation in the work of the profession, and contributing one's professional expertise to activities involving a variety of organizations, such as schools, industry, and local, state, and federal government agencies."

Service allocation in a faculty SOE typically ranges between 10% and 20% (averaging 4 to 8 hours per week) and must be evaluated accordingly. That is, evaluation should be calibrated based on effort allocated in the SoE. Normally, if a faculty member is not taking on leadership roles and other high impact service activities, the service load will be 10%. All faculty are expected to participate in the life of the department, including attending departmental meetings. Faculty who are mainly assigned to teaching are expected to engage in professional development activities related to maintaining and honing their skills as teachers. Faculty with teaching and research expectations are expected to engage in activities related to honing skills in both areas.

Evaluation of each faculty member in the area of service should take into account the following:

1. Effective functioning of departments, colleges, and the university as a whole depends on faculty stepping up to fill important committee positions. All faculty are expected to

carry a reasonable share of department, college, and university committee and other service responsibilities. We recognize that some committees require a great deal more work than others. Leadership roles typically carry a higher time commitment than committee membership. Level of service activities will vary according to faculty rank and experience (for example, junior faculty are not expected to fill university-level committee positions until they have experience in relevant department and college level committees). We also recognize that some service positions have more impact than others.

2. Professional service is expected of all scholars, and some activities are more work than others, and some have a higher impact than others.
3. Professional development is extremely important because faculty must constantly master new skills and knowledge to stay current with teaching and research/creative activities. Low impact, but necessary, activities include NAU workshops on pedagogy, technology, or policies and procedures. High impact, high value activities include thorough trainings, courses, and certifications in new skills and knowledge than can be applied to research, teaching, or both, in ways that further the mission of the unit. In most cases, effort related to professional development will not exceed 5% of a faculty member's time.
4. Community service and engagement is a valued and important part of faculty life. As with all service activity, it is important for the faculty member to justify their community activity and its link to professional activity.

There are several types of service categories in the life of a faculty member. Faculty not only need to list their service involvement, but they need to explain their role, its impact and the time commitment.

Institutional Committees: list committee service by level (Department/School, College, and University levels). List role (member, chair, Faculty Senator).

Other Institutional Service: list leadership roles, task forces, and contributions that facilitate the missions and accomplishments of the department, school, college or university and that are not defined as a formal committee assignment (example, departmental records management coordinator, outreach to specific communities, etc).

A formal leadership role such as department chair, graduate coordinator, undergraduate coordinator, or internship coordinator that is quantified via a course reassignment should be listed on the SOE and workload document as "other" with the role and percent effort allocation specified.

Professional Service: includes contributions to the faculty member's discipline including reviewing journal articles and other publications, reviewing or judging creative works, reviewing grant applications, editing journals, serving on professional committees, organizing conferences, holding office within an organization of a candidate's discipline, or the like as defined by the candidate's Department/School. List level (local, regional, national, international) and role (board member, officer; reviewer, editorial board member, editor; review panel member;

Professional Development: list type (trainings, workshops). List skills, knowledge, abilities, and applications. List hours, certifications, licenses.

Community Service: is defined as public activity that uses the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues. This can be governmental or non-governmental activity. List type of activity (board member, organizational officer, public presentation, workshop leadership, public forum participation, training, mentoring, advising, consulting, technical assistance) and level (local, regional, national, international). Note, personal enrichment activities are not considered community service.

Consulting: Volunteer consulting, or consulting done for a small honorarium and travel reimbursement may be counted as a service activity if one is sharing professional expertise with the public, non-profit organizations, or the activity is done to facilitate service learning for NAU students. List type, purpose, duration, and impact of consulting activities. Paid consulting for substantial remuneration should be disclosed as outside employment, and does not count as a service activity. If consulting is paid with a course reassignment, it should be counted under “other” in the Statement of Expectations and may be evaluated under research and applied activities.

Each unit will determine the relative level of importance and impact of the above activities based on level of faculty involvement (frequency of meetings and tasks, leadership roles, amount of work required for information gathering and report writing), impact (how broad is the scope of the activity? Who benefits?), linkage to the unit’s mission (does the activity specifically support the stated mission of the department, school, college, or university?), and linkage to the unit’s strategic plan. Levels can be defined as high and low impact (or a more nuanced system, as determined by the department and specified in its workload document).

Each faculty member is responsible for providing the evidence to support their evaluation. Note, it is the faculty member’s responsibility to provide documentation supporting performance. Using the evidence presented in the candidate’s Professional Review File (and the external letters only when appropriate), the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member’s performance has or has not met the criteria set for service activities in this document. The criteria consist of operational definitions or indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate’s performance in this area. Faculty’s service obligations should be calibrated to unit needs and based upon the SBS Workload document.

Typically, a low service allocation will be 5-10%; a medium service allocation will be 10-15% and a high service allocation will be 15-20%. Service in excess of 20% is considered a very high allocation. We recognize that a faculty member must be involved in the maintenance of their department and curriculum, and shoulder needed departmental service roles.

Satisfactory Rating

To receive a satisfactory rating, faculty should:

For a low allocation: Serve on one departmental committee and participate as a departmental citizen (attend meetings, etc).

For a medium allocation: Serve on two departmental committees and participate as a departmental citizen (attend meetings, etc).

For a high allocation: Serve on two departmental committees and one college or university committee and participate as a departmental citizen (attend meetings, etc).

Meritorious Rating

To achieve a meritorious performance rating, a faculty member must:

For a low allocation: serve on a departmental committee and one of the following:

- Serve on a one school/college or university level committee
- Fulfill on a leadership role in departmental/school/college/university activities or a professional leadership role appropriate to faculty rank
- Fulfill a substantial university leadership role appropriate to faculty rank
- Perform two or more professional activities such as reviewing publications and grants, serving on editorial boards or grant/fellowship evaluation panels
- Take part in a public or professional service project requiring substantial commitment of time and effort
- Fulfill a professional leadership role such as board/trustee member of a national or international professional organization, or journal editor or co-editor

For a high service allocation: serve on a departmental committee and two of the following:

- Serve on a one school/college or university level committee
- Fulfill a leadership role in departmental/school/college/university activities or a professional leadership role appropriate to faculty rank
- Fulfill a substantial university leadership role appropriate to faculty rank
- Perform two or more professional activities such as reviewing publications and grants, serving on editorial boards or grant/fellowship evaluation panels
- Take part in a public or professional service project requiring substantial commitment of time and effort
- Fulfill a professional leadership role such as board/trustee member of a national or international professional organization, or journal editor or co-editor

For a very high service allocation: serve on a departmental committee and three of the following:

- Serve on a one school/college or university level committee
- Fulfill a leadership role in departmental/school/college/university activities or a professional leadership role appropriate to faculty rank
- Fulfill a substantial university leadership role appropriate to faculty rank
- Perform two or more professional activities such as reviewing publications and grants, serving on editorial boards or grant/fellowship evaluation panels
- Take part in a public or professional service project requiring substantial commitment of time and effort
- Fulfill a professional leadership role such as board/trustee member of a national or international professional organization, or journal editor or co-editor

Highly Meritorious Rating

Most faculty who earn a highly meritorious rating will be engaged in high impact service activities. High impact service activities are those that stand out as taking an above average amount of time, effort, or expertise and that make a significant positive impact on the unit, the profession, or the community. These are determined at the unit level with the approval of the chair.

Examples of high impact service activities:

- Chairing a faculty search committee Serving on a faculty search committee
- Chairing the Annual Review or Faculty Service Committee Chairing the curriculum committee
- Chairing the college Promotion and Tenure committee Editing a journal
- Organizing a professional or pedagogical conference
- Regularly contributing to community service in a leadership role
- Completing professional development training with a substantial investment of time and acquisition of new knowledge, skills, and abilities that further the unit's mission
- Serving on the board of a national professional organization

For a low service allocation: Complete one high impact activity and participate as a departmental citizen (attend meetings, etc.).

For a medium service allocation: Serve on a departmental committee and complete one high impact activity as well as participate as a departmental citizen (attend meetings, etc.).

For a high service allocation: Complete two high impact activities and participate as a departmental citizen (attend meetings, etc.).

For a very high service allocation: Serve on a departmental committee and complete three high impact activities as well as participate as a departmental citizen (attend meetings, etc.).

Note: Faculty ought to discuss their service goals and expectations with their chair when setting their SOE to calibrate effort against their desired evaluation.

Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria

Adopted: April 2019

The SBS Promotion and Tenure Review Committee reviews department, program and school recommendations for tenure and/or promotion and makes recommendations to the Dean based upon the criteria specified in this document. The committee ensures that each candidate meets acceptable minimum standards for the University (see ABOR Policy 6-201 and the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service" [CoFS] document, Sections 1.2 and 1.4) and the College (as outlined below) in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; research, scholarship, or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline; and service to the university community and the profession. As stated in the CoFS (Section 1.4.6.1.3), "in making promotion decisions, the entire record of the faculty member, including accomplishments at other institutions and other professional activity, shall be considered."

This document defines the College's indicators of faculty performance to be used in evaluating a candidate, and the standards required by the College in each area for promotion and/or tenure. It is recognized that an individual department, school, or other academic unit (hereinafter, referred to as "Department/School") may adopt standards of performance for promotion that exceed those presented below.

Evaluation Criteria and Indicators of Faculty Performance

General

To be considered for promotion and/or tenure as a tenure eligible faculty, a candidate must achieve at least the minimum SBS and university criteria for each rank in the three areas under review: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; (2) research, scholarship and/or creative activities; and (3) service to the university community and the profession. In addition to meeting all the minimum requirements in the three areas under review, for promotion to the rank of Professor, a candidate must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in either (1) or (2) above as defined by College and Department/School criteria. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements.

For non-tenure eligible faculty holding the rank of Lecturer to be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer, a candidate must achieve the minimum SBS and university criteria for each rank in the following areas: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; and (2) a record of service and professional development related to the teaching role. For non-tenure eligible faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor of Practice to be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor of Practice, a candidate must achieve the minimum SBS and university criteria for each rank in the following areas: (1) teaching and other student-related responsibilities; and (2) scholarly, creative, or professional achievements. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements. For promotion to other non-tenure eligible faculty positions, see the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2.

Evaluation of a candidate by the SBS Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall be confined to the materials included in a faculty member's Professional Review File that adhere to the requirements set forth by the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.4.5.2. In addition, materials received, such as external letters of recommendation, to which the faculty member has agreed to waive access, shall be made available. External letters of recommendation must follow the College policy on the soliciting of such letters. The SBS Promotion and Tenure Review Committee will use external letters of recommendation in their evaluation of a candidate when these two conditions have been met.

By the deadlines specified in the University's Personnel Action Calendar, a candidate for promotion and/or tenure must submit a carefully organized and complete set of materials (the Professional Review File) that demonstrates the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of their performance in the areas relevant to the rank to which promotion is sought.

The College of Social and Behavioral Science promotes excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service to its stakeholders. In supporting this goal, the College recognizes that an innovative and dynamic faculty should develop performance standards that foster both individual and departmental success. Toward that end, the following examples of performance indicators are listed to help departments construct faculty evaluation standards that support the mission and disciplinary focus of each academic unit.

Indicators of Performance in the Area of Teaching, Advisement, and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

Besides classroom and/or online instruction, teaching activities include curriculum development and planning that meets the needs of contemporary students; reflects current knowledge, research, and trends in the discipline; and creates an awareness of gender and diversity issues. Advising activities include guiding progress toward graduation and post-graduation planning. Other student-related activities may include (but are not limited to) the following: student mentoring, student research supervision, and supplemental instruction sections.

Teaching, advisement, and student-related responsibilities include:

- Classroom and/or online instruction;
- Creation and updating of course materials;
- Teaching innovations;
- Teaching-related publications;
- Supervision of students' scholarly activities and independent studies, including graduate thesis and dissertation work;
- Curriculum development;
- Advisement;
- Other student related activities (student mentoring, student research supervision, supplemental instruction sections, and the like);
- Organization of or participation in professional development activities related to teaching.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File (and the external letters only when appropriate), the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities in this document. The criteria consist of operational definitions or indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate's performance in this area.

EXAMPLES OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IN THE AREA OF TEACHING, ADVISEMENT, AND OTHER STUDENT-RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES

- Sustained pattern of positive evaluations by the chair and peers.
- Evidence of effective classroom teaching and/or advising based on assessment of student learning using sound evaluation practices, and descriptions thereof in the annual review narrative. Other types of indicators of effective classroom teaching include letters from students, exit interviews, examples of student work, and other forms of documentation.
- Student/Faculty/University award nominations for excellence in teaching or teaching-related activities.
- Sustained pattern of positive evaluations from student opinion surveys and any other documentation believed by the Department/School to be relevant.
- Development of new or updated courses on a regular basis.
- Award of a grant for pedagogical innovation.
- Acquisition of new skills to be used in teaching on a regular basis.

- Development and delivery of online courses.
- Evidence of being instrumental in the development or redevelopment of Department/School programs.
- Commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience
- Including: directing independent studies and student research; organizing and/or directing fieldtrips; facilitating student participation at professional meetings; supervising presentation and/or publication of student scholarly work in professional venues.
- Sustained pattern of commitment to student professional growth through supervision of internships and practicums.
- Service as internship coordinator.
- Supervising Master's and/or Ph.D. students.
- Career and professional advising of students including letters of recommendation, informal meetings, and organized work sessions.
- Successful publication of instructional/teaching related materials.
- Sustained involvement in professional development activities related to teaching.

Indicators of Performance in the Area of Research, Scholarship and/or Creative Activities

Research, scholarship and/or creative activities are activities that lead to tangible, original works that expand the knowledge base of one's respective discipline, extend the discipline into new fields of application, and/or improve teaching in the discipline by the dissemination of pedagogic scholarship. These activities include publications, exhibitions or productions related to a candidate's discipline and academic interests and efforts to increase, synthesize, or disseminate knowledge in subject areas germane to a candidate's discipline. Publications are completed written documents or other tangible works such as refereed journal articles, books, chapter contributions to books, monographs, research/technical reports, or the like, as defined by the candidate's Department/School. Exhibitions and productions refer to works in a variety of media that survive a competitive review process, which might include external peer, editorial, and/or blind review in venues appropriate to a candidate's discipline.

Research, scholarship and/or creative activities include:

- Professional publications, papers, exhibitions, or productions;
- Research projects that can be documented in the form of laboratory reports, research logs, diaries, field notes, interim progress reports, or the like, as defined by the candidate's Department/School;
- Scholarly work accepted for publication, exhibition, or production;
- Grant and contract work, including applied projects, as defined by the candidate's Department/School;
- Applied research reports, exhibitions, productions, and other professional contributions;
- Papers, exhibitions, or productions presented at professional meetings; and
- Other tangible works related to the scholarly or creative process germane to a candidate's discipline.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File (and the external letters only when appropriate), the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for research, scholarship and/or creative activities in this document. The criteria consist of operational definitions or indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate's performance in this area.

A NOTE ABOUT PREDATORY PUBLISHING ([Resource: USC Libraries](#))

"With the advent of Open Access, more research is becoming available to a wider variety of researchers. Further, many organizations require publishing for tenure or advancement and funding agencies require publication. Unscrupulous publishers are entering the field with the goal of making money off unsuspecting authors. These are called "predatory publishers".

These journals generally claim high impact factors or peer review while the reality proves otherwise. As quality journals begin to require authors to pay fees, it becomes easier for fake journals to trick legitimate researchers into submitting their articles to be published for a nominal fee, generally providing instant (non-reviewed) publications. Additionally, most predators these will accept any article by anyone on any topic and call it ‘scientific.’”

Faculty are responsible for knowing the characteristics of predatory publishing and the academic unit is responsible for policing the rigor and reputation of publication venues, while calling out any such practice that misrepresents the validity of recognized, peer-reviewed scholarship. The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences does not support merit, promotion, or retainment of faculty that knowingly utilize predatory publishing as an indicator of impact and reputation in their field.

EXAMPLES OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IN THE AREA OF RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

- Successful publication of journal articles, book chapters, research/technical reports, applied project reports, and other peer-reviewed works.
- Presentation of research and creative activities at peer-reviewed professional meetings.
- Publication relevant to scholarly or creative expertise in non-peer reviewed outlets.
- Exhibition of creative works in non-juried venues.
- Invited talks and/or poster sessions at refereed conferences and meetings.
- Creation and presentation of film, video and media projects related to scholarly and/or creative activities.
- Organizing symposia at refereed conferences and meetings.
- Editing (or co-editing) a scholarly book or conference proceedings.
- Creation of a database for shared scholarly and/or creative works.
- Creation and dissemination of computer software for scholarly purposes.
- Research talks given in non-refereed formats, e.g., an invited speaker series.
- Preparation, submission and/or administration of grants for scholarly and/or creative activities.
- Awards from professional associations for scholarship and creative activity.
- Public presentations of scholarly/creative work to community groups.
- Citation of scholarly work in refereed papers, essays and books.
- Reprints of published scholarship in anthologies and edited volumes.

Indicators of Performance in the Area of Service

Service activities include participation in committee work and administrative tasks within the University (at Department/School, College, and University levels), leadership and/or participation in the work of the profession, and contributing one's professional expertise to activities involving a variety of organizations, such as schools, industry, and local, state, and federal government agencies.

Service activities include:

- Department/School, College, and University service such as participation on boards, panels, committees, task forces, or the like;
- Leadership at various levels within the University;
- Public or community service, such as workshops, public forums, consultations, and technical assistance to the public that uses the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues; and
- Professional service, such as reviewing journal articles and other publications, reviewing or judging creative works, reviewing grant applications, editing journals, serving on professional committees, holding office within an organization of a candidate's discipline, or the like as defined by the candidate's Department/School.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File (and the external letters only when appropriate), the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for service activities in this document. The criteria consist of operational definitions or indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate's performance in this area.

EXAMPLES OF PEFORMANCE INDICATORS IN THE AREA OF SERVICE

- Officer, committee chair or other significant leadership role in an academic or professional association.
- Chair and/or membership on University or College committee or sub-committee.
- Chair and/or membership on a Department/School committee or subcommittee
- Receipt of an award for service.
- Professional service to the campus and/or the larger community (may include public issue-oriented consulting, volunteer coordination, and technical assistance).
- Volunteer service in elementary and/or secondary schools.
- Volunteer service relevant to scholarly or creative expertise on community boards and commissions.
- Development and presentation of public lectures and workshops.
- Judge and/or reviewer for University or community events.
- Articles, invited opinion essays, or creative works in community publications based on one's academic expertise.
- Working with community colleges in curriculum development and transfer policies.

Indicators of Performance in Categories Defined by Department/School and Disciplinary Standards

The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences affirms that in the social and behavioral disciplines, service and teaching may be intertwined with research, particularly in the case of faculty with an applied research focus. The following are examples of activities that can reasonably be categorized in any one of the domains of teaching, research/creative activity and service. We encourage unit- level decisions about where best to classify them.

EXAMPLES OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IN CATEGORIES DEFINED BY DEPARTMENTAL AND DISCIPLINARY STANDARDS

- Advising of clubs and organizations that promote student learning, research, creative expression and/or public service.
- Grant reviewer for funding agencies.
- Editorial board membership and/or manuscript referee or creative juror.
- Review of book manuscripts for university presses and other scholarly publishers.
- Session organizer for a professional association.
- Organizer and host for professional meetings.
- Developing and/or managing websites that support stakeholder interests relevant to scholarly or creative expertise.

Standards for Promotion to Specific Ranks

Associate Professor (a tenure eligible or tenured position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.1, to hold the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must possess a doctorate or other terminal degree in the discipline area. A faculty member may not be promoted to this rank unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured Associate Professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor at NAU; the faculty member, however, may have prior service credit that was agreed to in writing at the time of hire. To hold the rank of Associate Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

- 1) A record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.
- 2) A record that shows a sustained pattern of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.
- 3) A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the University community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of Professor.

Professor (a tenured position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.1, a faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the written notice of appointment indicated the hire was at the rank of Professor without tenure. Professors are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as an Associate). To hold the rank of Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must have the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

- 1) A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.
- 2) A sustained pattern of high-quality research, scholarship or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.
- 3) A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's Department/School (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the Department/School, College, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty).

In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of Professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (1) or (2) above as defined by the criteria and indicators in this document.

Senior Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

- 1) A record of substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.
- 2) A record of service and/or professional development related to the teaching role.
- 3) If the candidate has had formal assignment of effort (through the Statement of Expectations during the relevant period) to scholarship, creative or professional activity,

they need to show accomplishment in this area. Accomplishment should be commensurate with the level of assignment over time to this area of effort.

Principal Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Principal Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of Senior Lecturer or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

- 1) A record of sustained excellence at the Senior Lecturer rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.
- 2) A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role.
- 3) If the candidate has had formal assignment of effort (through the Statement of Expectations during the relevant period) to scholarship, creative or professional activity, a record of sustained accomplishment commensurate with the level of assignment over time to this area of effort.

Associate Clinical Professor (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, clinical professors are primarily responsible for teaching and overseeing students in clinical and professional practice related courses and experiences, including internships, practica, and independent studies, to undergraduate and graduate students. Clinical Professors have a documented record of professional experience and expertise over a sustained period of time suitable for qualification to teach or manage internship or practice components of degree programs. As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, a faculty member is eligible to apply for the rank of Associate Clinical Professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Clinical Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as Assistant Clinical Professor or in a subsequent formal petition approved by the chair/director, dean and provost, prior to the Assistant Clinical Professor's application for promotion). To be eligible for the rank of associate clinical professor, the faculty member must have a least the following:

- 1) An earned doctorate in the appropriate discipline or other terminal degree and/or certification or licensing in her/his field of competence (where appropriate);
- 2) A record of performance in the job-related responsibilities that shows substantial effectiveness in the role assigned, including a demonstrated commitment to student success through effective teaching and other student related activities.
- 3) The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. Teaching outside of the academic year is credited only in the case of faculty members on fiscal-year (12-month) contracts.
- 4) If the candidate has had formal assignment of effort (through the Statement of Expectations during the relevant period) to scholarship, creative or professional activity, a record of accomplishment commensurate with the level of assignment over time to this area of effort.

Clinical Professor (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, a faculty member is eligible to apply for the rank of Clinical Professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Clinical Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as Associate Clinical Professor or in a subsequent formal petition approved by the chair/director, dean and provost, prior to the Associate Clinical Professor's application for promotion). To be eligible for the rank of clinical professor the faculty member must have a least the following:

- 1) An earned doctorate in the appropriate discipline or other terminal degree and/or certification or licensing in her/his field of competence (where appropriate).

- 2) A demonstrated record of sustained excellence at the associate clinical professor rank in responsibilities related to the role assignment, including a demonstrated commitment to student success through effective teaching and other student related activities.
- 3) The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of associate clinical professor or other relevant professional experience. Teaching outside of the academic year is credited only in the case of faculty members on fiscal-year (12-month) contracts.
- 4) If the candidate has had formal assignment of effort (through the Statement of Expectations during the relevant period) to scholarship, creative or professional activity, a record of sustained accomplishment commensurate with the level of assignment over time to this area of effort.

Associate Professor of Practice (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, professors of practice are primarily responsible for teaching courses, including seminars and independent studies, to undergraduate and graduate students that model the intersection of theory and practice in the relevant field upon which the faculty member has a documented record of expertise, professional history, or sustained involvement. As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, a faculty member is eligible for the rank of Associate Professor of Practice in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor of Practice at NAU, (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as Assistant Professor of Practice or in a subsequent formal petition, approved by the chair/director, dean and provost, prior to the Assist Professor of Practice's application for promotion). To be eligible for the rank of associate professor of practice, the faculty member must have a least the following:

- 1) A record of commitment to student success through substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student related responsibilities.
- 2) A record of service and professional development within the area of practice and related to the teaching role.
- 3) The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. Teaching outside of the academic year is credited only in the case of faculty members on fiscal-year (12-month) contracts.
- 4) If the candidate has had formal assignment of effort (through the Statement of Expectations during the relevant period) to scholarship, creative or professional activity, a record of sustained accomplishment commensurate with the level of assignment over time to this area of effort.

Professor of Practice (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, a faculty member is eligible for the rank of Professor of Practice in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor of Practice at NAU including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as Associate Professor of Practice or in a subsequent formal petition approved by the chair/director, dean and provost, prior to the Associate Professor of Practice's application for promotion. To be eligible for the rank of professor of practice, the faculty member must have at least the following:

- 1) A record of commitment to student success through sustained excellence at the associate professor of practice rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.
- 2) A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development within the area of practice and related to the teaching role.
- 3) The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of associate professor of practice or other relevant professional experience. Teaching outside of the academic year is credited only in the case of faculty members on fiscal-year (12-month) contracts.
- 4) If the candidate has had formal assignment of effort (through the Statement of Expectations during the relevant period) to scholarship, creative or professional activity, a record of sustained accomplishment commensurate with the level of assignment over time to this area of effort.

Associate Research Professor (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, research professors are primarily responsible for engaging in, being responsible for, or overseeing a significant area of research or scholarship. Research faculty may serve as principal or co-principal investigators on grants or contracts administered by the university. They are typically supported through external resources secured through the efforts of the appointee or in collaboration with others. To be eligible for the rank of associate research professor, the faculty member must supply evidence of a record that shows a sustained pattern of substantial scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty members' discipline. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of Associate Research Professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Research Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as Assistant Research Professor).

Research Professor (a non-tenure eligible position)

To be eligible for the rank of research professor, the faculty member must supply evidence of national or international recognition in his/her field and a sustained pattern of outstanding scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline, as well as evidence of leadership within the individual's scholarly and/or creative activity. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of Research Professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Research Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as Assistant Research Professor).

External Letters

Requirements for SBS external letters of evaluation:

- 1) Units are expected to integrate the SBS policy into unit level P&T documents by Spring 2020. Until then, SBS policy will prevail. This requirement is for promotion to associate professor with tenure and/or promotion to professor.
- 2) Letters must be obtained for all tenure-track faculty in that unit seeking promotion and/or tenure; it is not optional.
- 3) Letter writers evaluate only the area of research, scholarship, and/or creative activities in relation to the faculty's commitment of effort in this area and in relation to departmental and SBS documents.
- 4) Letters must be solicited using the process outlined below.

Process for soliciting outside letters:

- 1) Outside letters are solicited in the spring semester and/or early summer prior to the submission of the promotion and tenure file, using SBS standard letters for solicitation.
- 2) The faculty seeking promotion and the chair/director create a list of a minimum of six (6) potential letter writers who neither study nor work at NAU and do not have a close personal or professional relationship with the faculty (e.g., research collaborator, co-author) and identify the materials to be sent to letter writers. Faculty member may also provide a list of potential letter writers who would not provide a fair review.
- 3) The proposed list is created by the chair or director and submitted to the dean, including names, affiliation, and a description of the individual's work, qualifications, and/or reason for being included on the list. The dean reviews with a focus on potential conflict of interest; approves or requests revision of the list.
- 4) The chair/director prepares the request letter, which must include information on whether the faculty has or has not waived any right they might have to access the review letter. The following waiver language, signed by the faculty, is suggested:
 - a. I expressly waive any right I might have to access this review letter under any law, regulation, or policy. Faculty signature: _____ Date: _____
 - b. I do not agree to waive any right I might have to access this letter.
Faculty signature: _____ Date: _____
- 5) The chair/director provides external reviewers with a copy of the unit P&T policy document, SBS P&T policy, and information about the faculty member's level of

assignment to research/scholarship over the review period. Reviewers are asked to frame their reviews in terms of the unit criteria and amount of effort devoted to scholarship.

- 6) The chair/director requests letters from at least three (3) individuals on the candidate's list, contacting them by email first, followed by the request letter and the faculty's materials.

Letter writers are asked to submit their reviews directly to the chair/director by the date specified. They are uploaded into FAAR by the chair/director.

Reviewers are given a set of criteria by which to evaluate the research/scholarship record of the candidate, including the significance and impact of the candidate's contributions and promise of sustained scholarly activity.

Timeline:

1. The faculty seeking promotion provides the unit chair/director the list of potential reviewers in April/May, i.e. the Spring semester before submission of their tenure packet.
2. The chair/director solicits reviewers during May-June, giving time to ask additional writers if the first three are unavailable. Letter writers should be in place by early July.
3. The faculty has their tenure/promotion file (research items and narrative only) prepared to share with outside reviewers by mid-July.
4. Reviewers are asked to submit their letters to chair 2 weeks before (around August 15) P&T documents are due into FAAR.
5. Chair uploads letters into FAAR.

Letter from Chair to solicit external reviewers

Dear,

I am writing to ask if you would be willing to serve as an outside tenure reviewer for **[Insert Faculty Name]**, who will be up for promotion to Associate Professor in the **[Insert Department Name]** at Northern Arizona University Fall **[Insert Year]**. **[Insert Faculty Name]** has waived his right to access or examine reviewer letters solicited in the context of his promotion application.

In early Fall, the **[Insert Department Name]** Faculty Status and SBS Promotion and Tenure Committees will meet to consider **[Insert Faculty Name]** file, which will include letters from outside reviewers. These letters, solicited from recognized members of the profession, play an important role in the committee's deliberations as they evaluate the candidate's contribution to the profession in general and to scholarship and publication in particular. Thus, we would appreciate your help with this important task. Please rest assured that your confidential evaluation will be accessible only by me, the department and college review committees, our dean, provost, and president.

I am well aware that this request involves a genuine commitment of your time, and I want to thank you in advance for your help with this important process. If you are unable to write a letter for **[Insert Faculty Name]** please let me know as soon as possible so that I may ask someone else. If you are able to provide a review letter, we will need to receive such a letter by **[Enter Date]**. If you have any questions about this request, please call me **[Enter Phone Number]** or contact me via e-mail **[Enter Email]**.

Thank you for your assistance.

Letter to Accompany Review File

Dear,

Moments ago, I shared a drop box with you that contains **[Insert Faculty Name]** tenure materials. In here you can find his/her/their narrative and links to his/her/their research material. You can also find the waiver where he/she/they waives access to your letter. I am attaching our departmental document

that details expectations for promotion and tenure. We ask that you evaluate **[Insert Faculty Name]** relative to research, providing a detailed assessment of the strength and weaknesses of **[Insert Faculty Name]** research record, including the impact of publication outlets. Please comment on the significance of his/her/their reputation (national and international) and contributions to the discipline. We are also interested in your assessment of **[Insert Faculty Name]** future promise as a researcher. We recognize that this request requires a genuine commitment of your time, and we appreciate your contribution to our promotion and tenure efforts.

Thank you for your assistance.

Applied and Indigenous Studies

Annual Review

**Approved by AIS Faculty on April 21, 2010
Approved by the Office of the Provost, May 8, 2014**

This document establishes guidelines and procedures for the Department of Applied Indigenous Studies' annual review and retention review systems for faculty and Traditional Knowledge Scholars. The primary purpose is to establish a framework for documenting faculty achievement and assessing those with respect to the mission of the Department, College and University.

This document reflects the wording of Section 1.4 of the Conditions of Faculty Service. As per section 1.4.1 of this document, faculty (and, for AIS, Traditional Knowledge Scholars) will be evaluated annually. "Faculty performance evaluations will take several forms. For tenured faculty these include annual review and promotion review. For tenure eligible faculty these include annual review, probationary (retention) review, promotion review, and tenure review. For non-tenure eligible faculty these can include annual review, reappointment review, and promotion review. Part-time faculty will be evaluated according to the procedures established within the departments." The procedures for evaluating full and part-time Traditional Knowledge Scholars have been established by the Department and are described in this document.

The Annual Faculty Performance Report is due each fall in accordance with the [Personnel Action Calendar](#). The Annual Review will be conducted by the AIS Annual Review Committee and the Chair. The Annual Review Committee will be composed of four members, including at least two tenured faculty and/or affiliated faculty members of the AIS department, and a full-time Traditional Knowledge Scholar.

Annual Review Compared to Retention, Tenure and Promotion Reviews

All faculty who have less than full-time administrative responsibilities will be evaluated annually by faculty peers and appropriate administrators. For post-tenure faculty members, this may include an expedited review. The Annual Review will be conducted during the semester following the year being evaluated. For first-year faculty, the first year's retention review will encompass only the first semester. The Annual Review will focus upon: I) the Statement of Expectations, (2) the Annual Faculty Accomplishments Form, and (3) the Annual Faculty Performance Report; and is based on the criteria and standards set forth by AIS, the University, and ABOR. Traditional Knowledge Scholar.

Annual Reviews will be based on an overview of their Statement of Expectations and monthly reports. All faculty members are expected to maintain levels of professional activity appropriate to their disciplines to ensure that they will remain current in their disciplines and capable of delivering present and future curricula.

Typically, academic units will have different criteria and levels of performance expected for annual performance and retention evaluations (e.g., unsatisfactory, satisfactory, meritorious, highly meritorious) than for tenure and promotion.

Annual performance evaluations are retrospective of a single year, and sum up the work of that year. They do not cumulate into tenure and/or promotion decisions. Tenure and promotion reviews incorporate an evaluation of the quality of contributions of the faculty member to date and promise of continued excellence.

For probationary (tenure eligible) faculty, the annual evaluation should not be confused with the probationary (retention) review. While these may occur simultaneously and be based upon overlapping material, the probationary (retention) review incorporates the unit's estimate of the

faculty member's future promise and contributions to the unit and the discipline based on the performance and accomplishments to date.

The Relationship of Annual Review with Statement of Expectations and Workload Allocations

Statements of Expectations, workload allocations and annual reviews are related in that the workload assignments are described in the annual Statement of Expectations (SOE) and the SOE is the foundation for the annual review.

Statement of Expectations and Workload

All full-time faculty and Traditional Knowledge Scholars must have a Statement of Expectations, which will be used as the basis for performance evaluations. Exceptions to this policy include part-time faculty. AIS recognizes that not all faculty members have identical roles in the Department's mission and this is recognized in the SOE.

The SOE is negotiated with the faculty member in the spring prior to the academic year. When the faculty member and Chair agree and sign the document, it is forwarded to the Dean for approval. If any significant changes in workload occur, the SOE will be amended and sent to the Chair and Dean for approval.

A Statement of Expectations should be constructed so as to utilize the education, skills and talents of the departmental member as they relate to the missions and needs of the department, academic unit, school, college and/or the university. The performance of the departmental member will be measured within the context of his/her Statement of Expectations.

Workload assignments are negotiated on an annual basis and described in the Statement of Expectations that specifies how the allocations will be reflected in the evaluation process. Unless otherwise specified, the Statement of Expectations for tenure eligible faculty, tenured faculty, and Traditional Knowledge Scholars will set forth this assignment, including percentage of effort that is anticipated in each of the following areas for the contract period:

- Student-related responsibilities (to include at least teaching, advising, mentoring, and student supervision);
- Scholarship and research;
- Service to the profession, the University/college/school/department/discipline and to the community (local, state, national, tribal, and international) as it relates to the mission and guidelines of the University and the profession.

Statements of Expectations for faculty members who serve more than one discipline or academic unit should clearly specify the allocation of each faculty member's workload that will be assigned to each of the academic units served.

Workload Allocation (*taken from the AIS Workload Policy, approved April 21, 2010*)

Departmental members have a diversified workload expectation that is spread across teaching and other student-related responsibilities including advising, scholarship/research (including both funded and unfunded activities), and university, community, and professional service. The workload models below are guidelines. Each departmental member's workload is tailored to their SOE, as long as activities are in line with promotion and tenure processes and the needs of the unit.

The total workload for AIS faculty members and full-time Traditional Knowledge Scholars is equivalent to 15 units per semester, or 30 units per year. Each unit represents approximately three hours of work a week. The models in this section are based on typical workload patterns in the department. These models are based on 30 units being 100% of the departmental member's activities.

A part-time Traditional Knowledge Scholar workload is negotiated individually with the Departmental Chair and may vary to a maximum load of approximately 6 units or the equivalent of two 3-credit courses each semester.

Faculty members:

Model 1: This model is for tenured and tenure-track faculty with advising/student related activities in addition to a 3/3 course load, research, and service responsibilities.

Teaching/Advising/SRA	21 hours (teaching = 18 hours + advising/SRA = 3 hrs)	70%
Research	6 hrs	20%
Service	3 hrs	10%
Course load	3/3	

Model 2: This model is for tenured and tenure-track faculty with advising/student related activities, research, and service responsibilities that include a course buyout (3/2 course load with funding of 10% of the faculty member's salary and benefits).

Teaching/Advising/SRA	18 hours (teaching = 15 hours + advising/SRA = 3 hrs)	60%
Research	6 or 9 hours	20% or 30%
Service	3 or 6 hours	10% or 20%
Course load	3/2	

Model 3: This model is for non-tenure eligible faculty without research expectations in the SOE.

Teaching/Advising/SRA	24 hours	80%
Research	0 hrs	0%
Service	6 hrs	20%
Course load	4/4	

Full-Time Traditional Knowledge Scholars:

Model 1: This model is for full-time traditional knowledge scholars .

Advising/mentoring	18 hrs	60%
Teaching	3 or 6 hrs	10% or20%
Research	3 or 6 hrs	10% or20%
Service	3 hrs	10%

Annual Review Documentation

It is the faculty member's responsibility to maintain his/her annual review file and submit all necessary documents for review. Failure to provide the necessary files may result in an unsatisfactory rating. No material can be placed in the faculty review file without the knowledge of the faculty member. Only by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the Chair can materials can be removed.

Traditional Knowledge Scholars must file twice monthly activity reports that will be used for Annual Review purposes. Traditional Knowledge Scholars will be reviewed by both the ARC (which will include a Traditional Knowledge Scholar member) and the Chair.

They will receive letters from each and will have the same opportunity to follow grievance procedures as faculty members.

Annual Faculty Accomplishments Form

This form lists the basic data of a departmental member's accomplishments over the year. It is comprised of data on the three areas of: student-related responsibilities, scholarship/ research, and service. It also includes a section on administrative duties, if they are part of the SOE. All activities listed in the Faculty Accomplishments Form must be evidenced with supporting documentation (as described in the subsection below).

Annual Faculty Performance Report

This report is a narrative addressing the activities recorded in the Faculty Accomplishments Form. The report shall specifically address the areas referred to in the Statement of Expectations and the workload assignment described therein for the evaluation period. The report shall contain reference to materials submitted as described in a-d below.

- a. For the evaluation of teaching, advising and student-related responsibilities, the faculty member will supply materials to document performance. Such materials include a teaching portfolio consisting of syllabi, reading lists, handouts, samples of examinations and student papers and advising logs. It may contain: colleagues' peer-observation reports; evidence of guest lectures; and reports of participation in curriculum redesign, new course preparation, teaching-improvement workshops, and other student-related activities. Every annual review will include student opinion surveys, and every faculty member is expected to be evaluated on every course, every semester.
- b. For the evaluation of scholarship and research, the faculty member will provide evidence appropriate to the discipline and the Statement of Expectations. Examples of scholarly work are listed in the section on "Criteria for Evaluation" below.
- c. For the evaluation of service the faculty member will supply a list and evidence of his/her service activities (including service to the profession, department/ school/ college/ university, and to the community as these activities relate to the mission of the university) as defined in a faculty member's Statement of Expectations and the AIS workload policy document.
- d. A faculty member may provide additional materials related to the three areas listed above as part of his/her performance report.

Annual Review Procedures

The Chair is responsible for providing departmental members with a list of essential materials to be submitted and dates for the Annual Review.

1. Performance shall be evaluated overall and in the three areas of (1) student-related responsibilities (including teaching, advising and mentoring, and other student-related responsibilities), (2) scholarship and research, and (3) service (including service to the department/school/ college/university/profession, and to the community as these activities relate to the mission of the university).
2. Every departmental member will be evaluated in each of these areas on a four-point scale:
 - Highly meritorious 4
 - Meritorious 3
 - Satisfactory 2
 - Unsatisfactory 1

No departmental member can be rated unsatisfactory overall unless he or she is rated unsatisfactory in one or more areas. Whether a rating of unsatisfactory in one or more areas is a basis for an overall evaluation of unsatisfactory will depend upon the percentage of the departmental member's efforts assigned to those area(s) in the Statement of Expectations and the application of the AIS criteria to the departmental member's performance.

3. The ARC will provide a written recommendation to the Chair and provide a copy to the departmental member. The departmental member has five working days to respond if he or she desires. Upon receipt of the Chair's response, the departmental member has five working days to submit a written appeal to the Dean.
4. See Section 1.4.6.1.1 in COFS for the 8 steps in the annual review procedure. This also includes the procedure for grievances.
5. The basis for merit raises including those for first year faculty, will be the Annual Review.

Sabbatical Review

Given that faculty workload allocation during the sabbatical is typically devoted 100% to scholarship, faculty members are evaluated for their scholarly efforts using the AIS criteria for evaluating scholarship activities. Given that individual sabbatical activities must be taken into consideration as specified and approved in the sabbatical proposal, a rating of **meritorious** will be given if the faculty member successfully completes the activities specified in the approved proposal and meets the criteria specified in the meritorious category as described in this document. If the faculty member's performance during the sabbatical exceeds the criteria specified in the meritorious category, the rating will be **highly meritorious** for the evaluation period under review. A rating of **satisfactory** would be given if the faculty member successfully completes the activities specified in the approved proposal, yet does not meet the criteria specified in the meritorious category. An **unsatisfactory** rating would be given if the faculty member does not fulfill the activities specified in the sabbatical proposal and there is an absence of those criteria that are the minimum for a satisfactory rating in Scholarship.

Criteria for Evaluation in Each Area of Effort

Teaching, Advising and Student-Related Activities

The evaluation of teaching is more subjective than the evaluation of other areas. However, several criteria can be used to guide decisions about teaching excellence. At a minimum, a pattern of high quality teaching and student related responsibilities involves three different, though related, components:

Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Methodology refers to the idea that good teaching requires pedagogical methods that promote student learning. Some well recognized elements of teaching effectiveness include: good communication, knowledge of the subject matter, the creation of a supportive classroom environment for all students, promoting engaged and multi-contextual learning, and fairness in examinations and grading. Teaching Effectiveness is evidenced by: a narrative description of pedagogy and instructional methods and a pattern of strong written and numerical student opinion surveys (required). Optional materials include: peer and Chair evaluations; unsolicited letters from students; examples of student work; awards or recognition for outstanding teaching; evidence of the incorporation of innovative technology, and efforts to increase multi-contextual learning and reduce 'D' and 'F' grades; and other documentation that indicates the impact of teaching effectiveness.

Course Content and Organization refers to the idea that quality teaching depends upon good organization of the subject matter and course. Course objectives and student learning outcomes should be clearly stated in syllabi. Assessment strategies and methods of instruction should clearly lead to these objectives. Other aspects of good organization include the currency of the material used and the appropriateness of the material for the level of the course. Course Content and Organization is evidenced by: course syllabi (required); descriptions of projects, papers, and exercises used in class; descriptions of innovative teaching strategies employed; evidence that courses are revised regularly to remain current; and additional course materials related to content and organization.

Leadership and Professional Development in Teaching refers to the idea that student related responsibilities within a university setting involve both classroom teaching and a variety of other important tasks that contribute to the learning environment of the university, and consume additional amounts of faculty time and effort. Accurate and fair evaluation of faculty instructional efforts need to include the variety of teaching and student related responsibilities that comprise the entire faculty teaching workload. Faculty may participate in professional development and leadership activities related to teaching, and these should be considered important contributions. A narrative description should be included to best evidence this work.

Because teaching is a multifaceted activity, it is the view of the Department that teaching portfolios are the preferred vehicle for presenting and evaluating the quality of a faculty member's teaching activities. Teaching portfolios provide faculty members with an opportunity to individualize the presentation of their teaching activities. The committee will examine the faculty member's teaching portfolio holistically and make its decision based on the preponderance of evidence provided under each category.

Evaluation Criteria

For each of the three areas (teaching effectiveness and instructional methodology, course content and organization, and leadership and professional development in teaching) identified as critical to quality teaching, members of the review committee will assign an evaluation of Highly Meritorious, Meritorious, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory. The ratings will be based on criteria detailed in each category below, and using a standard of "most closely related to accomplishing the mission and goals of the Department of Applied Indigenous Studies" (italics = most closely related, bold = next most related, plain = of lesser relationship). The preponderance of items in each category will determine the ranking in each column. A more quantified determination is not considered appropriate by the Department because of the multi-dimensional, multi-disciplinary

and multi-contextual nature of teaching the diverse courses that make up Applied Indigenous Studies.

Once the three categories have been evaluated, an overall evaluation of student related responsibilities will be made, utilizing the following criteria:

TEACHING AND STUDENT RELATED RESPONSIBILITES		
RANKING	SCORE	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	9 - 10	Evaluation of highly meritorious in TWO of the categories AND at least a meritorious in the third category
Meritorious	7-8	Evaluation of at least meritorious in TWO of the categories AND at least a satisfactory in the third category.
Satisfactory	4-6	Evaluation of at least satisfactory in all three categories.
Unsatisfactory	0-3	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation.

Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Methodology	Course Content and Organization	Leadership and Professional Development in Teaching
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course student opinion surveys (required). • Faculty interpretation of patterns in student opinion surveys • Description of pedagogy, including instructional methods used and fit to course objectives • Teaching awards/recognition • Use of multi -contextual pedagogy • Use of applied pedagogy • Other documentation related to innovation & effectiveness and instructional methodology, e.g. unsolicited student letters, peer or chair evaluations, examples of student work, learner-centered teaching techniques • Innovations to reduce 'D' & 'F' rates • Innovations in pedagogy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course syllabi (required), including course objectives, learning outcomes, current readings, sequence of topics; appropriateness to level of course • Descriptions of class projects, papers, exercises, variety of assignments, innovative teaching strategies; collective assignments appropriately challenge students, reflect course goals, and match level of course • Other documentation of course content and organization, e.g. peer review of teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course preparation work, including # of new preparations, multiple course preps, overload teaching, time intensive courses, and other work that goes beyond SOE • Curricular development or program revision contributions to, e.g. AIS courses, Internship, Honors, Liberal Studies, and similar • Independent studies or Internships (graduate or undergraduate) • Mentoring/advising undergraduate or graduate students, junior faculty • Graduate committee work (Chair or member) • Invitations to teach a course in other departments • Guest lectures or facilitation of educational and university- or community-based research opportunities • Other documentation of teaching and student- related leadership or professional development, e.g. attended workshops, grants won for innovative teaching, other innovative teaching activities, directing student research projects, and similar.

Research, Scholarship and Applied Scholarship Activities

In the discipline of Applied Indigenous Studies, departmental members (faculty and Traditional Knowledge Scholars) carry out two kinds of research: scholarly research and community-based applied research. There may be overlap between the two but a differentiation is necessary because the strategies, dissemination and products of the two may differ.

Applied community-based research promotes the mission of the department and Northern Arizona University. It is as rigorous and valuable as scholarly research but differs from it in its intent, methodology and public accessibility. The intent of such research is to assist Native American communities in nation-building. It is more time-consuming than other research because of the distances involved, political relationships that must be maintained and the Indigenous research protocols that must be followed. The results of the research may be confidential. Researchers engaged in confidential community-based research should get a letter from the community for use in the faculty member's performance appraisal. This letter should outline the general nature of the project, the effort and time needed to complete it, and the general nature of the agreement with the faculty member.

Results of scholarly work must be made available to students, colleagues, Native American communities and the general public. The forms of dissemination may vary and may change, and include: print and web-based journal articles; monographs; books; edited volumes; book chapters; poster presentations; presentations at professional meetings; presentations at local, regional, national, tribal, and international meetings; development of new curricula; media-based scholarly presentations; and publication of instructional improvements or new methodologies. For community-based research these forms of dissemination may not always be possible because of the nature of the agreement, but could also include: community talks; talks at local and tribal meetings, workshops and schools; presentations to tribal government and its branches; and confidential research reports. The scholarly work of the Traditional Knowledge Scholars may be disseminated through their teaching and student-related activities.

Faculty members are expected to do scholarly work in addition to their community-based work and maintain a balance between the two in order to promote their movement towards promotion and tenure, and to fulfill annual review expectations.

The annual evaluation of research and scholarship will utilize specific sets of criteria. The first is scholarly publication and grants awarded. The term 'scholarly publications' refers to books (including work on second editions and editorships), articles and other scholarship in refereed journals, book chapters, monographs (including published and disseminated research reports, and training manuals) published or accepted for publication in the evaluation year. With respect to books, acceptance means a publisher's commitment to publish, not the initial granting of a contract. The term " grants" refers to both contracts and grants awarded from external funding agencies, and from internal funding sources. Review essays meet the requirements of published scholarship only if they are peer reviewed and appear in scholarly publications. Oral presentations to communities or in the media count as non-referred dissemination of scholarly work but will not be counted as highly as peer-reviewed publications (Column C rather than Column A or B). Applied community research will also count but not as highly as peer-reviewed publications (Column B rather than Column A). A letter from community leadership outlining as much detail as allowable by the agreement will be taken as evidence of confidential research work.

For the purposes of the annual evaluation, no distinction will be made between work that is singly authored and work that is jointly authored. With the exception of books in progress, publications may be counted only once -- EITHER in the year when they actually appear in print (a copy must be provided) OR in the year that it is accepted for publication (a letter of acceptance must be included). Note: Books under contract and in progress will be credited as equivalent to one publication for up to a maximum of two years preceding completion, and will be credited as one publication for the year of completion (for a total of 3 years). External grants in progress will be

credited for the duration of the grant. Credit for these activities will require demonstration of work toward completion accomplished during the review period.

"Revise and resubmits" do *not* qualify as a *new* submission of work for publication. This is simply an additional step to the original submission and is not a valid criterion for evaluating scholarship and professional development; however, scholarship that is rejected, substantially revised and then submitted to a *new* journal/publication for consideration may qualify as submission of work for scholarly publication. While the publication of encyclopedia entries, book reviews or similar non-refereed publications are considered published scholarship, they will be counted under Column B rather than Column A. This also applies to applied research documents such as: policy plans, legal briefs, official petitions, CDs, videos, manuals, curriculum guides, websites, exhibits and similar.

Reviews of book proposals or manuscripts that are undertaken in service to a publisher are considered professional service not scholarship. Reprints of publications are a recognition of the authors' contributions to the discipline and will be counted, although not as highly as a first publication (Column C rather than A or B).

The second measure of accomplishment in the area of scholarship is participation in activities that contribute to accomplishments in the area of publication and/or research. This includes participation in international, national, and regional meetings, including invited presentations; submitting articles, books or monographs for review; submitting and working on research grants and contracts; and other forms of professional development that facilitate future scholarly accomplishments.

Scholarship and professional development will be evaluated utilizing the following criteria:

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP		
RANKING	SCORE	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	9 -10	ONE item from A and ONE item from B
Meritorious	7-8	ONE item from A - OR - ONE bolded item from B and TWO items from C
Satisfactory	4-6	TWO italicized items
Unsatisfactory	0-3	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation

A	B	C
Published or had accepted for publication ONE piece of scholarship, including refereed journal articles, book chapters and documented work on an authored or edited book	<i>Submission of work for scholarly publication</i>	
	<i>Presentation of scholarship or invited presentation at international, national, regional, or local tribal meetings</i>	<i>Discussant at a conference</i>
	<i>Submitted a major external grant application</i>	Reprint of a publication
	Non-refereed publication (e.g. conference proceedings)	
	<i>Prepared a proposal for an external grant</i>	
Received an external grant	<i>Book review or other non-refereed publication</i>	Oral presentation of scholarship in community forum, or in media production
Applied research reports	Applied community research project in progress	Other research or scholarly work in progress
Scholarship award	Book in progress	
	Produced applied research documents (not a report)	Professional development activity

Service

Successful service may include service performed for a wide range of institutional, professional and societal purposes. It includes service to the Department of Applied Indigenous Studies, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, University-wide service, AIS-related service to the campus, Indigenous communities, and/or the larger community, and to the discipline. Service beyond the University is especially valued because of the applied nature of most work within Applied Indigenous Studies, because of the contributions this work makes to Native American nation-building, and because of the positive attention it yields for the department and the University.

Because the types of academic and professional service that might be performed are very broad, it is impossible to create a comprehensive list of service possibilities. Thus, departmental members may request that unique service contributions they have made be considered relevant to service for the current review period. Following the completion of the review process, AR Committee members are required to seek formal departmental approval for any new criteria that they have accepted as relevant to the service category for that year.

"Highly meritorious" service is characterized by activities that are clearly outside of the routine activities that departmental members are expected to perform within a university setting. In general, these activities should serve to increase the visibility and status of the department, as well as the visibility and status of the individual, because of their exceptional nature. Departmental committee work although valued, does not count toward an evaluation of highly meritorious, since the category refers to service efforts that go beyond the department; however, no faculty member shall receive an evaluation of highly meritorious if that person has not served on at least one department committee, or otherwise demonstrably contributed to the service function in the department.

"Meritorious" service refers to either a limited amount of service that goes beyond the University OR to a sustained commitment to service within the NAU community.

Significant departmental committee work, such as service on several labor-intensive committees or committees that take on significant work for the year, is reflected in Category C below. "Satisfactory" service is evidenced by limited service beyond the department but adequate contributions within the university community. The rating of "Unsatisfactory" is indicated by the failure to meet the service threshold established under the category "Satisfactory."

Evaluation of service is determined utilizing the following criteria:

SERVICE		
RANKING	SCORE	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	9 -10	TWO items from A or B, where at least ONE is from A
		THREE items from A, B or C, where at least ONE is italicized
Meritorious	7-8	TWO items from A, B or C
		Italicized item in A
Satisfactory	4- 6	ONE item from B or C
Unsatisfactory	0- 3	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation.

A	B	C
<i>Professional organization officer status, chair of committee or other significant leadership role in an academic association; main organizer of conference; leadership role in AIS-related organization outside the academic community</i>	<i>University committee or sub-committee work, SBS College committee or sub-committee work, or advisor for a student organization.</i>	<i>Session organizer for a professional association; moderator or chair of a conference session.</i>
Chair of a significant university or college	<i>Peer reviewer/or professional journals, manuscript reviewer for publishers or grant reviewer</i>	Chair of a departmental committee or subcommittee, advisor to student club, or exceptional departmental service (i.e., multiple labor-intensive committees significant work that year)
Editorial position for a journal or book series	<i>AIS-related service to the campus or tribal Nations and/or the larger community (may include public issue oriented consulting).</i>	
Receipt of an award for service		
	<i>Development/maintenance of scholarly website</i>	Other community or professional service work, including professional development in a service area

Overall Ranking

To arrive at the final ranking for Annual Review, the following method will be employed. Utilizing the relevant criteria (see tables above), each member of the Annual Review Committee will determine a performance "Score" for each area: "Teaching/Advising/Student Related Responsibilities," "Research, Scholarship, and Applied Research Activities" and "Service." The performance score will then be multiplied by the percentage from the SOE for teaching/student related responsibilities, scholarship, and service. The three weighted scores will be totaled for a cumulative score.

The Annual Review Committee will then compute an "Overall" average score based on the collective total scores of each committee member. These scores will then determine the overall ranking for the faculty member as follows:

OVERALL RANK	AVERAGE PERFORMANCE SCORE
Highly Meritorious	100-90
Meritorious	89-70
Satisfactory	69-40
Unsatisfactory	39-below

Non-Tenure Eligible Faculty

The same procedures will be used for non-tenure eligible faculty as are used for tenure- eligible faculty, with the exception that the review will only take into account "one or more of the following" of teaching/advising/student related activities, scholarship and service as described in their SOE (COFS 1.4.6.2.1.b). Grievance procedures also differ (see COFS 1.4.6.2.1.f and g).

Post Tenure Review

According to Section 1.4.7 of COFS, "the goals and principle of the Post-Tenure Review Process ...are established at Northern Arizona University to ensure sustained high-quality performance, especially in the areas of teaching and other student-related responsibilities, and specifically as faculty move well beyond the point of receiving a tenured appointment. The post-tenure review process emphasizes opportunities for continued faculty development and provides additional accountability to the university community, to the public and to the Board."

The post-tenure review process in AIS is linked to the annual review process following the same procedures and criteria. It is used to identify those faculty at any level who are "judged to be performing at less than a satisfactory level" as defined by AIS criteria, and to enroll such faculty in a faculty improvement process, as described in COFS Section 1.4.7.1 and 2.

Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria

Approved by AIS Faculty on April 16, 2020

This document is based on Northern Arizona University's [Conditions of Faculty Service \(COFS\)](#) and the [NAU Faculty Handbook](#)

This document describes the indicators of faculty performance to be used in evaluating a candidate, and the standards required by the Department of Applied Indigenous Studies in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service for promotion and/or tenure.

NAU Standards for Tenure Eligible Positions

According to the NAU's COFS document (2015):

The tenure eligible positions include assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Tenure eligible faculty shall have a maximum probationary period no longer than seven (7) years in full-time service at tenure eligible rank, except in cases of waiver by the President for an individual faculty member. All tenure eligible positions require an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the appropriate discipline. Any exception to this degree requirement must be recommended by the faculty and Chair of the academic unit, and approved by the Dean and Provost. Achievement of a faculty rank at NAU shall be determined by evaluation and recommendation using written academic unit criteria which must be approved by the Dean and Provost before implementation. Academic unit criteria may exceed, but must not be less than ABOR standards (6-201 I.) and the NAU standards below: (Section 1.2.1)

Those standards are listed below by rank in the following pages of this document.

Also listed in the NAU COFS document are the following statements:

Achievement of a faculty rank at NAU shall be determined by evaluation and recommendation using written ABOR and NAU criteria, and college/academic unit criteria which must be approved by the Dean and Provost before implementation. Academic unit criteria may exceed ABOR (6-201 I.) and NAU standards. In making promotion decisions, the entire record of the faculty member, including accomplishments at other institutions and other professional activity, shall be considered (COFS 1.4.6.1.3). "The procedure for review and evaluation of faculty for tenure shall be the same as the policy set forth in the Procedure for Review and Evaluation for Promotion." (COFS 1.4.6.1.c).

According to COFS 1.2.1, the minimum standards for Promotion and Tenure are as follows:

Associate Professor

The rank of associate professor is a tenure eligible or tenured position. A faculty member may not be promoted to associate professor unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured associate professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of associate professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor at NAU. Any prior service credit to be counted must be agreed to in writing at the time of hire. To hold the rank of associate professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have:

- a. *A record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.*
- b. *A record that shows a sustained pattern of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.*
- c. *A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the university community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of professor.*

Professor

A faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the Notice of Appointment indicates it is at the rank of professor without tenure. Professors are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of associate professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as associate). To hold the rank of professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have:

- a. A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.
- b. A sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.
- c. A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's department (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the department, college, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty).

In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (a) or (b) above as defined by college and academic unit criteria.

Evaluation Criteria and Indicators for Tenure/Promotion

The mission of the Department of Applied Indigenous Studies is to provide students with the knowledge and tools to contribute to the sustainability of Indigenous Nations and communities in the 21st century. Using a *curriculum to community* approach, students in AIS are prepared to move from learning to action, applying Native ways of knowing for the benefit of indigenous communities within the US and abroad. Our mission and the faculty's teaching, scholarship, and service also serve NAU's strategic goal of "A commitment to Native Americans—to become the leading university serving Native Americans." In accordance with our mission and in service of NAU's strategic goal named above, the department values faculty work in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service that serves Indigenous and Native nations, communities, and students.

To be eligible to apply for tenure and/or promotion to each of the tenure-eligible positions, the department will use the following evaluation criteria and indicators. Considerable responsibility is placed on the department's Faculty Status Committee and the department chair to implement both the letter and intent of this document. It is recognized that with the diversity of activities and interest within the Department of Applied Indigenous Studies and our department's mission, evaluation will require professional interpretation and judgment.

Faculty members are responsible for ensuring that reviewers have the necessary documentation/evidence to evaluate performance (i.e., effectiveness, productivity, quality, and impact) of their teaching, advisement, and student-related responsibilities; of their scholarship; and of their service.

Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Methodology

Indicators of Effectiveness in Teaching, Advisement, and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

While the conditions and contexts of teaching vary widely (i.e. face-to-face, web-based, hybrid, upper or lower division courses, etc.), some general features remain consistent. Besides instruction, teaching activities should reflect current knowledge, research, and trends within the field of Applied Indigenous Studies. Using the evidence in the candidates Professional Review File, the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities in this document. The criteria consist of operational definitions or indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate's performance within the field of Applied Indigenous Studies and in this specific area. Indicators of effective teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities may include, but are not limited to, a combination of the following:

- Sustained pattern of positive evaluations by the chair and peers. **4 points**
- Sustained pattern of positive evaluations from student opinion surveys and any other documentation believed by the Department to be relevant to AIS majors and the AIS curriculum. **4 points**
- Student/Faculty/University award nominations for excellence in teaching or teaching related activities. **4 points**
- Organization of or participation in professional development activities related to teaching. **3 points**
- Development of new or updated courses on a regular basis. **3 points**
- Supervision of students' scholarly activities and independent studies, including graduate thesis and dissertation work. **4 points**
- Development and delivery of online courses. **3 points**
- Evidence of advising students in course selection, or academic and professional development, including letters of recommendation, informal meetings, and organized work sessions. **2 points**
- Acquisition of new skills to be used in teaching on a regular basis. **3 points**
- Service as internship coordinator. **3 points**
- Sustained involvement in professional development activities related to teaching. **2 points**
- Commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience including: organizing and/or directing fieldtrips; facilitating student participation at professional meetings; supervising presentation and/or publication of student scholarly work in professional venues. **3 points**
- Successful development or publication of instructional/teaching related materials. **2 points**

Indicators of Effectiveness in Scholarly Activity

Scholarly and/or creative activities are work or activities that develop or produce original works, creative performances or creative products, or other contributions as delineated below.

Since documentation of the product and the dissemination of the results of scholarly activity are essential, yet varied, categories of products and dissemination are given below as a guide. The categories of products described below provide an organizational structure with which to assess faculty work in the area of scholarly activity. These categories are useful in communicating expectations for faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure. The categorization does not reduce the responsibility of reviewers to ensure that products demonstrate high quality. Some examples of products that might be within each category include, but are not limited to, the following:

Category A (substantial external validation of scholarly products) **4 Points Each:**

- Refereed (i.e., juried/peer-reviewed) journal articles (published in a recognized publishing house; not a vanity press; may be paper or electronic journal)
- Authored and edited books or textbooks (published in a recognized publishing house; not a vanity press) including documented work on a book
- Book chapters
- Received an external grant, or research or program/service grant, or documented work on that grant or research

Category B (externally accepted scholarly products) **3 points each:**

- Submission of work for scholarly publication
- Presentation of scholarship at international, national, Indigenous or regional meetings
- Invited presentations at international, national, International or regional professional and scholarly meetings (documentation must make these presentations accessible to reviewers; published proceedings from conferences would be appropriate)
- Submitted an external grant application
- Non-refereed publication, technical reports, case briefs, policy documents
- Prepared a proposal for and/or worked on an external or internal grant(s)
- Receipt of an award for scholarship and/or professional development
- Review (book, article, other) published in an appropriate scholarly publication
- Reprints of articles in books of readings that are peer reviewed
- Publication of a new edition of a book or textbook
- Refereed presentations at international, national, tribal or regional professional and scholarly meetings (documentation must make these presentations accessible to reviewers; published proceedings from conferences would be appropriate)
- Research or program/service grants receiving positive external, peer-review feedback, but not funded
- Applied research with Indigenous nations or communities (with supporting documentation)
- Invited colloquia at other universities and academic conference presentations (documentation must make these presentations accessible to reviewers)
- Editorship of professional journal with a national audience (extended term, not a special issue)
- Original curriculum products (e.g., CD ROM's, videos, tests, clinical instruction documents; ancillary materials for textbooks) with wide dissemination
- Workbooks/Study guides (published by a recognized publishing house)
- Other professional publications (e.g., magazine or newsletter articles, which are relevant to the profession)

Category C (minimal or no external review) **2 points each:**

- Presentation of scholarship or invited presentations at international, national, or regional scholarly or professional meetings
- Research or program/service grants awarded internally or without peer review
- Creation, development, and maintenance of a discipline-related scholarly Web site
- Discussant at a conference
- Reprints of articles in books of readings
- Prepared a proposal for and/or worked on an internal or external grant(s)
- Other professional publications (not mentioned in Category B, but which are relevant to the profession)

Category D 1 point each

All other scholarly or creative activity not captured in Category A, B, or C

NOTE: Examples of products in the above categories are not “absolutes.” If well documented and justified, the category of a product can be changed.

Indicators of Effectiveness in Service to the Profession, the University, and Indigenous Communities

Service activities are efforts that contribute to the department, university, Indigenous nations, communities, and Indigenous-serving organizations, local communities, state, federal or international organizations or agencies, and the unit's discipline or the discipline of the faculty member's terminal degree through service to a professional organization.

Some examples of service activities include, but are not limited, to the following:

Sample service to department or college (1 point each)	Sample service to university (1 point each)	Sample service to community (local, Indigenous, or professional) and Indigenous Nations (2 points each)
Active participation on Committees* Mentoring junior faculty Active participation in other administrative tasks such as coordinating areas and preparing accreditation and related reports, etc. Administration of grants**	Active participation on University Committees or sub-committees Chair of a significant university or college committee or sub-committee Activities that promote and support cultural diversity within the University Activities that promote the recruitment and retention of students Receipt of an award for service	Editorship of professional journal or book series Officer status or chair of a committee or other significant leadership role in an academic association or an AIS-related organization outside the academic community AIS-related service to the campus, Indigenous communities, and/or the larger community (may include public issue-oriented consulting and technical reports) Activities for schools, industry, local, state, tribal, and national agencies, and for the public at large Leadership of professional organizations Guest editing of Peer Reviewed Journal Peer reviewer for professional journals, manuscript reviewer for publishers or grant reviewer Session organizer for a professional association; moderator or chair of a conference session Receipt of an award for service Participation in other professional activities such as reviewing works submitted to conferences or serving on professional editorial boards

		Informal service to Indigenous/Native Nations or communities
--	--	--

*Active participation means more than attending meetings. It implies significant contributions to committees such as input into policy discussions, gathering data for reports, writing reports, etc.

**Normally, the *writing and submission* of a grant is considered Scholarship. Depending upon the nature of the grant, the *administration* of the grant might be considered Service.

Standards for Tenure/Promotion

To be eligible to apply for promotion to each of the tenure-eligible positions, the department will apply the following standards to the indicators previously described:

Associate Professor

According to the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service (2015):

The rank of associate professor is a tenure eligible or tenured position. A faculty member may not be promoted to associate professor unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured associate professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of associate professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor at NAU. Any prior service credit to be counted must be agreed to in writing at the time of hire. To hold the rank of associate professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have: a. A record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities. b. A record that shows a sustained pattern of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline. c. A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the university community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of professor (COFS 1.2.1)

To be appointed or promoted to the rank of associate professor and/or be awarded tenure, the faculty member must submit all relevant documents, materials both from previous positions/institution.

AIS Requirements: Based on meeting the review standards of the Department's Annual Review document, the candidate must demonstrate a record of effective teaching for those years taught at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by a complete review of a teaching portfolio that documents effort in three areas: (a) teaching effectiveness and instructional methodology, (b) course content and organization and (c) leadership and professional development in teaching. Assessment will be made through the following indicators: current knowledge of the taught subjects (e.g. current and appropriate level of readings and course content, appropriate course revisions), effective application of appropriate teaching methods (e.g. learning outcomes aligned with appropriate standards, appropriateness to level of course), and an overall positive performance in the indicators of teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities and the potential for continued contributions (e.g. student opinion surveys, mentoring/advising students, independent studies and/or internships).

AIS Requirements: Based on meeting the review standards of the Department's annual review document, the candidate should demonstrate an active scholarly agenda in the discipline of Applied Indigenous Studies and/or a closely related field prior to application, and exhibit a sustained pattern of scholarly publications in refereed journals or equivalent scholarly outlets since appointment to Assistant Professor. The candidate's total professional record should demonstrate the products of a sustained pattern of scholarly activity. An example of this might be showing evidence of three to five scholarly products of which three come from Category A, with additional items from category B., with a **score of eighteen (18) or higher**, which includes three

items from Category A as described above, two items from category B as described above, or three items from Category A as describe above, one item from Category B as described above and two from Category C as described above.

An active scholarly agenda is determined by such factors as quality publications, books, monographs, grant preparation, applied community-based research with Indigenous nations or communities, applied community-based research, and/or other creative and scholarly activities as well as presentations and other participation at international, national, Indigenous and regional meetings. Publications that are the equivalent of a refereed article are necessary and important but the candidate strengthens his/her case by demonstrating performance on the other items, including applied research with Indigenous Nations and communities which for reasons of confidentiality or sensitivity, may not be approved by the Indigenous Nation for publication in scholarly journals. Given the mission of the Department of Applied Indigenous Studies and how that mission serves NAU's strategic goal entitled Commitment to Native Americans, applied research with Indigenous/Native nations serve the department, the discipline, and the University and reflect the most recent direction of the discipline of Indigenous/American Indian/Native American Studies.

The candidate should provide a narrative of the value of these publications in their Narrative Statement, for example, in terms of their impact on the field, how they were received in the discipline, and so on).

AIS Requirements: Based on meeting the review standards of the Department's Annual Review document, since appointment to Assistant Professor the candidate should demonstrate active participation in department affairs, including contributions in program development and administration, membership on department/college/university standing or ad hoc committees, and service activities to the profession, Indigenous communities, and larger community beyond the NAU. Meaningful service activities should advance the mission of the department, college, university, community and profession.

Professor (a tenured position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service (2015):

"A faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the Notice of Appointment indicates it is at the rank of professor without tenure. Professors are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of associate professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as associate). To hold the rank of professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have: a. A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities. b. A sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline. c. A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's department (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the department, college, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty)."

"In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (a) or (b) above as defined by college and academic unit criteria." (COFS 1.2.1)

AIS Requirements: Based on meeting the review standards of the Department's Annual Review document, the candidate must demonstrate current knowledge of the subjects they teach (e.g. current and appropriate level of readings and course content, significant curricula revisions as necessary), effective application of appropriate teaching methods (e.g. innovative teaching strategies, multi-contextual teaching techniques, learner centered course activities), and an

overall positive performance in the indicators of teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities and the potential for continued contributions (e.g. student opinion surveys, directing student research, graduate student committee work, and the curriculum-to-community approach reflected in the department's mission and program outcomes).

AIS Outstanding Requirements: The candidate must submit a teaching portfolio that will provide evidence of outstanding teaching, advisement, and student related activities, based on meeting the review standards of the Department's Annual Review document. The teaching portfolio may include, but not be limited to the following: teaching philosophy, course syllabi, evidence of student learning, evidence of the use of valid assessments to measure course outcomes, student opinion surveys, teaching innovations, awards, effective application of appropriate teaching methods, development of new curricula, publication of instructional improvements, and an overall excellent performance in the indicators of teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities and the potential for continued contributions.

A sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.

AIS Requirements: Based on meeting the review standards of the Department's annual review document, the candidate's total record must provide evidence of a pattern of high quality and sustained publication of scholarly products. Additionally, since promotion to Associate Professor, the record must provide evidence of sustained scholarship publications that expand the knowledge base of the discipline, extends the discipline into new fields of application, and/or improves the teaching of the discipline through the dissemination of pedagogic knowledge. The candidate's *total professional record* should demonstrate the products of a sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly activity. An example of this might be showing evidence of six to eight scholarly products from Category A (with three of those published since promotion to associate professor rank) and four from Categories B and C with a minimum of two from Category B. **overall core of 32 or higher, with a minimum of 15 since promotion to Associate Professor.**

Assessment of a pattern of high-quality scholarly endeavors is determined through the following indicators: print and Web-based journal articles, monographs, books, edited volumes, chapters in books, poster presentations, presentations at professional meetings, presentations at regional, tribal, or local meetings, publication of new methodologies, products of applied community-based research, review performance, and professional exhibitions. Scholarly recognition may come from invited presentations, awards in juried exhibitions, submission and funding of competitive grants, fellowships, invited participation on national panels, election to executive boards of professional organizations, invitations to join editorial boards of scholarly journals, and awards from professional organizations.

The candidate must also provide a narrative that indicates the contribution to the discipline of their scholarly publications (what impact they had on the field, how they were received, invitations to present the work etc.). Publications equivalent to a refereed journal article, book, book chapter or external grant are viewed as important evidence of a pattern of high-quality scholarly activity. However, the candidate strengthens his/her case by demonstrating performance in the other indicators listed above.

AIS Outstanding Requirements: Based on meeting the review standards of the Department's annual review document, the candidate's total record must provide evidence of significant scholarly products that includes a range of high-quality publications (e.g., books, refereed journal articles, book chapters, reports, etc.). Additionally, since promotion to Associate Professor, the record must indicate evidence of professional standing and scholarly recognition. An example of this might be showing evidence of ten scholarly products from Category A (with five of those published since promotion to professor rank) and at least four from Category B.

A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession, the University community and Indigenous Nations and communities, and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's department (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the department, college, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty).

AIS Requirements: Based on meeting the review standards of the Department's Annual Review document, the candidate should demonstrate significant service activity each year to the department/college/university; and since appointment to Associate Professor, service activities to the larger community beyond NAU. Meaningful service activities should advance the mission of the department, college, university, Indigenous peoples, community and profession. In addition to service, the candidate should participate in departmental/college meetings. In service activities, the candidate should contribute at the leadership level. Of special consideration is the contribution to development/mentorship of junior faculty members in scholarship and teaching, such as mentoring in proposal development, writing for publication, syllabus or test preparation, use of technology in teaching, etc.

Non-tenure Track Full-Time Faculty

To be eligible to apply for promotion to each of the non-tenure eligible positions, the department will apply the following standards:

Senior Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service (2015)," Section 1.2.2, "*to be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience.*" In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

A record of substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.

AIS Requirements: The candidate must demonstrate a record of effective teaching for those years taught at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by a complete review of a teaching portfolio that documents effort in three areas: (a) teaching effectiveness and instructional methodology, (b) course content and organization and (c) leadership and professional development in teaching. Assessment will be made through the following indicators: current knowledge of the taught subjects (e.g. current readings and course content, appropriate course revisions), effective application of appropriate teaching methods (e.g. learning outcomes aligned with appropriate standards, appropriateness to level of course), and an overall positive performance in the indicators of teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities and the potential for continued contributions (e.g. student opinion surveys, outside evaluations).

A record of service and professional development related to the teaching role.

AIS Requirements: Since appointment to Senior Lecturer the candidate should demonstrate participation in some service activities to the Department such as faculty mentor to the CHEI Club. The candidate is also encouraged to use their expertise to provide service locally, nationally, tribally, or internationally.

To be promoted to the rank of senior lecturer, the candidate must have a record of three to five four-point items as described above for teaching, and four to five three-point and two-point items and as described above with at least two three-point items. **Minimum score 22**

Principle Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service (2015):

Principal Lecturer: a faculty member is eligible to apply for the rank of Principal Lecturer in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Senior Lecturer at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as Senior Lecturer or in a subsequent formal petition, approved by the chair/director, dean and provost, prior to the Senior Lecturer's application for promotion). To be eligible for the rank of principal lecturer, the faculty member must have at least the following: 1. A record of commitment to student success through sustained excellence at the senior lecturer rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities. 2. A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role. 3. The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of senior lecturer or other relevant professional experience. Teaching outside of the academic year is credited only in the case of faculty members on fiscal-year (12 month) contracts. (Section 1.2.2 c).

AIS Requirements: The candidate must demonstrate a record of effective teaching for those years taught at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by a complete review of a teaching portfolio that documents effort in three areas: (a) teaching effectiveness and instructional methodology, (b) course content and organization and (c) leadership and professional development in teaching. Assessment will be made through the following indicators: current knowledge of the taught subjects (e.g. current readings and course content, appropriate course revisions), effective application of appropriate teaching methods (e.g. learning outcomes aligned with appropriate standards, appropriateness to level of course), and an overall positive performance in the indicators of teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities and the potential for continued contributions (e.g. student opinion surveys, outside evaluations).

A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role.

AIS Requirements: Since appointment to Principal Lecturer the candidate will demonstrate participation in some service activities to the Department such as faculty mentor to the CHEI Club or other Indigenous-focused student club. The candidate is also encouraged to use their expertise to provide service locally, nationally, to Indigenous nations and communities or Indigenous-serving organizations, or internationally. To be promoted to the rank of Principle Lecturer, the candidate must have a record of an additional (over 12 semesters since serving in the rank of Senior Lecturer) three to five four-point items over 12 semesters since serving in the rank of Senior Lecturer) as described above for teaching, and a combination of four to five three-point or two-point items (over 12 semesters since serving in the rank of Senior Lecturer) as described above with at least two three-point items. **Minimum score 22.**

SBS DEANS NOTE (MAY 17, 2021): THE FOLLOWING SECTION HAS NOT BEEN APPROVED BY THE COLLEGE, AS IT DOES NOT CONFORM TO THE SBS GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION. THESE PROCESSES MAY BE DISCUSSED FOR FUTURE EVALUATION YEARS. ANY PROCESS THAT DIFFERS FROM THE COLLEGE-WIDE PROCESS MUST BE APPROVED BY THE DEAN AND PROVOST.

Process for Faculty Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure

The department will follow the process outlined in the COFS document, approved 2015, with the exception of the substitution of an AIS Affiliated Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee taking the place of a college promotion and tenure committee, as AIS will not be part of a college under the terms specified in the AIS Transition Proposal document and described herein:

Each Spring, the entire body of AIS Affiliated Faculty will convene with the Faculty Senate elections officer and elect five members from the body of AIS Affiliated Faculty to serve as the equivalent of a college Promotion and Tenure Committee for the subsequent academic year, for the purposes of reviewing and evaluation applications for promotion and tenure among the AIS

faculty. The Faculty Senate elections officer will facilitate the meeting, and may, to ensure a sufficient number of five faculty serving on the committee, select a faculty member at large from the Faculty Senate to ensure a committee of five members, should there be less than five AIS Affiliated Faculty members able to serve on the committee for the subsequent academic year. The AIS Affiliated Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee shall, after review and discussion, provide a written recommendation as to promotion and tenure to the Dean/VP of the Office of Native American Initiatives and the faculty member under consideration for tenure and/or promotion, following the Personnel Action Calendar created by the Provost's office.

Upon advice from the Faculty Senate, the Affiliated Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee process described in the AIS transition document, most closely mirrors a college promotion and tenure committee, and will act in place of a college P & T committee, following similar processes. The promotion and tenure process outlined in [Conditions of Faculty Service \(COFS\)](#).

Anthropology

Annual Review

Approved by Office of the Provost: May 7, 2014

This document establishes guidelines and procedures for annual review of faculty performance in the Department of Anthropology. The primary purpose is to establish a framework for documenting faculty achievements and assessing those with respect to the missions of the Department, College, and University.

I. General Principles

Per the NAU Faculty Handbook (08.15.08), annual evaluation shall be made by an elected Annual Review Committee. This committee shall be composed of five members, including at least three tenured faculty members of the Anthropology Department who also elected are members of the Department's Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS) B.3.1. Committee.

Evaluation shall be made according to the overall effort and effectiveness of a faculty member in fulfilling the Department of Anthropology's goals. This evaluation shall be based on the faculty members' assigned workload and allocation of time as set forth in her/his Statement of Expectations (SOE; NAU COFS 1.4.5.1). Through consultation with the Anthropology Department Chair, faculty will establish their work distribution as percentages devoted to research/applied activities, teaching, and service.

The purpose and spirit of the SOE is to clarify and commemorate an individual faculty member's job structure, tasks, and areas of specialization as these pertain to Department goals. The diversity of faculty skills, expertise, interests, and job assignments requires a flexible approach to annual evaluation. The Department of Anthropology recognizes that not all faculty have identical roles in the Department's mission. Faculty shall be encouraged to emphasize their areas of special expertise and skill, provided this is done in consultation with the Department Chair, and provided that these emphases contribute to the overall mission of the Department.

Each category of effort – research/applied activities, teaching, and service – shall be evaluated individually according to the guidelines provided in Section IV of this document. If particular areas of effort are not required in a faculty member's annual SOE, then effort in that category shall be rated as Not Applicable (N/A).

Evaluation shall be based solely on the written materials contained in the faculty member's Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation Report and Professional Review File. Materials to be submitted in the Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation Report shall be based on Section 1.4.5 of COFS.

A faculty member's overall rating (Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious, and Highly Meritorious) shall be based on a preponderance of evidence considered across all areas of effort commemorated in the annual SOE.

II. Categories of Performance Rating

For purposes of assessing merit, we employ four categories of performance rating: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious, and Highly Meritorious.

Unsatisfactory faculty members do not meet the standards defined for Satisfactory performance (see below), and are not taking appropriate steps to remedy shortcomings.

A **Satisfactory** university faculty member performs up to expected standards of excellence. At NAU, faculty members:

- Are prepared, organized, competent, and effective teachers who maintain responsibility for advising students.
- Are involved in scholarly activities, and carry out their own theoretical or applied research agendas.
- Are involved in the maintenance of their department and curriculum, and shoulder needed departmental service roles.

Meritorious And Highly Meritorious means performing above the expected satisfactory range. The degree to which a faculty member performs "above," distinguishes merit from high merit.

III. Department of Anthropology Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation

The following format represents the Department of Anthropology's major categories and structure for listing accomplishments during the period of annual review. Faculty may provide evidence of accomplishments in each category below. Faculty may also provide evidence of additional accomplishments in any or each of the three categories (Teaching, Research, Service) that are not covered by this basic listing, which they wish to have considered for annual evaluation.

I. Teaching/Advising/Other Student-Related Responsibilities

- a. Courses taught during review period (indicate if new preparation; give course numbers and enrollment; include independent studies).
- b. Advising (indicate number of undergraduate and graduate advisees, other activities related to advising).
- c. Graduate thesis and internship committees (indicate if chair).
- d. Course and teaching development (include teaching workshops, teaching grants, development of course-related material, etc.).
- e. Other teaching contributions (include presentations in other classes, facilitating research opportunities for students, etc.).
- f. Teaching awards and other recognition.
- g. Programmatic contributions to Department Teaching.

Include a section of commentary/summary to provide an overview of accomplishments for the teaching category

II. Research/Applied/Scholarly Activities

- a. Publications during review year.
 - i. Authored books and monographs;
 - ii. Co-authored books and monographs;
 - iii. Edited and co-edited books and monographs;
 - iv. Chapters in books;
 - v. Articles in refereed journals;
 - vi. Articles in non-refereed publications (include newsletter pieces, encyclopedia articles, etc.);
 - vii. Reports, policy plans, other professional works (including CD's, videos, web sites, exhibits, and the like, related to professional research).
- b. Works in progress/ in press (indicate status: revise and resubmit, accepted, being written, etc.).
- c. Papers presented at professional meetings (indicate meeting and date).
- d. Other professional presentations (can include presentations at other universities, community organizations, or talks at NAU).
- e. Grants and contracts (including those applied for; indicate if funded).
- f. Unfunded current research.
- g. Other professional/research activities (do not include professional service here).
- h. Professional Awards and Honors.

i. Programmatic contributions to Department research

Include a section of commentary/summary to provide an overview of accomplishments for the publication/research category.

III. Service

- a. Committees.
 - i. Department committees;
 - ii. College Committees;
 - iii. University Committees;
 - iv. Other service within the university.
- b. Community service (as related to professional expertise).
- c. Professional service (include offices in professional organizations).
- d. Other service contributions (including workshops).
- e. Service awards and other recognition.

Include a section of commentary/summary to provide an overview of accomplishments for the service category.

IV. Guidelines for Evaluating Individual Areas of Performance

The following table provides guidelines to be used by the Department of Anthropology's Annual Review Committee in evaluating a faculty member's performance in each area of effort (research/applied [R/A] activities, teaching, and service).

Teaching/Advising/Other Student-Related Responsibilities	
Unsatisfactory	Performance below the level of Satisfactory and lack of initiative and progress toward improvement to the level of satisfactory. Unacceptable performance leading to a rating of unsatisfactory might include (but would not be limited to): Excessive or unexplained absence from scheduled class sessions or exams; excessively high rates of written complaints about teaching from students or colleagues; clear evidence of abusive or intolerant behavior toward students; high rates of students dropping the faculty member's courses; excessive inattention to office hours and student appointments; demonstrated unfairness in grading procedures or other student evaluations
Satisfactory	To receive a satisfactory rating, a faculty member: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Performs expected teaching duties, meets classes, remains organized and current; shows evidence of being a prepared, competent, and effective teacher.2. Receives indications of effective teaching: positive comments outweigh negative comments.3. Improves weak areas.4. Maintains a reasonable advising load that contributes to departmental advising mission.5. When needed, contributes to department curriculum development and maintenance

Meritorious and Highly Meritorious	<p>A meritorious rating can be achieved if a faculty member has a high level of teaching effectiveness: positive comments clearly preponderant over negative comments (we recognize that challenging courses with high expectations of student performance often garner a certain number of negative student evaluations), or average scores at or above college mean, and shows evidence of notable performance in at least one of the areas of teaching/advising merit listed below:</p> <p>A rating of highly meritorious requires performance at the level of meritorious, plus substantial, high-quality contributions in other areas of teaching effort derived from the following list.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Substantial programmatic contributions to Department teaching load, e.g., teaching effectively with notably high course enrollments 2. Mentoring activities: club advisor, independent/directed studies. 3. New course development or substantial course revision. 4. Teaching grant submission (classroom improvement or related activities 5. Teaching award. 6. Attending or providing a teaching workshop. 7. Working closely with students on research projects and/or sponsoring student research. 8. Receipt of teaching grant. 9. Substantial curricular contribution: course or curriculum development beyond service on department committee work 10. High graduate or undergraduate advising load and effective advising. 11. Notable non-formal mentoring activity involving close work with individual students or groups of students. 12. Provision of outside lectures/workshops related to teaching methods or effectiveness. 13. Teaching courses or assuming teaching duties or responsibilities beyond those required in the SOE (i.e., not involving extra compensation) 14. Creative teaching delivery and/or development of new pedagogical approaches (e.g., web, IITV, experiential) 15. Significantly above average thesis and/or internship committee loads. 16. Significantly above average graduate independent or graduate research supervision loads.
------------------------------------	--

Research/Applied/Scholarly (R/A/S) Activities	
Unsatisfactory	Performance below the level of Satisfactory and lack of initiative and progress toward improvement to the level of satisfactory.
Satisfactory	Some R/A activities reported, but relatively minimal involvement. Should show evidence of engagement in scholarly activities and pursuit of an individual theoretical or applied research agenda. Minimum rate is considered to include some level of scholarly activity, to the extent of involvement in at least ONE of the scholarly activities outlined in the next section.

Meritorious	<p>Meritorious performance is distinguished from satisfactory in the following ways. A meritorious rating is based on a substantial contribution to departmental R/A program by involvement in at least TWO of the following categories. In addition, to receive a rating of "Meritorious" these activities must include at least one publication or funded grant.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing opportunities for student research (examples might include co-authoring publications with students, or assisting a student in preparing a grant). 2. Submitting an internal or external grant. 3. Awards and recognition for R/A work. 4. Papers presented/workshops given/discussant in sessions at professional meetings. 5. Public presentation of R/A results (writing or speaking; examples might include authoring a newspaper article, or delivering a public presentation at the Museum or Northern Arizona). 6. Documentable work on an article, book, monograph, or equivalent applied deliverable. 7. Receipt of an internal or external grant (the submission and award of an internal or external grant shall count as two elements in the evaluation process). 8. Pursuing professional development activities (updating computer skills, attending professional meetings, taking courses or workshops related to research or applied pursuits). 9. Publication
Highly Meritorious	<p>A highly meritorious rating is distinguished from meritorious in the following ways. Highly meritorious performance makes a significant contribution to the field through publication in high quality (high impact) outlets (and may include substantial and documentable progress toward or completion of a book or major contractual report or receipt of substantial external grant funding including multiyear or multi-personnel funding.) Faculty seeking a Highly Meritorious rating may also submit documentation of notable and high-quality activity in at least one of the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submission of significant internal/external grants. 2. Professional awards and recognition. 3. Providing substantial R/A opportunities for students. 4. Making substantial professional presentations. 5. Receipt of significant internal or external grant.

Service	
Unsatisfactory	Absence of community, university, or professional service functions and departmental service below the norm.
Satisfactory	Performs departmental tasks, serves on department committees and evidences limited service outside the university.
Meritorious	Serving as a contributing member in a number of departmental, college, or university committees or responsibility or activity in service projects requiring substantial commitment of time and effort.
Highly Meritorious	Performs necessary departmental service and makes an exceptional service contribution by either active membership in a number of service activities or serving in leadership roles in important departmental, college, university, civic, or professional organizations.

Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria

Approved by Office of the Provost: May 23, 2014

The Anthropology Department Committee on Faculty Status reviews department recommendations for tenure and/or promotion and makes recommendations to the Chair based upon the criteria specified in this document. The committee ensures that each candidate meets acceptable minimum standards for the University (see ABOR Policy 6-201 and the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service" [CoFS] document, Sections 1.2 and 1.4) and the College (as outlined below) in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; research, scholarship, or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline; and service to the university community and the profession. As stated in the CoFS (Section 1.4.6.1.3), "in making promotion decisions, the entire record of the faculty member, including accomplishments at other institutions and other professional activity, shall be considered."

This document defines the Anthropology Department's indicators of faculty performance to be used in evaluating a candidate, and the standards required by the College in each area for promotion and/or tenure.

Evaluation Criteria and Indicators of Faculty Performance

General

To be considered for promotion and/or tenure as a tenure eligible faculty, a candidate must achieve at least the minimum Anthropology, SBS, and university criteria for each rank in the three areas under review: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; (2) research, scholarship and/or creative activities; and (3) service to the university, community and the profession. In addition to meeting all the minimum requirements in the three areas under review, for promotion to the rank of Professor, a candidate must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in either (1) or (2) above as defined by College and Department/School criteria. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements.

For non-tenure eligible faculty holding the rank of Lecturer to be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer or from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer, a candidate must achieve the minimum SBS and university criteria for each rank in the following areas: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; and (2) a record of service and professional development related to the teaching role. For non-tenure eligible faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor of Practice to be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or from Associate Professor of Practice to Professor of Practice, a candidate must achieve the minimum SBS and university criteria for each rank in the following areas: (1) teaching and other student-related responsibilities; and (2) scholarly, creative, or professional achievements. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements. For promotion to other non-tenure eligible faculty positions, see the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2.

Evaluation of a candidate by the Committee on Faculty Status shall be confined to the materials included in a faculty member's Professional Review File that adhere to the requirements set forth by the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.4.5.2. In addition, materials received, to which the faculty member has agreed to waive access, shall be made available.

By the deadlines specified in the University's Personnel Action Calendar, a candidate for promotion and/or tenure must submit a carefully organized and complete set of materials (the Professional Review File, which may be submitted electronically) that demonstrates the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of their performance in the areas relevant to the rank to which promotion is sought.

The College of Social and Behavioral Science promotes excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service to its stakeholders. In supporting this goal, the College recognizes that an innovative and dynamic faculty should develop performance standards that foster both individual and departmental success. Toward that end, the following examples of performance indicators are listed to help departments construct faculty evaluation standards that support the mission and disciplinary focus of each academic unit.

Performance minimums for promotion and tenure. SBS College criteria, as well as this Anthropology Department promotion and tenure document include: 1) Scholarship: the minimum scholarship standard for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is a sustained pattern of high quality research as indicated by criteria listed below, including a minimum of three (3) refereed journal articles or their equivalent. Promotion to full Professor from Associate Professor is a sustained pattern of high quality research as indicated by criteria listed below, including a minimum of three (3) refereed journal articles, during the faculty member's time in rank as Associate Professor. 2) Teaching: The minimum standard for promotion from assistant to associate, or from associate to full professor is consistently positive teaching evaluations throughout the time in rank (including, but not limited to, student evaluations at or above the College mean, as well as evaluations of meritorious or highly meritorious for the overall teaching portfolio). 3) Service: The minimum standard is service on at least one departmental committee each year and service on one or more college level and/or university level committees during the evaluation period.

Indicators of Performance in the Area of Teaching, Advisement, and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

In addition to classroom and/or online instruction, teaching activities include curriculum development and planning that meets the needs of contemporary students; reflects current knowledge, research, and trends in the discipline; and creates an awareness of gender and diversity issues. Advising activities include guiding progress toward graduation and post-graduation planning. Other student-related activities may include (but are not limited to) the following: student mentoring, student research supervision, and supplemental instruction sections.

Teaching, advisement, and student-related responsibilities include:

- Classroom and/or online instruction;
- Creation and updating of course materials;
- Teaching innovations;
- Teaching-related publications;
- Supervision of students' scholarly activities and independent studies, including graduate thesis and dissertation work;
- Creation of field-based learning opportunities for students, including graduate research;
- Curriculum development;
- Working to improve and infuse the curriculum with global experiences and understanding;
- Advisement;
- Other student related activities (student mentoring, student research supervision, supplemental instruction sections, and the like);
- Organization of or participation in professional development activities related to teaching.
- Advising of clubs and organizations that promote student learning, research, creative expression and/or public service.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File (and the external letters only when appropriate), the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities in this document. The criteria consist of operational definitions or

indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate's performance in this area.

Examples of Performance Indicators in the Area of Teaching, Advisement, and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

- Sustained pattern of positive evaluations by the chair and peers.
- Responsiveness to useful comments and ratings from student opinion surveys and any other documentation believed by the Department/School to be relevant and demonstrated improvements to course methods and content in response to student feedback and other relevant feedback.
- Evidence of effective classroom teaching and/or advising based on annual review narratives, letters from students, exit interviews, examples of student work, and other forms of documentation.
- Student/Faculty/University award nominations for excellence in teaching or teaching-related activities.
- Development of new or updated courses on a regular basis.
- Award of a grant for pedagogical innovation.
- Acquisition of new skills, knowledge, and materials to be used in teaching on a regular basis.
- Development and delivery of online courses.
- Evidence of being instrumental in the development or redevelopment of Department/School programs.
- Commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience including: directing independent studies and student research; organizing and/or directing fieldtrips; facilitating student participation at professional meetings; supervising presentation and/or publication of student scholarly work in professional venues; creating and directing student participation in field-based research and learning experiences.
- Sustained pattern of commitment to student professional growth through supervision of internships and research.
- Service as internship, undergraduate, and/or graduate coordinator.
- Supervising Master's and/or Ph.D. students.
- Career and professional advising of students including letters of recommendation, informal meetings, and organized work sessions.
- Successful publication of instructional/teaching related materials.
- Sustained involvement in professional development activities related to teaching.

Indicators of Performance in the Area of Research, Scholarship and/or Creative Activities

Research, scholarship and/or creative activities are activities that lead to tangible, original works that expand the knowledge base of one's respective discipline, extend the discipline into new fields of application, and/or improve teaching in the discipline by the dissemination of pedagogic scholarship. These activities include publications, exhibitions or productions related to a candidate's discipline and academic interests and efforts to increase, synthesize, or disseminate knowledge in subject areas germane to a candidate's discipline. Publications are completed written documents or other tangible works such as refereed journal articles, books, chapter contributions to books, monographs, applied research/technical reports, or the like, as defined by the Department of Anthropology. Exhibitions and productions refer to works in a variety of media that survive a competitive review process, which might include external peer, editorial, and/or blind review in venues appropriate to a candidate's discipline.

Research, scholarship and/or creative activities include:

- Professional publications, papers, exhibitions, videos, websites, or productions;
- Research projects that can be documented in the form of laboratory reports, research logs, diaries, field notes, interim progress reports, or the like;
- Scholarly work accepted for publication, exhibition, or production;
- Grant and contract work, including applied projects;

- Applied research reports, exhibitions, productions, and other professional contributions;
- Papers, exhibitions, or productions presented at professional meetings;
- Other tangible works related to the scholarly or creative process germane to a candidate's discipline;
- Acting as grant reviewer for funding agencies;
- Editorial board membership and/or manuscript referee or creative juror;
- Review of book manuscripts for university presses and other scholarly publishers;
- Session organizer for a professional association;
- Organizer and host for professional meetings; and
- Developing and/or managing websites that support stakeholder interests relevant to scholarly or creative expertise.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File (and the external letters only when appropriate), the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for research, scholarship and/or creative activities in this document. The criteria consist of operational definitions or indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate's performance in this area.

Examples of Performance Indicators in the Area of Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activities

- Successful publication of journal articles, book chapters, books, research/technical reports, applied project reports, and other peer-reviewed works.
- Presentation of research and creative activities at peer-reviewed professional meetings.
- Publication relevant to scholarly or creative expertise in non-peer reviewed outlets in print, video, website, or other electronic form.
- Exhibition of creative works in non-juried venues.
- Invited talks and/or poster sessions at refereed conferences and meetings.
- Creation and presentation of film, video and media projects related to scholarly and/or creative activities.
- Organizing symposia at refereed conferences and meetings.
- Editing (or co-editing) a scholarly book or conference proceedings.
- Creation of a database for shared scholarly and/or creative works.
- Creation and dissemination of computer software for scholarly purposes.
- Research talks given in non-refereed formats, e.g., an invited speaker series.
- Preparation, submission and/or administration of grants for scholarly and/or creative activities.
- Awards from professional associations for scholarship and creative activity.
- Public presentations of scholarly/creative work to community groups.
- Citation of scholarly work in refereed papers, essays and books.
- Reprints of published scholarship in anthologies and edited volumes.
- Presentation or discussion participant (e.g., panel participant) at professional meetings or public bodies on topics related to research or scholarly interest.

Indicators of Performance in the Area of Service

Service activities include participation in committee work and administrative tasks within the University (at Department/School, College, and University levels), leadership and/or participation in the work of the profession, and contributing one's professional expertise to activities involving a variety of organizations, such as schools, industry, and local, state, and federal government agencies.

Service activities include:

- Department/School, College, and University service such as participation on boards, panels, committees, task forces, or the like;
- Leadership at various levels within the University;

- Public or community service, such as workshops, public forums, consultations, and technical assistance to the public that uses the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues; and
- Professional service, such as reviewing journal articles and other publications, reviewing or judging creative works, reviewing grant applications, editing journals, serving on professional committees, holding office within an organization of a candidate's discipline, or the like.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File (and the external letters only when appropriate), the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for service activities in this document. The criteria consist of operational definitions or indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate's performance in this area.

Examples of Performance Indicators in the Area of Service

- Officer, committee chair or other significant leadership role in an academic or professional association.
- Chair and/or membership on University or College committee or sub-committee.
- Chair and/or membership on a Department/School committee or subcommittee
- Receipt of an award for service.
- Professional service to the campus and/or the larger community (may include public issue oriented consulting, volunteer coordination, and technical assistance).
- Volunteer service in elementary and/or secondary schools, non-profits in the local community and abroad.
- Volunteer service relevant to scholarly or creative expertise on community boards and commissions in the US and abroad.
- Development and presentation of public lectures and workshops in the US and abroad.
- Judge and/or reviewer for University or community events.
- Articles and/or invited opinion essays in community publications based on one's academic expertise.
- Working with community colleges in curriculum development and transfer policies.

Standards for Promotion to Specific Ranks

Associate Professor (a tenure eligible or tenured position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.1, to hold the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must possess a doctorate or other terminal degree in the discipline area. A faculty member may not be promoted to this rank unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured Associate Professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor at NAU; the faculty member, however, may have prior service credit that was agreed to in writing at the time of hire. To hold the rank of Associate Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.
2. A record that shows a sustained pattern of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline, including a minimum of three (3) refereed journal articles or their equivalent.
3. A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the University community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of Professor.

Professor (a tenured position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.1, a faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, unless at the time of initial appointment

the written notice of appointment indicated the hire was at the rank of Professor without tenure. Professors are faculty who have achieved the level of outstanding accomplishments in the areas of either teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as an Associate). To hold the rank of Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must have the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.
2. A sustained pattern of high-quality research, scholarship or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline including a minimum of three (3) refereed journal articles or their equivalent during the faculty's time in rank as Associate Professor.
3. A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's Department/School (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the Department/School, College, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty).

In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of Professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (1) or (2) above as defined by the criteria and indicators in this document.

Senior Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record of substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.
2. A record of service and professional development related to the teaching role.

Principal Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Principal Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of Senior Lecturer or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record of sustained excellence at the Senior Lecturer rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.
2. A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role.

Criminology and Criminal Justice

Annual Review

Approved by CCJ Faculty: April 2020

B.1 INTRODUCTION

Annual Review (AR) and Post-tenure Review (PTR) are procedures designed to evaluate faculty accomplishments in the areas of “Student Related Responsibilities,” “Scholarship, Research, and/or Creative Activity and Professional Development,” and “Service” each academic year or, for tenured faculty, in a five-year cycle. The review process may provide valuable input that can inform career development decisions, especially for tenure eligible and non-tenure eligible faculty members. It is important to note that, consistent with COFS, annual evaluations do not cumulate into tenure and/or promotion decisions.

Document B details the criteria for determining the following evaluative categories, based on a four-point scale, as specified in the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS): (4) Highly Meritorious, (3) Meritorious, (2) Satisfactory, (1) Unsatisfactory.

As specified by COFS, all full-time faculty, whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track, must create a Statement of Expectations (SOE) that will be used as the basis for performance evaluations. The SOE encompasses the faculty member’s anticipated activities for the time period under university contract, utilizing weightings to reflect the percentage of effort devoted to each area of activity. Annual reviews and post-tenure reviews for each faculty member will be determined within the context of his/her Statement of Expectations and relying upon the documentation outlined in Document A. For teaching, the FSC may use the worksheet entitled the FSC Annual Review Document for Teaching Portfolio to evaluate the criteria that faculty include in their teaching portfolio. For faculty members undergoing a *comprehensive* five-year Post-Tenure review, in order to attain a particular evaluation category, the FSC must evaluate the faculty member’s cumulative accomplishments over the five-year period as equivalent to having met the expectations for that evaluation category for each of the five years under review. *Expedited* reviews require the FSC to determine if the ranking from the previous merit ranking from a comprehensive review can be affirmed, based upon the faculty member’s annual accomplishments and overall progress toward a successful five-year comprehensive evaluation. Therefore, for expedited reviews, FSC may include demonstrated progress toward stated goals in determining the outcome of an expedited review.

The criteria outlined in Document B provide guidelines for the evaluation of ordinary workloads related to Student Related Responsibilities; Scholarship, Research, and/or Creative Activity and Professional Development; and Service. These duties shall be written into the individual faculty member’s Statement of Expectations and evaluated by the Chair. At the end of each evaluation year, the faculty member shall submit a brief written report to the Chair regarding relevant administrative accomplishments. In addition to a general summary of administrative work accomplished, the report should specify how this administrative work contributes to “Student Related Responsibilities,” “Scholarship, Research and/or Creative Activity and Professional Development,” and “Service.” This report shall be added to the materials submitted for AR and shall be considered as part of the materials evaluated in each section.

B.2. TEACHING AND STUDENT RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (*Teaching was not revised with Scholarship and Service on 4/30/20*)

B.2.a. Basic Premises

This document outlines the evaluation criteria for faculty members in the department of Criminology and Criminal Justice. It is the view of this department that **quality teaching** refers to effectiveness in both classroom teaching and in other teaching and student related activities that combined contribute to the educational mission of the department, college, and/or university. Several criteria can be used to guide decisions about teaching effectiveness. At a minimum, high quality teaching and student related responsibilities involves three different, though related, components.

Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Methodology refers to the idea that good teaching requires pedagogical methods that promote student learning. Some well recognized elements of teaching effectiveness include good communication, knowledge of the subject matter, the creation of a supportive classroom environment for all students, and fairness in examinations and grading. Teaching Effectiveness is evidenced by: both written and numerical student evaluations (required – although student evaluations must be interpreted cautiously); a narrative description of pedagogy and instructional methods (required to be on file and updated as necessary); faculty interpretations of student evaluations (highly desirable); peer and Chair evaluations, unsolicited letters from students, examples of student work, awards or recognition for outstanding teaching, and other documentation related to teaching effectiveness.

Course Content and Organization refers to the idea that quality teaching depends upon good organization of the subject matter and course. Course objectives and student learning outcomes should be clearly stated in syllabi. Assessment strategies and methods of instruction should clearly lead to these objectives. Other aspects of good organization include the currency of the material used and the appropriateness of the material for the level of the course. Course Content and Organization is evidenced by: course syllabi (required); descriptions of projects, papers, and exercises used in class; descriptions of innovative teaching strategies employed; evidence that courses are revised regularly to remain current; and additional course materials related to content and organization.

Leadership and Related Professional Development in Teaching refers to the idea that student related responsibilities within a university setting involve both classroom teaching and a variety of other important tasks that contribute to the learning environment of the university, and consume additional amounts of faculty time and effort. Accurate and fair evaluation of faculty instructional efforts needs to include the variety of teaching and student related responsibilities that comprise the entire faculty teaching workload. Faculty may participate in professional development and leadership activities related to teaching, and these should be considered important contributions. Leadership and Professional Development is evidenced by: course preparation work (e.g., new courses developed and/or taught, # of different courses taught, and other work beyond the SOE); independent studies; graduate student thesis, dissertation, or exam committees; curricular or program revision contributions; guest lectures provided to other classes, organizations, or institutions; educational opportunities developed within the university (e.g. creating panel discussions, bringing in outside speakers, etc.); professional development activities related to teaching, such as participation in workshops or other programs designed to enhance teaching skills; mentoring/advising students, junior faculty or instructors; grants for innovative teaching; and additional materials related to leadership and professional development. A narrative description may be included to best evidence this work.

Because teaching is a multifaceted activity, it is the view of the Department that **teaching portfolios** are the preferred vehicle for presenting and evaluating the quality of a faculty member's teaching activities. Teaching portfolios provide faculty members with an opportunity to individualize the presentation of their teaching activities. The committee will examine the faculty member's teaching portfolio holistically and make its decision based on the preponderance of

evidence provided under each category using the predetermined criteria set out in Document B and outlined in the FSC worksheet. Faculty are encouraged to include in their portfolio items such as: a statement of teaching philosophy, sample syllabi, assignments and other course materials, evaluations/assessment of engagement with department student learning outcomes, and evidence of engagement with innovative techniques and practices that encourage quality teaching practices.

Faculty members are encouraged to provide evidence in a range of categories to enhance their portfolio and to make a case for their involvement in and commitment to student related responsibilities.

Faculty members must document their activities in the area of Teaching and Student Related Responsibilities for the evaluation period by submitting a teaching portfolio, as specified in Document A.

B.2.b. Evaluation Criteria for Teaching and Student Related Responsibilities

Within the constraints of their position, faculty members are able to negotiate the total percentage of their workload they allot to teaching and student related responsibilities at the time of writing their SOE. While quality teaching should meet the basic standards below regardless of the workload percentage allotted for these responsibilities, FSC shall consider teaching load in their evaluation.

For each of the three areas identified as critical to quality teaching, members of the review committee will assign an evaluation of Highly Meritorious, Meritorious, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory, based on criteria detailed in each category on the next page and using a standard of “preponderance of evidence.”

For Annual Review, once the three categories have been evaluated, an overall evaluation of student related responsibilities will be made, utilizing the following criteria; for Post-Tenure Review, the number of items/criteria needed to achieve a particular ranking will be multiplied by the number of years under review:

RANKING	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	Evaluation of highly meritorious in TWO of the categories AND at least a meritorious in the third category
Meritorious	Evaluation of at least meritorious in two of the three categories and no less than satisfactory in the third.
Satisfactory	Evaluation of at least satisfactory in all three categories.
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation.

Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Methodology	Course Content and Organization	Leadership and Related Professional Development
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty teachings courses and engages in student-related activities as documented by SOE. • Student opinion surveys (required) • Faculty interpretation of student opinion surveys • Description of pedagogy, including instructional methods used and fit to course objectives • Teaching methods are appropriate to the learner, subject, and the teaching context (e.g. large in-person classes versus online cases) • Evidence of students' mastery of learning goals (assessment is required for HM, not just one of many options for SBS) • Teaching awards or recognition • Proof of evaluations by peers or Department Chair • Other evidence demonstrating effectiveness of teaching such as unsolicited student letters and faculty-initiated student opinion surveys • Documentation of course preparation work including the number of new preps and other work beyond the SOE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course syllabi (<i>required</i>) • Learning outcomes aligned with appropriate standards • Course content is current • Current readings • Sequence of Topics • Appropriateness to level of course • Descriptions of class projects, papers, exercises, variety of assignments • Innovative teaching strategies • Collective assignments challenge students, reflect course goals and match level of course • Other documentation of course content and organization • Course materials and activities exemplify best pedagogical, learner centered, and discipline specific practices valid to course outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course preparation work, including # of new preparations and other work beyond SOE • Evidence of flexibility and accommodation to department needs • Curricular or program revision contributions • Graduate committee work • Independent studies • Mentoring/advising -students or junior faculty • Guest lectures or facilitation of educational opportunities • Other documentation of teaching and student-related leadership or professional development (e.g. workshops, or other involvement in developmental activities that result in the acquisition of new course development skills) • Directing student research outside thesis work • New course development • Significant revision of current courses • Courses that require critical thinking, effective writing and oral communication, quantitative and scientific reasoning • Types and variety of courses taught • Supervision of student teaching or other teaching experiences • Accessibility to students • The mentoring of students • Supervising the presentation or publication of student scholarly work in professional venues • Sustained involvement in professional development activities that result in the acquisition of a variety of new course delivery skills

Category A consists of external works – primarily scholarly publications and grants. This category represents the culmination of the research process, when rigorous, original scholarship is completed and made accessible to others. The term “scholarly publications” refers to peer-

reviewed books (including work on subsequent editions and editorships), articles in refereed journals, book chapters, monographs (including published and disseminated research reports and training manuals based on scholarly expertise, grant related research, etc.), as well as creative/book reviews. Scholarship of Teaching and learning (SoTL) research, when accepted or published through a peer review process, also counts as category A. For peer-reviewed books, an accepted prospectus counts as category A and the completed book counts again as category A (the equivalent to three journal articles at time of publication). All other publications may be counted only once -- EITHER in the year when they actually appear in print OR in the year that it is accepted for publication (documentation must be included in both circumstances). For the purposes of the evaluation, no distinction will be made between work that is singly authored and work that is jointly authored. The term "grants" refers to both contracts and grants awarded from external funding agencies. A grant can be counted for both the year it is awarded along with any subsequent years in which the grant is administered or run by the faculty member. A special provision is made for non-tenured faculty, who may count internal grants as equivalent to external grants. This is to account for the fact that internal grants are often designed for and more accessible to non-tenured faculty.

Category B is primarily comprised of participation in activities that contribute to accomplishments in the area of publication and/or research or in the dissemination of scholarship. This includes participation in international, national, and regional meetings (including invited presentations and keynotes); submission of grants, articles, book prospectus, book chapters/reviews or monographs for review; the awarding of internal grants and contracts and the running/administration of those internal grants; and documented work on a book (credit given for two years preceding completion of book), as well as fieldwork and data collection. As discussed in the previous section, internal grants count in category A for non-tenured faculty and the running or administration of a grant will be credited for the duration of the grant. Scholarly publications and grants are defined by the same conditions outlined in Category A. An article can be counted as a submission either at the time of original submission or after a "Revise and resubmit" (R&R) re-submission but not at both stages. Scholarship that is rejected, substantially revised and then submitted to a new journal/publication may qualify as submission of work for scholarly publication. In this scenario, faculty members should explain in their narratives whether such revisions constitute a new submission.

Category C encapsulates activities that either assist in the development of research and scholarship or work that, while contributing to an active scholarly agenda, is not as time-intensive as category A and B accomplishments. These can include but are not limited to items such as legal briefs, technical reports, program evaluations, and any other form of publication that does not go through a peer review process. Peer reviewed publications are counted under Category A. Other category C activities can include the development of community-based, applied, and/or policy research which accounts for time spent identifying and meeting partners, developing relationships, and other similar activities. Additionally, category C can include attending a conference without other forms of professional participation, and engaging in professional development related to scholarship. Reprints of publications are a recognition of the authors' contributions to the discipline and will be counted, although not as highly as a first publication (Column C rather than A or B).

Reviews of book proposals or manuscripts that are undertaken in service to a publisher are considered professional service not scholarship. Coursepacks created by faculty members that are designed to be used only in classrooms do not count as scholarship, unless the faculty member engaged in significant editorial work on original contributions or authored original and substantial contributions to the coursepack.

It's important to note that the examples given here are not intended to be definitive, but rather should be considered illustrative and representative. Because creative and scholarly activities are, by their very nature, unique products, faculty members wishing to count activities that are not specified should provide an explanation in the narrative that establishes their equivalency to one

or more items listed in the table below. Faculty members who wish to count scholarly activities in categories that do not clearly fit within established criteria, must provide an explanation in the narrative advocating for their inclusion and explaining the rationale.

B.3.b. Evaluation Criteria for Scholarship, Research, and/or Creative Activity and Related Professional Development

The Annual Review of scholarship, research, and/or creative activity and professional development will be evaluated by percentage of workload specified in the individual faculty member's SOE. For example, a 5-10% allocation of workload to research/scholarship represents that approximately 5-10% of the faculty member's time will be allocated to research related activities. A distinction between Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty and Non-Tenure Track faculty has been made with corresponding SOE percentages for research/scholarship due to the different work-related responsibilities associated with the different positions.

Note: New TT faculty (in first two years) are sometimes allowed additional course buyout to jump start their research agenda. This automatically places them in a high or very high research percentage. Understanding that a research agenda takes time to build and research-related products take time to yield results, the department recognizes that such a situation can place new faculty at a disadvantage in the Annual Review Process and penalize them. In order to minimize this potential, faculty in this situation (in the first two years) have the option of having their scholarship evaluated to the next least percentage category (e.g. A new faculty member with a research percentage of 55%- Very High, can be evaluated within the 35-45%- High research percentage). This option is available to avoid penalizing new faculty who may need time to build their publications, community contacts, and grant writing skills.

Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:

5-10% (Low) ALLOCATION TO SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	
RANKING	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	ONE from A - OR - THREE from B
Meritorious	TWO from B - OR - ONE from B and ONE from C
Satisfactory	ONE from B - OR - TWO from C
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation.

20-30% (Medium) ALLOCATION TO SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	
RANKING	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	ONE item from A AND ONE from B
Meritorious	TWO from B AND ONE from C
Satisfactory	ONE from B AND ONE from C
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation.

35-45% (High) ALLOCATION TO SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	
RANKING	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	TWO items from A - OR - ONE item from A AND TWO items from B
Meritorious	ONE item from A - OR - THREE items from B AND ONE from C
Satisfactory	TWO from B AND ONE from C

Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation.
----------------	---

50%+ (Very High) ALLOCATION TO SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

RANKING	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	TWO from A AND THREE from B - OR- ONE from A AND FOUR from B
Meritorious	ONE from A AND THREE from B - OR- FOUR from B AND ONE from C
Satisfactory	THREE from B AND ONE from C
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty:

5-10% ALLOCATION TO SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

RANKING	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	ONE from A - OR- ONE from B AND ONE from C
Meritorious	TWO from C
Satisfactory	ONE from C
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation.

15-20% ALLOCATION TO SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

RANKING	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	ONE from A - OR- TWO from B
Meritorious	ONE from B AND ONE from C
Satisfactory	TWO from C
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation.

Note: Items from A can substitute for B and items from B can substitute for C

Category A Externally Reviewed Work	Category B Works in Progress	Category C Supporting Work
Peer-reviewed publication <i>Published or had accepted for publication ONE piece of peer reviewed scholarship, Eg: book*, article, book chapter, book/creative review</i>	Submission or revise & resubmit of peer-reviewed scholarship	Reprint of a publication
		Non-peer reviewed publications/reports
External** grant or contract <i>Awarded an EXTERNAL grant or contract as well as work related to the running and administrating of the grant for all subsequent years</i>	Internal** grant or contract <i>Awarded an INTERNAL grant or contract as well as work related to the running and administrating of the grant for all subsequent years</i> Submission of a grant or contract (<i>both internal and external</i>)	Development of community-based, applied, and/or policy research (e.g. identifying partners, meetings, etc.)
Acceptance of a book prospectus/proposal		
	Submission of a book prospectus/proposal	
	Documented work on a book, field work or data collection	
	Official conference participation***	Conference attendance only

	Invited research talks	Professional development related to research
--	------------------------	--

* Peer-reviewed published books (1 peer-reviewed book counts as 3 peer-reviewed articles)

** Exception: Internal grants may count as equivalent to external grants for non-tenured (NTT included) faculty

*** Official conference participation means the faculty member must be listed on the program

SERVICE AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

B.4.a. Basic Premises

It is the view of the Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice that successful service includes service performed for a wide range of institutional, professional and societal purposes. It includes service to the Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, University-wide service, justice-related service to the campus and/or the larger community, and to the discipline. Service beyond the University is especially valued because of the applied nature of much work within criminal justice, the opportunities for collaboration that are generated by such service, and because of the positive attention it yields for the department and the University.

Because the types of academic and professional service that might be performed are very broad, it is impossible to create a comprehensive list of service possibilities. Thus, in the narrative provided by each faculty member, they may describe and request that unique service contributions made be considered relevant or equivalent to our service categories for the current review period. Following the completion of the review process, AR Committee members are required to seek formal departmental approval for any new criteria that they have accepted as relevant to the service category for that year.

“Highly meritorious” service is characterized by activities that focus on leadership activities that are vital to the success of the department, college, university, and/or profession. These activities are outside of the routine activities that faculty members are expected to perform within a university setting. In general, these activities should provide stewardship and serve to increase the visibility and status of the department, as well as the visibility and status of the individual, because of their exceptional nature. Most departmental committee work, although valued, does not by itself warrant an evaluation of highly meritorious, since the category refers to service efforts that provide leadership to the department, university, or discipline (that go beyond just the internal workings of the department). However, no faculty member shall receive an evaluation of highly meritorious if that person has not served on at least one department committee, or otherwise demonstrably contributed to the service function in the department. All departmental service is to be noted on the AR Worksheet.

“Meritorious” service refers to a service that does not require a leadership role; but does contribute to the functioning of the university, college, department, community, or profession. Contributions of a faculty member, whether that be within the department, college, university, community, or discipline may vary in duration (See Column B and C) with those in Column B requiring a more significant contribution. Significant departmental committee work is also included in the B category, and may be documented in the supporting narrative (excludes those deemed labor-intensive committees as those are reflected in category A below).

“Satisfactory” service is evidence by more localized departmental service, and/or service to the college, university, community, or profession that is isolated, brief in duration, and not involving a leadership role.

The rating of “Unsatisfactory” is indicated by the failure to meet the service threshold established under the category “satisfactory.”

Faculty members must document their activities in the area of service for the evaluation period, as specified in Document A (e.g. examples of documentation include email or letter showing

participation in academic associations, committee assignments provided by the CCJ Department Chair, committee meeting minutes with your name in attendance, committee work examples with your name).

B.4.b. Evaluation Criteria for Service and Related Professional Development

Category A is primarily comprised of service that performs a leadership role within the university, college, department, community, and/or profession, and is known to be particularly labor intensive. Service in this category includes, but is not limited to, serving in a significant leadership role within an academic association, or community justice-related organization. The term “academic associations” include professional or academic organizations at the national, regional, or state level. This category also includes chairing/serving on an elected committee (FSC, P & P, Search Committee), and/or serving on a labor-intensive committee (other than those designated) involving a significant amount of work in a given year. Service on a committee with a significant amount of work during a given year should be documented by the committee chair, and submitted with the narrative. Other leadership roles that would be included in this category include chairing a significant college or university committee or subcommittee, holding an editorial position for a professional journal or academic book series, and/or organizing a professional or pedagogical conference.

Category B is primarily comprised of non-leadership services roles to the university, college, community, profession or department. The service identified in Category B is generally considered to be moderately labor intensive. Generally speaking, serving on a university, college, departmental committee or subcommittee would be considered in this category. Committee work within professional or community organizations, organizing sessions for a conference, or serving as a peer reviewer for two or more academic manuscripts or grant applications would be counted in this category. Justice-related service activities to the campus or and/or the larger community such as disseminating information to the non-academic community through presenting workshops or other training, or providing technical assistance or public issue consulting may not require leadership but often require some sustained level of commitment. Other types of service work not necessarily described in the above categories can also be considered. Taking part in a public or professional service that requires a significant time commitment may fit under this category, and can be supported through the faculty narrative.

Category C includes service that is important to the department, college, or university but does not typically involve a large time commitment. Some examples include service at a college level event or activity, serving as a peer reviewer for 1 academic manuscript, or grant, moderating or chairing a conference session, or serving as a member of a departmental committee that may not require a significant amount of labor in any given year (i.e. CCJ club and pre-law advisor, internet liaison, FYLI during non-renewal years or an ad hoc committee). Being nominated for a service award would also fall under this category.

ALLOCATION TO SERVICE AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (5% Low)	
RANKING	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	One A or two from either B or C
Meritorious	One from B or two C
Satisfactory	ONE item from C
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation.

ALLOCATION TO SERVICE AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (10%-15% Medium)	
RANKING	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	Two items from A or B
Meritorious	One item from A or B and one from C
Satisfactory	One item from B or two C
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation.

ALLOCATION TO SERVICE AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (20% & Higher)	
RANKING	CRITERIA
Highly Meritorious	Three items from A, B or C , where at least ONE is A
Meritorious	Two items from A or B and one from C
Satisfactory	One items from A or B and one from C
Unsatisfactory	Failure to meet above criteria or to provide necessary documentation.

B.3. SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, AND/OR CREATIVE ACTIVITY AND RELATED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

B.3.a. Basic Premises

The following document outlines the evaluation criteria for faculty members of the department of criminology and criminal justice. The Annual Review process is intended to serve not only as an evaluative tool, but also as a means to develop, encourage, and recognize faculty accomplishments in the areas of research and scholarship. The department has a longstanding commitment to scholarship that positively impacts the discipline, university, department, and community and the approach of this department in the Annual Review process is intended to foster the continued achievements of our faculty in terms of producing high quality and high impact scholarship in our respective areas of expertise. For example, we encourage faculty to pursue innovative and interdisciplinary work and to publish in scholarly outlets appropriate for the particular subject matter and methodological approach. These criteria are also designed to take into account the many steps involved in completing long-term research. Through accounting for elements of a large-scale project such as researching and writing a book project, which may include fieldwork, data collection, and the development of community-based relationships – this document protects the “behind-the-scenes” work that goes into a major research project. The criteria within this document are also formulated in such a way as to enable and encourage faculty members at various ranks and stages in their careers to engage in research-related activities that strengthen their teaching and contribute to the discipline. Through these carefully crafted criteria, this document tracks and recognizes the myriad ways that our faculty contribute to scholarly advancements and the dissemination of knowledge.

One of the primary functions of this document is to provide a thoughtful and equitable set of conditions by which faculty members can be reviewed each year by the departmental Annual Review Committee/Faculty Status Committee, and separately by the Departmental Chair. It is important that faculty members’ efforts surrounding research and scholarship are recognized in their annual reviews. Many times, these intensive, solitary activities are less visible than teaching or service. This process ensures that faculty members’ work in the areas of research and scholarship are assessed according to appropriate evaluative criteria that match their particular percentage of effort in the areas of research and scholarship. Because these percentages are determined in relation to percent-efforts for teaching and service for a particular year, this document serves as a way to ensure that expectations are reasonable and representative of

faculty members' numerous and varying obligations. As such, the criteria in this document are designed to reflect faculty members' work for specified review periods, rather than the entire faculty record.

Faculty are required to outline their plans for each academic year in a statement of expectations (SOE) that is negotiated with the Departmental Chair. The SOE should reflect the criteria outlined in the tables below, so that faculty members' planned research activities align with their allocated percentage of effort for scholarship and research. The tables are divided into two sections: one for tenure-track/tenured faculty and one for non-tenure track faculty. Within these two categories, criteria are further specified based on the individual faculty member's agreed upon percentage of effort in the category of research and scholarship. Faculty should familiarize themselves with these criteria in order to meet departmental standards. When submitting an annual review, faculty are required to provide documentation of their scholarly work with an accompanying narrative that allows for further detail of work submitted in the annual review file. All materials should be submitted according to university, college, and unit policy and procedures (see CCJ Department Document A for details). Questions can be directed to the chair of the CCJ Faculty Status Committee/Annual Review Committee or the Departmental chair.

Organizationally, the specific activities that constitute criteria for evaluation are divided into three categories (A, B, C). These categories primarily represent stages of the research process. While the ranking of these criteria emphasizes peer-reviewed, completed work, the substantial and ongoing work that leads to such publications and/or awarded grants is fully accounted for in the document. It should be noted that items from A can substitute for B and items from B can substitute for C when needed.

A- Leadership Role in Service	B - Non-Leadership Role Service to College, University, Community and Profession	C- Localized Service to Department or Short-term Service to University, Community, Profession
Officer status or chair of a committee or other significant leadership role in an academic association	Committee or subcommittee work at the University or the SBS College or other college level or other college level or specific departmental committees, for example: Speaker Committee, Undergraduate Committee, Graduate Committee	Moderator or chair of a conference session
Chair of a departmental committee or subcommittee, service on elected committee, or exceptional departmental service (i.e., labor intensive committees with significant work in a given year, must be documented by committee chair).	(2) Peer reviewer for professional journals, manuscript reviewer for publishers or grant reviewer	Active service as a member of a department committee on the following or similar committees: CCJ Club, Scholarship committee, or FYLI (during non-renewal years), Internet Liaison, or ad hoc committee.
Chair of a significant university or college committee or subcommittee	Justice-related service to the campus or and/or the larger community (may include public issue-oriented consulting and technical reports) (e.g. presenting workshops or training at non-academic conferences, technical assistance efforts)	Service at a university or college level event or activity.
Editorial position for a journal or book series	Take part in a public or professional service project requiring substantial commitment of time and effort	Nomination for an award for service
Organizing a professional or pedagogical conference	Committee member at a professional organization OR session organizer for a professional organization	Peer reviewer for professional journals, manuscript reviewer for publishers or grant reviewer (1 manuscript)
Regularly contributing to community service in a leadership role	Participated in service-related professional development activities	
Fulfill a leadership role in departmental/school /college/ university activities or a professional leadership role		

Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria

Standards for Appointment/Promotion/Tenure For Tenure Eligible Positions

This document is based on Northern Arizona University's Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS) document approved May 2007 and adheres to faculty standards found in the NAU Faculty Handbook (October 2007). This document also adheres to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences criteria for promotion and tenure (as approved March 2008). These documents are available as follows:

- [NAU COFS](#)
- [NAU Faculty Handbook](#)
- [SBS College Criteria for Promotion and Tenure](#)

This document describes the indicators of faculty performance to be used in evaluating a candidate, and the standards required by the Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service for promotion and/or tenure.

NAU Standards for Tenure Eligible Positions

According to the NAU COFS document (May 2007), tenure-eligible positions include: "associate professor, and professor. Tenure eligible faculty shall have a maximum probationary period no longer than seven (7) years in full-time service at tenure eligible rank, except in cases of waiver by the President for an individual faculty member. All tenure eligible positions require an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the appropriate discipline. Any exception to this degree requirement must be recommended by the faculty and Chair of the academic unit, and approved by the Provost. Achievement of a faculty rank at NAU shall be determined by evaluation and recommendation using written academic unit criteria which must be approved by the Dean and Provost before implementation."

Also listed in the NAU COFS document are the following statements. "In making promotion decisions, the entire record of the faculty member, including accomplishments at other institutions and other professional activity shall be considered". (COFS- 1.4.6.1.3). "The procedure for review and evaluation of faculty for tenure shall be the same as the policy set forth in the Procedure for Review and Evaluation for Promotion". (COFS- 1.4.6.1.3)

According to the NAU COFS document (May 2007) and the SBS College Criteria for Promotion and Tenure (March 2008), the minimal general standards for associate professor and professor are:

Associate Professor

The rank of associate professor is a tenure eligible or tenured position. A faculty member may not be promoted to associate professor unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured associate professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of associate professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor at NAU. Any prior service credit to be counted must be agreed to in writing at the time of hire. To hold the rank of associate professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have:

- a. *A record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.*
- b. *A record that shows a sustained pattern of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.*
- c. *A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the university community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of professor.*

Professor

A faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the Notice of Appointment indicates it is at the rank of professor without

tenure. Professors are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of associate professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as associate). To hold the rank of professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have:

- a. A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.
- b. A sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.
- c. A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's department (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the department, college, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty).

In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (a) or (b) above as defined by college and academic unit criteria.

Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice Evaluation Criteria and Indicators for Tenure/Promotion

To be eligible for an initial appointment and tenure and/or promotion to each of the tenure-eligible positions, the department will use the following evaluation criteria and indicators. Considerable responsibility is placed on the department Faculty Status Committee and department chair to implement both the letter and intent of this document. It is recognized that with the diversity of activities and interest within the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice evaluation will require professional interpretation and judgment.

Faculty members are responsible for ensuring that reviewers have the necessary documentation/evidence to evaluate performance (i.e., effectiveness, productivity, and quality) of their teaching, advisement, and student-related responsibilities; of their scholarship, and of their service. Faculty members eligible and applying for promotion to Associate and Professor ranks must submit external support letters as per SBS Policy (Approved April 2008). These materials must be submitted by the deadlines specified in the Personnel Action Calendar provided each year by the Provost's Office.

Indicators of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities:

While the conditions and contexts of teaching vary widely (i.e., face-to-face, web-based, upper or lower division courses, etc.), some general features remain consistent. Indicators of effective teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities may include, but are not limited to, a combination of the following:

Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Methodology

- Student opinion surveys (*required*)
- Faculty interpretation of student opinion surveys
- Description of pedagogy, including instructional methods used and fit to course objectives
- Teaching awards/recognition
- Evaluations by peers
- Evaluations by department chair
- Other evidence relevant to demonstrating effectiveness of teaching, instructional methodology, advisement, unsolicited student letters and other student-related responsibilities

Course Content and Organization

- Course syllabi (*required*)

- Learning outcomes aligned with appropriate standards
- Course content
- Current readings
- Sequence of Topics
- Descriptions of class projects, papers, exercises, variety of assignments
- Innovative teaching strategies
- Collective assignments appropriately challenge students, reflect course goals and match level of course
- Other documentation of course content and organization, e.g. peer review of teaching
- Course activities exemplify learner centered practices that are valid to course outcomes

Leadership and Professional Development in Teaching

- Course preparation work, including # of new preparations and other work that goes beyond SOE
- Curricular or program revision contributions to, e.g., Graduate or Undergraduate Program, Internship, Honors, Liberal Studies and similar
- Graduate committee work (member or chair)
- Independent studies (graduate or undergraduate)
- Mentoring/advising undergraduate or graduate students, junior faculty
- Guest lectures or facilitation of educational opportunities
- Other documentation of teaching and student-related leadership or professional development, e.g. attended workshops, grants won for innovative teaching, other innovative teaching activities
- Directing student research outside thesis work
- New course development
- Significant revision of current courses
- Courses that require critical thinking, effective writing and oral communication, quantitative and scientific reasoning
- Types and variety of courses taught
- Supervision of student teaching or other teaching experiences
- Accessibility to students
- The mentoring of students
- Supervising the presentation or publication of student scholarly work in professional venues
- Sustained involvement in professional development activities that result in the acquisition of a variety of new course delivery skills

Indicators of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors

The COFS document (May 2007) defines scholarly and/or creative activities as “activities that lead to tangible, original works, performances, or other contributions. In turn, these works expand the knowledge base of their respective disciplines, extend the discipline into new fields of application, and/or improve teaching in their discipline by the dissemination of pedagogic scholarship.”

Additionally, the COFS document (May 2007) indicates that “results of scholarly and creative endeavors must be made available to students, colleagues, and the general public. The forms of dissemination are many, varied, and changing and include print and Web-based journal articles, monographs, books, edited volumes, chapters in books, poster presentations, presentations at professional meetings, presentations at regional or local meetings, development of new curricula, publication of instructional improvements or new methodologies, review, performance, and professional exhibitions. Scholarly recognition may come from invited presentations, awards in juried exhibitions, submission and funding of competitive grants, fellowships, invited participation on national panels, election to executive boards of professional organizations, invitations to join editorial boards of scholarly journals, and awards from professional organizations.”

Since documentation of the product and the dissemination of the results of scholarly activity is essential, yet varied, “categories” of products and dissemination are given below as a guide. The “categories” of products described below provide an organizational structure with which to assess faculty work in the area of scholarly activity. These categories are useful in communicating expectations for faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure. The categorization does not reduce the responsibility of reviewers to ensure that products demonstrate high quality. ***Some examples of products that might be within each category include, but are not limited to, the following:***

Category A (substantial external validation of scholarly products)

- Refereed (i.e., peer-reviewed) journal articles (published in a recognized publishing house; may be paper or electronic journal)
- Authored and edited books or textbooks (published in a recognized publishing house) including documented work on a book or textbook
- Book chapters
- Funded external grants or research or program/service grants or documented work on that grant or research as PI or co-PI (e.g., a year-end report, interim/yearly report or a research report).

Category B (accepted for institutional review)

- Submission of work for scholarly publication
- Presentation of scholarship at international, national or regional meetings
- Invited presentations at international, national or regional professional and scholarly meetings (documentation must make these presentations accessible to reviewers; published proceedings from conferences would be appropriate)
- Submitted an external grant application
- Non-refereed publication, technical reports, case briefs, policy documents
- Documented work on a funded external or internal grant.
- Receipt of an award for scholarship and/or professional development
- Review (book, article, other) published in an appropriate scholarly publication

Category C (minimal or no external review)

- Presentation of scholarship or invited presentation at international, national or regional meetings
- Discussant at a conference
- Reprints of articles in books of readings
- Prepared a proposal for an internal or external grant(s)
- Research or program/service grants awarded internally
- Invited addresses or keynote speeches or media interviews on scholarly topics (documentation must make these presentations accessible to reviewers)
- Other professional publications (e.g., magazine or newsletter articles, which are relevant to the profession)
- Web design with academic content

NOTE: Examples of products in the above categories are not “absolutes.” If well documented and justified, the category of a product can be changed.

Indicators of service to the profession and the university community

The COFS document (May 2007) defines service activities as contributions that “take place both within the University (at departmental, College, and University levels) and outside of the University (at professional and community levels). Service to community groups and to local, state, national, and international governmental groups not only provides these organizations with faculty expertise but also helps to fulfill the University’s mission of service to the State of Arizona and beyond. … Faculty members are also expected to participate in the life of the University by

attending various activities on campus or in the community, and University-wide functions such as commencement, school/College convocations, and department/College/University colloquia.”

Some examples of service activities include, but are not limited, to the following:

Sample service to department or college:

- Active participation on committees, SBS College committee or sub-committee work, or advisor for a student organization.
- Mentoring junior faculty.
- Active participation in other administrative tasks such as coordinating areas and preparing related reports, etc.
- Chair of a departmental committee or subcommittee, or exceptional departmental service (i.e., multiple labor-intensive committees with significant work that year).
- Creation, development, and maintenance of a discipline-related website.

Sample service to university:

- University committee or sub-committee work
- Chair of a significant university or college committee or sub-committee
- Activities that promote and support cultural diversity within the University
- Activities that promote the recruitment and retention of students
- Receipt of an award for service

Sample service to community (local or professional):

- Editorship of professional journal or book series.
- Officer status or chair of a committee or other significant leadership role in an academic association or a justice system related organization outside the academic community.
- Justice-related service to the campus or and/or the larger community (may include public issue oriented consulting and technical reports).
- Activities for schools, local, state, tribal, and national agencies, and for the public at large.
- Leadership of professional organizations and participation in other professional activities such as reviewing works submitted to professional journals or conferences or serving on professional editorial boards.
- Guest editing of Peer Reviewed Journal.
- Peer reviewer for professional journals, manuscript reviewer for publishers or grant reviewer.
- Session organizer for a professional association; moderator or chair of a conference session.
- Receipt of an award for service.

Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice

Standards for Tenure/Promotion

To be eligible for promotion to each of the tenure-eligible positions, the department will apply the following standards to the indicators previously described:

Associate Professor

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.1, to hold the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must possess a doctorate or other terminal degree in the discipline area. A faculty member may not be promoted to this rank unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured Associate Professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor at NAU; the faculty member, however, may have prior service credit that was agreed to in writing at the time of hire.

To be appointed or promoted to the rank of associate professor and/or be awarded tenure, the faculty member must submit all relevant documents, materials both from previous positions/institutions as well as those at NAU, that show:

A record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.

Requirements: The candidate must demonstrate a record of effective teaching for those years taught at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by a complete review of a teaching portfolio that documents effort in three areas: (a) teaching effectiveness and instructional methodology, (b) course content and organization and (c) leadership and professional development in teaching. Assessment will be made through the following criteria: current knowledge of the subjects taught (e.g. current and appropriate level of readings and course content, appropriate course revisions), effective application of appropriate teaching methods (e.g. learning outcomes aligned with appropriate standards, appropriateness to level of course), and an overall positive performance in the indicators of teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities (e.g. student opinion surveys, mentoring/advising students, independent studies) and the potential for continued contributions.

A record that shows a sustained pattern of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.

Requirements: In accordance with SBS Promotion and Tenure guidelines, an individual department, school, or other academic unit may adopt standards of performance for promotion that exceed those presented in SBS guidelines. Candidates for the rank of Associate Professor should demonstrate a sustained pattern of scholarly contributions to the discipline of criminology, criminal justice or related fields. The Department considers a sustained pattern of scholarship appropriate for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor to be exemplified by three or more scholarly publications or an equivalent level of scholarly or creative accomplishments since assuming the rank of Assistant Professor, examples of which are detailed in "Indicators" and "Criteria" above, the CCJ Review Document B.2 and the SBS Criteria for Promotion and Tenure.

A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the university community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of professor.

Requirements: Since appointment to Assistant Professor the candidate should demonstrate active participation in department affairs, including contributions in program development and administration, membership on department/college/university standing or ad hoc committees, and service activities to the profession and larger community beyond the NAU. Meaningful service

activities should advance the mission of the department, college, university, community and profession.

Professor (a tenured position)

As stated in the NAU “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.2.1, a faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the written notice of appointment indicated the hire was at the Rank of Professor without tenure. Professors are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as an Associate). To hold the rank of Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must have the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

To be appointed or promoted to the rank of professor, the faculty member must submit all relevant documents, materials both from previous positions/institutions as well as those at NAU, that provide evidence of effectiveness in all areas and additionally must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in teaching or scholarship. Specifically, the candidate must submit a record that shows:

A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.

Requirements: The candidate must demonstrate current knowledge of the subjects they teach (e.g. current and appropriate level of readings and course content, significant curricula revisions as necessary), effective application of appropriate teaching methods (e.g. innovative teaching strategies, collective assignments that challenge students, learner centered course activities), and an overall positive performance in the indicators of teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities (e.g. student opinion surveys, outside evaluations, directing student research, graduate student committee work) and the potential for continued contributions.

For candidates for promotion to Professor who specify teaching as an area of outstanding accomplishments, outstanding accomplishment is exemplified by a sustained pattern of teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities that exceeds the minimum requirements of high quality teaching defined above and in CCJ Review Document B and the SBS Criteria for Promotion and Tenure. The candidate must submit a teaching portfolio that provides evidence of such outstanding accomplishment and may include, but not be limited to the following: teaching philosophy, course syllabi, evidence of student learning, evidence of the use of valid assessments to measure course outcomes, student opinion surveys, teaching innovations, awards, effective application of appropriate teaching methods, and an overall excellent performance in the indicators of teaching, course content, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities (e.g. description of pedagogy, activities that exemplify learner centered practice, student opinion surveys, teaching awards/recognition, supervision of student teaching experiences).

A sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member’s discipline.

Requirements: In accordance with SBS Promotion and Tenure guidelines, an individual department, school, or other academic unit may adopt standards of performance for promotion that exceed those presented in SBS guidelines. Candidates for the rank of Professor should demonstrate a sustained pattern of scholarly contributions to the discipline of criminology, criminal justice or related fields. The Department considers a sustained pattern of scholarship appropriate for promotion to the rank of Professor to be exemplified by at least eight scholarly publications or an equivalent level of scholarly or creative accomplishments, examples of which are detailed under “Indicators” and “Criteria” above, in CCJ Review Document B.2, and the SBS Criteria for

Promotion and Tenure. At least three of these accomplishments must have occurred since promotion to Associate Professor.

For candidates for promotion to Professor who specify scholarship as an area of outstanding accomplishments, a sustained pattern of outstanding accomplishment is exemplified by at least ten scholarly publications or an equivalent level of scholarly or creative accomplishment, examples of which are detailed in CCJ Review Document B.2 and the SBS Criteria for Promotion and Tenure. At least five of these accomplishments must have occurred since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. In addition, candidates for promotion to Professor who specify scholarship as an area of outstanding accomplishments must demonstrate intellectual leadership through work that has expanded the knowledge base of the discipline, extended the discipline into new fields of application, and/or improved the teaching of the discipline through the dissemination of pedagogic knowledge.

A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's department (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the department, college, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty).

Requirements: The candidate should demonstrate significant service activity each year to the department/college/university, and since appointment to Associate Professor, service activities to the larger community beyond the NAU. Meaningful service activities should advance the mission of the department, college, university, community and profession. In addition to service, the candidate should participate in departmental/college meetings. In service activities, the candidate should contribute at the leadership level. Of special consideration is the contribution to development/mentorship of junior faculty members in scholarship and teaching, such as mentoring in proposal development, writing for publication, syllabus preparation, use of technology in teaching, etc.

Senior Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

A record of substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.

Requirements: The candidate must demonstrate a record of effective teaching for those years taught at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by a complete review of a teaching portfolio that documents effort in three areas: (a) teaching effectiveness and instructional methodology, (b) course content and organization and (c) leadership and professional development in teaching. Assessment will be made through the following indicators: current knowledge of the subjects taught (e.g. current readings and course content, appropriate course revisions), effective application of appropriate teaching methods (e.g. learning outcomes aligned with appropriate standards, appropriateness to level of course), and an overall positive performance in the indicators of teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities (e.g., student opinion surveys, outside evaluations) and the potential for continued contributions.

A record of service and professional development related to the teaching role.

Since appointment to Senior Lecturer the candidate should demonstrate participation in service activities to the Department, such as serving as faculty mentor to Honors Club or CCJ Club. The candidate is also encouraged to participate and present their scholarship in professional meetings locally, nationally or internationally.

Principal Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Principal Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of Senior Lecturer or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

A record of sustained effectiveness at the Senior Lecturer rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.

Requirements: The candidate must demonstrate a record of effective teaching for those years taught at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by a complete review of a teaching portfolio that documents effort in three areas: (a) teaching effectiveness and instructional methodology, (b) course content and organization and (c) leadership and professional development in teaching. Assessment will be made through the following indicators: current knowledge of the subjects taught (e.g. current readings and course content, appropriate course revisions), effective application of appropriate teaching methods (e.g. learning outcomes aligned with appropriate standards, appropriateness to level of course), and an overall positive performance in the indicators of teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities (e.g. student opinion surveys, outside evaluations) and the potential for continued contributions

A record of sustained service and professional development related to the teaching role.

Since appointment to Principal Lecturer the candidate will demonstrate participation in service activities to the Department such as faculty mentor to Honors Club or CCJ Club. The candidate will be expected to participate and present their scholarship in professional meetings locally, nationally or internationally.

Process for Faculty Evaluation for Promotion and/or Tenure

The department will follow the process outlined in the [COFS document](#) approved May 2007.

Ethnic Studies

Annual Review

Approved by the Office of the Provost, June 4, 2014

This document clarifies the procedures and criteria for annual performance evaluations in the Ethnic Studies Program. The document is in accordance with section 1.4 "Faculty Evaluation" of the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS). Annual Performance evaluators are encouraged to refer to Section 1.4.6 of the NAU COFS prior to engaging in the annual performance evaluation. Section 1.4 of COFS includes the scope of evaluations, the criteria and calendar for evaluation procedures, personnel involved in faculty evaluations, necessary materials to complete the annual review, and evaluation policies for non-tenure eligible faculty, tenure eligible faculty, and tenured faculty.

The Statement of Expectations (SOE) provides the context for the Annual Review. Annual workload assignments as stated in the SOE must be considered during the annual review process and during the promotion and tenure (P & T) review process. Workload assignments need to take into account the criteria for annual review and P & T and these assignments follow the guidelines found in the ES Work Load Policy. During the annual review period outlined in the member's SOE, the faculty member will receive a written review by the Program's Annual Review Committee and, following that, from the Program Director, that assesses their performance in the areas of teaching, advising, and student-related activities, research and scholarship and service to the university community, to the profession, and to the Ethnic Studies Program. Faculty members will be given an opportunity to appeal these recommendations if they so desire by following the instructions laid out in the Conditions of Faculty Service.

Teaching, Advising and Student Related Activities

Several categories of interest can be used to enhance judgments about teaching effectiveness in Ethnic Studies. At a minimum, a pattern of high-quality teaching and student related responsibilities involves three different, though related, components: instructional methodology, course content and organization, and leadership/professional development in teaching.

Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Methodology refers to the idea that good teaching requires pedagogical methods that promote student learning. Well-recognized elements of teaching effectiveness include the following: good communication, knowledge of the subject matter, the creation of a supportive classroom environment for all students, promoting engaged and multi-contextual learning, and fairness in examinations and grading. Teaching Effectiveness is evidenced by: a narrative description of pedagogy and instructional methods; faculty interpretations in the performance report on student opinion surveys; and a pattern of strong written and numerical student opinion surveys (required).

Optional materials include: peer and Chair evaluations; unsolicited letters from students; examples of student work; awards or recognition for outstanding teaching; evidence of the incorporation of innovative technology and efforts to increase multi-contextual learning and reduce 'D' and 'F' grades; and other documentation that indicates the impact of teaching effectiveness.

Course Content and Organization refers to the idea that quality teaching depends upon good organization of up-to-date subject matter in a cohesive course. Course objectives and student learning outcomes should be clearly stated in syllabi. Assessment strategies and methods of instruction should clearly lead to these objectives. Other aspects of good organization include the currency of the material used and the appropriateness of the material for the level of the course. Course Content and Organization is evidenced by: course syllabi (required);

descriptions of projects, papers, and exercises used in class; descriptions of innovative teaching strategies employed; evidence that courses are revised regularly to remain current; and additional course materials related to content and organization.

Leadership and Professional Development in Teaching refers to the idea that student related responsibilities within a university setting involve both classroom teaching and a variety of other important tasks that contribute to the learning environment of the university. Accurate and fair evaluation of faculty instructional efforts needs to include the variety of teaching and student related responsibilities that comprise the entire faculty teaching workload. Faculty may participate in professional development and leadership activities related to teaching, and these should be considered important contributions. A narrative description should be included to best evidence this work.

General Faculty Expectations

All faculty have to meet the general faculty expectations: to meet classes, to prepare syllabi and complete one item from Category B. It is also expected that faculty would provide advising to students, work with their students to expose them to the values of diversity that is the foundation of the Ethnic Studies Program curriculum. Names of advisees will be provided each year and will be cumulatively available.

Faculty Rating Criteria:

- To receive a "Highly Meritorious" rating, a faculty member must meet the General Faculty Expectations and have 2 items from Category A below and 3 items from Category B.
- To receive a "Meritorious" rating, a faculty member must meet the General Faculty Expectations and have 1 item from Category A and 2 items from Category B below.
- To receive a "Satisfactory" rating, a faculty member must meet the General Faculty Expectations and have 3 items from Category B below.
- To receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating, a faculty member does not meet the criteria of any of the above.

Faculty Rating Categories

Category A

- A Teaching Award.
- Funded grant for improving teaching or curriculum.
- Multiple course preps that include significant work on a new course and that exhibit pedagogical soundness.
- Major revisions to existing courses that exhibit pedagogical soundness in the revisions.
- Effectiveness in Teaching as demonstrated by the use of innovative technological methods reflected in the syllabi and course materials that include pedagogical soundness and course handouts that include the recognition of diversity which is at the core of Ethnic Studies, (e.g. innovation, student evaluations).
- Other items may be included if faculty explain their equivalency to the items above.

Category B

- Nomination for a teaching award
- Submission of a grant application for improving teaching or curriculum
- Documentation of significant advising that provides mentoring to students
- Documentation of mentoring new faculty concerning teaching, advising and/or student-related activities
- Serving as a member of thesis committees
- Creative use of pedagogical techniques and/or technology in the classroom
- Participation in teaching workshops and clinics
- Directing Independent Studies
- Positive student opinion scores and comments.
- Other items may be included if faculty explain their equivalency to the items above.

Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

This area includes evidence of research, scholarly and creative activities which contribute to the field, knowledge or expertise of the faculty member's discipline or Ethnic Studies. A faculty's base research, scholarly and creative activities load may be adjusted for the individual and for the Program within the parameters set by the workload policy of the Ethnic Studies Program.

The Statement of Expectations document, which is developed with input from the faculty member and the Program Director, is the formalized tool for stating the expectations of the faculty member's research, scholarship and creative activities.

Faculty Rating Information

- To receive a "Highly Meritorious" rating, a faculty member must have 1 item from Category A below.
- To receive a "Meritorious" rating, a faculty member must have 1 item from Category B or 3 from C.
- To receive a "Satisfactory" rating, a faculty member must have 2 items from Category C.
- To receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating, a faculty member does not meet the criteria of any of the above.

Faculty Rating Categories

Category A

- Funded external grant for research or creative work
- Peer reviewed journal article or exhibition
- Published book authorship. Single author or co-author for a maximum of 3 years of credit as follows:
 - 1 year for contract
 - 1 year for multiple chapters
 - 1 year for the published book
- An edited book (as editor or co-editor). A maximum of 2 years of credit as follows:
 - One year for contract
 - One year for published book
- A chapter in a published book
- Other items may be included if faculty explain their equivalency to the items above.

Category B

- Published book reviews
- Submission of a grant application for research or creative work
- Published conference proceedings
- Development/Maintenance of a scholarly or creative research website
- Non-peer reviewed published research
- Research or creative presentations at professional academic conferences
- Other Items may be included if faculty explain their equivalency to the items above.

Category C

- Non-peer reviewed publication or creative work
- Two conference presentations (local or invited)
- Other items may be included if faculty explain their equivalence to the items above.

Service to the University, Program, and Profession

Service activities typically include participation in unit and University committee work and other administrative tasks. In addition, faculty may perform service activities for schools, industry, local, state, and national agencies, and for the public at large as long as these activities are related to the faculty's academic expertise. Leadership of professional organizations and participation in other professional activities such as reviewing work submitted to professional journals or

conferences or serving on professional editorial boards are also important to the mission of the University, as well as to the advancement of one's profession or discipline.

The University recognizes the importance of faculty service activities that promote and support cultural diversity within the University. Faculty members are also expected to participate in the life of the University by attending various activities on campus or in the community, and University-wide functions such as commencement, school/College convocations, and program/College/University colloquia. Many faculty are also directly involved in activities that promote the recruitment and retention of students.

Faculty Rating Criteria

The workload parameters for service to the university, program, profession and community in the Ethnic Studies Program is found in the workload policy. A faculty's service load may be adjusted for the individual and for the Program within the parameters of the policy. The basic expectation for all faculty members is that they attend all unit meetings and be engaged in discussions on unit issues.

The Statement of Expectations document, which is developed with input from the faculty member and the Program Director, is the formalized tool for stating the expectations of the faculty member's service activities.

Highly Meritorious (two or more of the following with a narrative that explains the extent of the service performed)

- **Membership in at least 2 Ethnic Studies Committees or Chair of one Ethnic Studies Committee.**
- Membership in one of the following or its equivalent: Faculty Senate, University Curriculum Committee, Liberal Studies Committee, Commission on Ethnic Diversity, Commission on the Status of Women, Commission on Disability Access and Design.
- Chair of a task force or board that is related to the faculty's academic expertise for city, county, or state government.
- Editorial board member of a journal
- Main organizer of a national/regional/local conference or exhibition
- Main organizer of a regional or local film series
- Other items may be included if faculty explain their equivalence to the items above.

Meritorious (two or more of the following, with a narrative that explains the extent of the service performed)

- Membership in one committee in Ethnic Studies.
- Member of a task force or board on the city, county, or state level that is related to the faculty's academic expertise.
- Chair of an Ethnic Studies Program committee
- Reviewer of a journal related to the field of Ethnic Studies
- Other items may be included if faculty explain their equivalence to the items above.

Satisfactory

- Attendance at Unit meetings and participation in 1 unit committee

Unsatisfactory

- To receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating, a faculty member does not meet the criteria of any of the above.

Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria

Approved by faculty vote: April 20, 2011

Approved by the Office of the Provost, June 4, 2014

The Ethnic Studies Program Faculty Status Committee reviews program recommendations for tenure and/or promotion and makes recommendations to the SBS Promotion and Tenure Committee based upon the criteria specified in this document. The committee ensures that each candidate meets acceptable minimum standards for the University (see ABOR Policy 6-201 and the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service" [CoFS] document, Sections 1.2 and 1.4) and the College (see SBS P&T Document) in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; research, scholarship, or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline; and service to the university community and the profession. As stated in the CoFS (Section 1.4.6.1.3), "in making promotion decisions, the entire record of the faculty member, including accomplishments at other institutions and other professional activity, shall be considered." This document defines the Program's indicators of faculty performance to be used in evaluating a candidate, and the standards required by the Program in each area for promotion and/or tenure.

Each fall semester, the Ethnic Studies Program will elect faculty members from the Steering Committee to serve on the Annual Review committee (ARC) and the Faculty Status Committee (FSC). The ARC will consist of a minimum of three full-time tenure-stream faculty members and must have at least one full-time faculty from each professorial rank. Typical membership includes 3 faculty members. The membership of the FSC is limited to tenured faculty members and must have at least one full-time faculty from the associate and full professor ranks. Membership of the two committees can overlap, with the exception that FSC membership is limited to tenured faculty.

I. Evaluation Indicators of Faculty Performance

A. General

To be considered for promotion and/or tenure as a tenure eligible faculty, a candidate must achieve at least the minimum Ethnic Studies Program, SBS and University criteria for each rank in the three areas under review: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; (2) research and scholarship; and (3) service to the university community and the profession. In addition to meeting all the minimum requirements in the three areas under review, for promotion to the rank of Professor, a candidate must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in either (1) or (2) above as defined by College and Program criteria. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements.

For non-tenure eligible faculty holding the rank of Lecturer to be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer, a candidate must achieve the minimum Ethnic Studies Program, SBS, and university criteria for each rank in the following areas: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; and (2) a record of service and professional development related to the teaching role. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements. For promotion to other non-tenure eligible faculty positions, see the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2.

Evaluation of a candidate by the Ethnic Studies Program Faculty Status Committee shall be confined to the materials included in a faculty member's Professional Review File that adhere to the requirements set forth by the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.4.5.2. By the deadlines specified in the University's Personnel Action Calendar, a candidate for promotion and/or tenure must submit a carefully organized and complete set of materials (the Professional Review File) that demonstrates the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of his/her performance in the areas relevant to the rank to which promotion is sought.

The Ethnic Studies Program promotes excellence in teaching, scholarly activities, and service. In supporting this goal, the Program recognizes that an innovative and dynamic faculty should develop performance standards that foster both individual and programmatic success. The Ethnic Studies Program at Northern Arizona University has as its major goal to provide challenging and enriching undergraduate and graduate programs through the efforts of talented faculty who are

dedicated to university teaching. Faculty able to contribute to this teaching goal will by definition bring a multitude of backgrounds, strengths, and visions of the future. An evaluation process of their contributions in teaching, advising, research or scholarship, creativity, and service must acknowledge each person's strengths and contributions. It is imperative that the FSC committee and program chairperson evaluate the candidate's accomplishments in relation to the candidate's workload allocations for the period under consideration. Therefore, promotion and tenure decisions will be made on an individual basis, taking into account the specific mission of the Ethnic Studies Program and the unique assignments and performance of each person.

B. Indicators of Performance in the Area of Teaching, Advisement, and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

The candidate, at a minimum, must demonstrate a record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities. The evidence that is provided must demonstrate both the quality and quantity of the candidate's performance in this area in the context of the responsibilities found in his/her statement of expectations. The quantity of the evidence provided for each indicator should reflect its importance in affecting overall effectiveness in this area. The candidate is responsible for explaining this importance. In addition, the candidate is responsible for explaining why his/her performance on the indicators is offered as evidence of a quality performance.

Teaching, advisement, and student-related responsibilities may include:

- Classroom and/or online instruction;
- Creation and updating of course materials to reflect current knowledge, research, and trends in the discipline;
- Creating an awareness of U.S. and global diversity issues;
- Teaching innovations;
- Teaching-related presentations and publications;
- Supervision of students' scholarly activities including undergraduate research, graduate thesis, and dissertation work;
- Supervision of students' independent studies;
- Curriculum development;
- Advising activities include guiding progress toward graduation and post-graduation planning;
- Other student related activities (student mentoring, supplemental instruction sections, etc.);
- Organization of or participation in professional development activities related to teaching.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File, committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities in this document.

Examples of Programmatic Indicators for the Area of Teaching, Advisement, and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

- A sustained pattern of positive evaluations by the chair, peers, and from student opinion surveys and any other documentation believed by the Program to be relevant
- Evidence of effective classroom instruction and/or advising based on annual review narratives, letters from students, exit interviews, examples of student work, and other forms of documentation
- Development of new courses
- Regular course updates
- Student/faculty/university award nominations for excellence in teaching or teaching-related activities
- Award of a grant for pedagogical innovation
- Acquisition of new skills to be used in teaching on a regular basis
- Development and delivery of online courses

- Evidence of being instrumental in the development or redevelopment of Ethnic Studies programs
- Commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience including: directing independent studies and student research; organizing and/or directing fieldtrips; facilitating student participation at professional meetings; supervising presentation and/or publication of student scholarly work in professional venues
- Supervision of fieldwork placements and practica.
- Supervising Master's students
- Career and professional advising of students including letters of recommendation, informal meetings, and organized work sessions
- Successful publication of instructional/teaching related materials
- Sustained involvement in professional development activities related to teaching

Faculty being considered for promotion should include the following materials in their dossier*:

- Syllabi, sample examinations, handouts, etc., for all courses for period under consideration (graduate and undergraduate) that have been taught.
- Class supplementary materials.
- Development of new course materials.
- Grants from NAU (e.g., e-learning, Office of the Provost, Office of the President) for development of new didactic methods of materials.
- Innovative classroom projects.
- Workshops attended that address issues of teaching; membership in professional organizations.
- Participation in activities that foster the development of new and better teaching methods and activities.
- The number and names of students of theses, dissertations, and independent study projects that they have been involved in during the period of time under consideration for promotion and tenure decision.
- The number of student advisees per year that a person counsels and advises.
- Faculty may also request that the Faculty Status Committee observe a lecture as evidence of teaching expertise but this form of peer evaluation is optional.

**This list is not exhaustive and others items and materials that faculty members feel should be evaluated as related to their accomplishments and contributions should be included in their dossier, along with supportive comments as to their importance.*

C. Indicators of Performance in the Area of Research and Scholarship or Creative Activity

The evidence of a candidate's scholarship and research that is provided must demonstrate both the quality and quantity of the candidate's performance in this area in the context of the responsibilities found in his/her statement of expectations. The quantity of the evidence provided for each indicator should reflect its importance in affecting overall effectiveness in this area. The candidate is responsible for explaining this importance. In addition, the candidate is responsible for explaining why his/her performance on the indicators is offered as evidence of a quality performance. Research and scholarship are activities that lead to tangible, original works that expand the knowledge base of Ethnic Studies or related-fields, extend the discipline into new fields of application, and/or improve teaching in Ethnic Studies by the dissemination of pedagogic scholarship. Creative activity related to Ethnic Studies includes original productions (e.g., fiction, poetry, film) that enhance the appreciation and understanding of ethnic studies issues.

Research and scholarship may include:

- Professional publications, creative exhibitions, papers, presentations, books, chapter contributions to books, monographs;
- Refereed scholarly work accepted for publication or exhibitions;

- Grant and contract work, including applied projects and grant applications;
- Applied research reports and other professional contributions;
- Papers and research findings presented at professional meetings; and
- Other tangible works related to the scholarly process germane to the discipline of ethnic studies.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File, the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for research and scholarship in this document. Please note: Scholarship and creative work refers to work within the discipline of Ethnic Studies or a related field within the candidate's areas of academic study.

Examples of Programmatic Indicators for Research and Scholarship

- Successful publication of journal articles, book chapters, research/technical reports, applied project reports, creative exhibitions, and other peer-reviewed works
- Presentation of research or exhibition at peer-reviewed professional meetings
- Invited talks and/or poster sessions at refereed conferences and meetings
- Publication relevant to scholarly expertise in non-peer reviewed outlets
- Editing (or co-editing) a scholarly book or conference proceedings
- Creation of a database for shared scholarly work
- Creation and dissemination of computer software for scholarly purposes
- Research talks given in non-refereed formats, e.g., an invited speaker series
- Preparation, submission and/or administration of grants for scholarly activities
- Awards from professional associations for scholarship and research-related activity
- Public presentations of scholarly work to community groups
- Citation of scholarly work in refereed papers, essays and books
- Reprints of published scholarship in anthologies and edited volumes

Faculty being considered for promotional decisions should include the following items in their professional dossiers**:

- Publications in all journals, both within and external to the discipline
- Documentation of creative exhibitions
- Books, chapters in books, monographs, etc.
- All presentations (panel discussions, symposia, lectures, slides, posters, etc.) at professional meetings
- Reports and professional projects that involve ethnic studies-related activities, including any types of interdisciplinary projects
- Grants that have been submitted, that are pending, or that have been funded should be identified (both intramural and extramural).
- Workshops, symposia, other developmental activities (related to scholarly work) that have been attended
- Independent research projects in which the faculty member has taken an active role in working closely with a student (undergraduate or graduate)

***This list is not exhaustive, and others items and materials that the faculty member feels should be evaluated as related to their accomplishments and contributions, should be included in their dossier, along with supportive comments as to their importance.*

D. Indicators of Performance in the Area of Service

The evidence that is provided must demonstrate both the quality and quantity of the candidate's performance in this area in the context of the responsibilities found in his/her statement of expectations. The quantity of the evidence provided for each indicator should reflect its importance in affecting overall effectiveness in this area. The candidate is responsible for

explaining this importance. In addition, the candidate is responsible for explaining why his/her performance on the indicators is offered as evidence of a quality performance.

Service activities may include:

- Program, College, and University service such as participation on boards, panels, committees, task forces, or the like;
- Leadership at various levels within the University;
- Public or community service, such as workshops, public fora, and consultations that uses the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues; and
- Professional service, such as reviewing journal articles and other publications, reviewing grant applications, editing journals, serving on professional committees, holding office within an organization of a candidate's discipline.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File, the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for service activities in this document.

Examples of Programmatic Indicators for the Area of Service

- Officer, committee chair or other significant leadership role in an academic or professional association
- Chair and/or membership on University or College committee or sub-committee
- Chair and/or membership on a Program committee or subcommittee
- Receipt of an award for service based on expertise in the field of Ethnic Studies
- Professional service to the campus and/or the larger community (may include public issue oriented consulting, volunteer coordination, and technical assistance)
- Volunteer service in elementary and/or secondary schools (relevant to scholarly expertise)
- Volunteer service relevant to scholarly expertise on community boards and commissions
- Development and presentation of public lectures and workshops based on scholarly expertise
- Judge and/or reviewer for University or community events based on scholarly expertise
- Articles and/or invited opinion essays in community publications based on one's academic expertise
- Working with community colleges in curriculum development and transfer policies
- Session organizer for a professional association
- Organizer and host for professional meetings
- Advising of clubs and organizations that promote student learning, research, and/or public service
- Grant reviewer for funding agencies
- Editorial board membership and/or manuscript referee
- Unremunerated review of book manuscripts for university presses and other scholarly publishers
- Developing and/or managing websites (journal and/or scholarly group listserv) relevant to scholarly expertise

Faculty being considered for promotional decisions should include the following items in their professional dossiers***:

- List of committees served on within the program since appointment. Identify those committees on which one has served as chair.
- List of all college and university committees (e.g., Graduate Council, Institutional Research, Faculty Senate, SBS Promotion & Tenure, University Planning, etc.). Identify those committees on which one has served as chair.
- Description of community involvement related to the discipline, workshops, lectures, that have been presented to a community agency or any types of contribution to the community at large.

****This list is not exhaustive and other items and materials that the faculty member feels should be evaluated as related to their accomplishments and contributions should be included in their dossier, along with supportive comments as to their importance.*

II. Standards for Promotion to Specific Ranks

A. Associate Professor (a tenure eligible or tenured position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.1, to hold the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must possess a doctorate or other terminal degree in the discipline area. A faculty member may not be promoted to this rank unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured Associate Professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor at NAU; the faculty member, however, may have prior service credit that was agreed to in writing at the time of hire.

To hold the rank of Associate Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record that shows substantial evidence of a sustained pattern of high quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities since appointment at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors listed in IB (p. 2) of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate's courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Evidence that the candidate's courses contribute to the mission of the academic unit is also important. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer valid evidence when used in conjunction with other material.
2. A record that shows a sustained pattern of research and scholarly activity related to the faculty member's discipline since appointment at NAU. A sustained pattern of scholarly activity is defined as having an active research agenda (for example, equivalent of three refereed journal articles since appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor) in the discipline prior to the application for promotion and the production of the types of scholarship described below. The demonstrated scholarly activity is determined by such factors listed in IC (pp. 4-5) of this document.
 - a. Primary evidence of scholarship includes published work in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters or scholarly books published by respected academic publishers, and grants. Presentations at regional and national meetings and manuscripts accepted for publication supplement a record of published work. Minor work, such as book reviews, or incomplete work, such as working papers, are considered evidence of professional activity, but are not alone sufficient for promotion. For evaluation of a candidate's published work, the program relies on the judgment of its own members, the faculty member, and discipline specific ratings.
3. A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the University community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of Professor.
 - a. Membership on a variety of program, college, and university committees is expected. Assistant Professors are expected to primarily focus their service contributions to program committees. However, it is expected that Assistant Professors will also serve, to a lesser extent, on college, and/or university committees. The candidate must demonstrate a sustained pattern of service prior to the year of application. Satisfactory service is to be determined by such factors as listed in ID (pp. 5-6) of this document.

B. Professor (a tenured position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.1, a faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the written notice of appointment indicated the hire was at the rank of Professor without tenure. Professors are faculty members who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as an Associate).

To hold the rank of Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must have the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities since submission of materials for last promotion or appointment at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors as listed in IB (p. 2) of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate's courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Evidence that the candidate's courses contribute to the mission of the academic unit is also important. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer one indicant when used in conjunction with other material.
 - b. The Associate Professor must have maintained a record of pedagogical excellence, continued to develop as a teacher, developed innovative course materials, participated in graduate education through service on thesis committees and successfully chaired completed theses. Awards or recognition for teaching or mentoring, and other indicators of outstanding instructional contributions enhance a candidate's record.
2. A sustained pattern of high-quality research and scholarship related to the faculty member's discipline since submission of materials for last promotion or appointment at NAU (for example, equivalent of three refereed journal articles since appointment to the rank of Associate Professor). Performance in this area is determined by such factors listed in IC (pp. 4-5) of this document.
 - a. Primary evidence of scholarship includes published work in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters or scholarly books published by respected academic publishers, and grants. Presentations at regional and national meetings and manuscripts accepted for publication supplement a record of published work. Minor work, such as book reviews, or incomplete work, such as working papers, are considered evidence of professional activity, but are not alone sufficient for promotion. For evaluation of a candidate's published work, the program relies on the judgment of its own members, the faculty member, and discipline specific ratings.
 - b. The Associate Professor must have maintained a record of high quality, and scholarly contributions. Evidence of outstanding scholarship, including evidence supporting the significance of a candidate's contributions to the literature, typically include articles in respected peer reviewed journals, books, book chapters in scholarly edited works, grant proposals receiving external funding, invited scholarly presentations, and special honors or awards. In assessing the quality of the work under consideration, the committee will make a judgment following their own close readings, and then weigh these reactions against other evidence—contemporary reviews and citations in other scholarly work. Scholarship may include significant conceptual and theoretical works as well as quantitative and qualitative research. Evidence of scholarship may also be visible in other

- professional activities, for example, instruction and service activities that are informed by the relevant professional and scholarly literature.
3. A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's Program (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the Program, College, and/or the University, and to mentor junior faculty since appointment to Associate Professor).
 - a. Membership on a variety of program, college, and university committees is expected, including leadership responsibilities. Associate Professors are expected to take on increasing responsibilities in committees, such as chairing program committees, chairing and/or serving on college, and/or university committees or making contributions to the administration of programs. Ongoing service to the profession is expected from candidates for promotion to Full Professor. Examples of service to the profession include participation in professional organizations (serving on a committee, organizing a conference, etc.) and serving as a reviewer for refereed journals. Evidence of outstanding service contributions for example, service awards, appointment to journal editorships, or election as an officer of a professional organization, further attest to the quality of university, community, and professional service. Other recognized forms of professional activity include presenting papers at professional meetings; serving on editorial boards of scholarly journals; holding offices in professional organizations; and participating in workshops and seminars.
 4. In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of Professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (1) or (2) above as defined by the criteria and indicators in this document.
 - a. The faculty performance in research/scholarship must exceed the performance level required as a minimum. The faculty member must demonstrate outstanding, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in research/scholarship. The faculty member's reputation in research should extend beyond the university. Primary evidence of scholarship includes several published works in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters or scholarly books published by respected academic publishers, and grants. Presentations at national or international meetings and manuscripts accepted for publication supplement a record of published work. Minor work, such as book reviews, or incomplete work, such as working papers, are considered evidence of professional activity, but are not alone sufficient for promotion. For evaluation of a candidate's published work, the program relies on the judgment of its own members, the faculty member, and discipline specific ratings.
 - b. The faculty performance in teaching/advising/student-related responsibilities must exceed the performance level required as a minimum. Outstanding accomplishments include demonstration of superior ability and interest in stimulating in students a genuine desire for learning. Evidence of outstanding teaching may include indications of the success of students, student evaluations, publication of textbooks or teaching materials, active participation in organizations devoted to teaching, and so forth.

C. Senior Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record of substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors listed in IB (p. 3) of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate's courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-

quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer valid evidence when used in conjunction with other material.

2. A record of service and professional development related to the teaching role.
 - a. Primary evidence of professional development and service includes participation at teaching seminars, teaching conferences, mentoring students, and student-related activities.

D. Principal Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Principal Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of Senior Lecturer or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record of sustained excellence at the Senior Lecturer rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors listed in IB (p. 3) of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate's courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer valid evidence when used in conjunction with other material.
2. A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role.
 - a. Primary evidence of professional development and service includes participation at teaching seminars, teaching conferences, mentoring students, and student-related activities.

Geography, Planning, and Recreation

Annual Review

Approved by GPR Faculty Vote: April, 24, 2018

Approved by SBS Dean: August 27, 2018

GPR Coordinator Roles

- Geographic Science & Planning (GSP) Program Coordinator
- Parks & Recreation Management (PRM) Program Coordinator
- Geographic Science & Planning (GSP) Graduate Programs Coordinator
- Parks & Recreation Management (PRM) Graduate Program Coordinator

Coordinator positions are nominated and approved by PRM or GSP faculty and the department chair on an as needed basis. Per SBS guidelines, the assignment is equivalent to 10% to 20% of the Service workload of the individual, as negotiated in their Statement of Expectations (SOE). Specific duties are outlined in the GPR Administrative Duties document, which is subject to negotiation among the Chair and program coordinators.

The Coordinator positions are form of Service to the department and will be assessed through the Service component of the annual review process. Continuation in a program coordinator position is based on satisfactory performance, faculty support, and department chair support. Lack of any one of these three criteria may be grounds for reconsideration of the coordinator appointment.

Annual Faculty Review Procedure

The annual faculty review assesses the faculty member's contributions to the department, college and university based on the workload assigned in their Statement of Expectation (SOE) in the academic year prior to the review.

Faculty members must complete the GPR Self-Evaluation Form using the points stipulated in this document as a guide. Please follow these instructions:

Point Evaluations

At a minimum, the GPR Self-Evaluation Form requires that the faculty member shows how they met (or did not meet) 100% of their SOE workload requirement to receive a "Satisfactory" rating for their evaluation. A brief narrative is also required.

Optionally, the faculty member may list activities that exceeded 100% of their SOE workload requirements to be considered for a "Meritorious" or a "Highly Meritorious" rating. Total points must reach 115% of the SOE for the faculty member to receive a "Meritorious" rating in any one category (teaching, research and service) and overall. This is not required for faculty who are seeking a "Satisfactory" rating. A "Highly Meritorious" faculty member must meet the 115% point rating and justify their Highly Meritorious self-evaluation through their personal narrative, as described below.

To receive 100% of the points possible for a specific listed activity in this document, the faculty member must very briefly explain what they did and why it deserves additional points. Without such an explanation, the activity will only receive 80% of the points possible as shown in this document.

Faculty can suggest that they deserve up to 120% of the points suggested for a listed activity, based on their self-evaluation of the quality and effort of the work involved. This will typically require additional explanations for the department's Annual Review Committee to assess.

Personal Narrative:

A personal narrative is required for each GPR Self-Evaluation Form, as per SBS College requirements.

If the faculty member has an “Unsatisfactory” rating, based on their self-evaluation points, then an explanation must be provided, along with steps to reverse this situation.

For a “Satisfactory” or “Meritorious” rating, the narrative may simply state that the faculty member agrees with the self-evaluation points and their associated rating, while also pointing out the particular strengths of the self-evaluation for the department Annual Review Committee.

For a “Highly Meritorious” rating, the narrative should summarize and justify why the faculty member feels they deserve this rating, referring to their major accomplishments in the activity lists. The narrative should be no more than 1000 words (2 pages) in length.

TEACHING & STUDENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Merit Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Teaching and Student-Related Activities

Each faculty member is responsible for providing the evidence to support their evaluation rating.

Unsatisfactory Performance

All faculty who have teaching requirements in their Statement of Expectation are expected to achieve at least a satisfactory level of effort related to teaching and student-related activities. A faculty member who achieves an unsatisfactory level for teaching and student-related activities fails to meet these basic expectations, including aligning with best practices in the scholarship of teaching and learning, as outlined by NAU’s Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS) and other ABOR policies. Faculty working at an unsatisfactory level for multiple years before tenure or promotion do not meet the minimum teaching standards for promotion or tenure.

Satisfactory Performance

A faculty member who achieves a satisfactory level of performance teaches their assigned courses and engages in student-related activities as defined in their Statement of Expectation document, with no evidence of unsatisfactory performance. A satisfactory rating uses data from student opinion surveys as the only source of external evaluation. A self-evaluation of teaching and mentorship is included in the form of a brief narrative that is supported by the GPR Department self-evaluation (point system). The self-evaluation does not explicitly relate teaching efforts to the teaching and learning goals and standards of various department degree programs. It should be noted, that faculty working only at a satisfactory level for multiple years before tenure or promotion could be in jeopardy of not meeting minimum teaching standards for promotion or tenure.

Meritorious Performance

A faculty member who achieves a meritorious level of performance teaches their assigned courses and engages in student-related activities as defined in their Statement of Expectation document. They are engaged in active improvement of their teaching and mentoring of students, and development of their courses and curriculum. Data from student opinion surveys are not the only source of external evaluation; additional forms of external evaluation are valued. A self-evaluation of teaching and mentorship is included, as summarized by the faculty member in their annual self-evaluation narrative, supported by the GPR Department self-evaluation (point system). The self-evaluation explicitly relates teaching efforts to the teaching and learning goals and standards of various department degree programs, and successful student learning practices for the teaching or mentoring activities.

Highly Meritorious Performance

A faculty member who achieves a highly meritorious level of performance teaches their assigned courses and engages in student-related activities as defined in their Statement of Expectations document. They demonstrate leadership in the improvement of their teaching and mentoring of students, and in the development of their courses and curriculum. Multiple forms of external and internal evaluation are provided about the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. The narrative self-evaluation clearly justifies and demonstrates evidence of work that significantly exceeds the teaching and student-related activities assigned in their Statement of Expectations and cannot be based on the GPR Department's quantitative measures (point system) alone.

STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS & ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION NOTES

- The Minimum points required to be considered Effective in one year is dependent upon the percent of work load allocated to Teaching in the faculty member's Statement of Expectations.
- This category can be averaged over a two-year period for SOE purposes.
- Teaching Courses: A three credit hour course is considered 10% of the teaching load and is allocated 100 points for Effective (or satisfactory) Performance.
- Unpaid Overload Courses (Fall, Spring, Winter & Summer): The course will not be part of the SOE workload, but faculty will receive 100 points per 3 credit hour course for Effective (or satisfactory) Performance.
- Paid Overload Courses (Fall, Spring, Winter & Summer): The course will not be part of the SOE workload, and faculty will receive 0 points.
- Co-convened and Combined Courses: For co-convened Undergraduate and Graduate courses or combining two sections of the same courses in the same online course shell, one course receives full points per credit hours taught, the second receives 1 additional credit hour in points (33 points). This policy might not apply for low enrollment courses (might not get the extra 1 unit) or very high enrollment courses (which might get more than the 1 extra unit).
- Team taught courses: These can be doubled (each person earning full credit) ONLY to the extent that both persons are in the classroom and assuming FULL responsibility for the class at all times. Classes MUST be pro-rated for time when this does not occur (splitting teaching weeks, class sessions, etc.). Only courses approved by the chair qualify for this. This policy might not apply for low enrollment courses. Department chair determines credit for team taught courses.

TEACHING & ADVISING POINTS

Teaching and Student Related Activity Points are meant to be a baseline and a general guide. In your self-evaluation, please determine your effort based on time commitments, impact/contribution/quality of outcome and other special and appropriate considerations, and present a rationale for awarding more or less points in any given category. The GPR Annual Review Committee and the Department Chair will assess your final points for this category based on available information sources.

CATEGORY	RATIONALE	POINTS
COURSE DEVELOPMENT	Only include here if not listed under Research or Service.	
New course development	Developing & teaching a course from scratch for the first time.	3 CH = 50 per course 2 CH = 33.34 per course 1 CH = 16.67 per course
Major revision of a course	At least 10% of the content is revised or new. Must be justified by providing details of what was done.	10 points per 10%, up to 40 points or 40% of course.
Moving an in-person course to online OR an online course to in-person instruction	Must be justified by providing details of what was done.	25 per course

Redesigning or integrating a course into Honors, FYLI or FYS	Points can only be awarded for course re-design, NOT every time the course is taught.	5 per credit hour
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	Only include here if not listed under Research or Service.	
Chair or co-chair of a grad student committee		25 per student/ year
Member of a grad student committee		5 per student/year
Supervision of independent study/student research		10 per credit hour
Individual internship supervision	Separate from teaching the internship class as the responsibility of a program internship coordinator.	15 per intern
SERVICE & DEVELOPMENT	Only include here if not listed under Research or Service.	
Professional Development: 1-8 hours (up to 1 full day)	Related to: teaching, advising or individual area of expertise that directly relates to the classes taught by the individual. Please provide a 1 paragraph rationale outlining what was done per incident.	10 per incident
Professional Development: Multiday (2 or more days)	Related to: teaching, advising or individual area of expertise that directly relates to the classes taught by the individual. Please provide a 1 paragraph rationale outlining what was done per incident.	20 per incident
Voluntary peer teaching assessment exchanges	Can only be done for acquiring points once a semester (2 per year). Please see * below for description	25 per occurrence
Class related community service	Students must be acting in a participatory role. Attending meetings or presentations for class does NOT count.	15 per event
Class/Teaching related research	Please provide a 1 paragraph rationale outlining what was done per incident.	5 per incident. Range of points with justification up to 20.
Management of Federal Agency Special Use Permits or Contracts		15 per permit or contract
Procurement of new (or renewal of F.A.S.U. permit or contract		25 per permit or contract
Contribution to degree program assessment data	Can be counted if the individual is NOT acting as the assessment coordinator and is providing individual class data to the assessment coordinator.	10 per assessment measure

Teaching related presentation or guest lecture	Only if NOT listed under research or service.	10 points per hour
Master teacher	The Master Teacher role is for online classes that a full-time faculty member develops to be taught by part-time instructors. The Master Teacher is the "course designer" and maintains the integrity of the course content and oversees the quality of instruction.	15% of the total course points
Mentoring adjunct or guest faculty	Cannot be counted if department chair, part of the chair's job responsibility. The chair can delegate this out if desired.	10 per occurrence
Coordinating guest speakers for class presentations	Same as above. Speakers for the department, college or university – NOT for individual classes.	10 per incident
FIELD INSTRUCTION	Only include here if not listed under Service.	
Primary field instructor: ½ to 1 day	Responsible for organizing field time & in charge of students.	5 per occurrence
Primary field instructor: 2-3 full days	Responsible for organizing field time & in charge of students.	15 per occurrence
Primary field instructor: 4-7 full days	Responsible for organizing field time & in charge of students. Field time greater than 7 days should be prorated appropriately.	25 per occurrence
Assistant field instructor: ½ to 1 day	Accompanying primary field instructor.	2 per occurrence
Assistant field instructor: 2-3 full days	Accompanying primary field instructor.	10 per occurrence
Assistant field instructor: 4-7 full days	Accompanying primary field instructor. Field time greater than 7 days should be prorated appropriately.	15 per occurrence
Designated on-call Emergency Field contact	Must have field packet & be available by phone or email 24 hours a day while course is in the field.	5 per field time. Adjust accordingly if coordinating an incident.
STUDENT SURVEYS		
Student opinion/evaluation survey reflection	Can only be done for acquiring points once a semester (2 per year). Please see ** below for description	15 per occurrence
Student opinion survey results	Can only be done for acquiring points once a semester (2 per year). Please see *** below for description	Case by case basis. Up to 10 points a class.

* Voluntary peer teaching assessment exchanges description:

- Faculty members can voluntarily team with another GPR peer to exchange visits to each other's classrooms during the fall and/or spring semesters.
- Participating faculty choose the course and period to observe through mutual agreement.
- A related approach can be used for online course exchanges, with peers showing/discussing aspects of the online course they teach.
- After mutual visits take place, participants meet for a comfortable and open discussion surrounding what each learned from the other and possible ideas for future practice.
- In order to receive annual review credit, each participant needs to write a summary of their meeting including but not limited to: What was learned and what might be tried as teaching approaches in the future (one or more).
- This reflection should be included as an additional document to the self-evaluation report.

**** Student opinion/evaluation survey reflection description:**

- Faculty members are encouraged to analyze their student evaluations from each of their classes. Faculty can also pull information from individual surveys or questions in class if that is part of the course.
- The reflection would serve as a self-analysis of student feedback. A thorough reflection should include a showcase & discussion of positive comments while taking an opportunity to interpret suggestions for improvement and other feedback.
- This reflection should be included as an additional document to the self-evaluation report.

***** Student opinion survey results description:**

The faculty member can consider awarding additional points/credit on a case by case basis for:

- Generally excellent overall student opinion survey results.
- Higher-than-average response rates.
- Strong positive comments from students.
- Additional indications of quality teaching through evidence of classroom assessments and implementation of creative, learner-centered projects (beyond tests/grades).
- Justification & rationale for points should be included as an additional document to the self-evaluation report.
- This CAN ONLY be done in lieu of the student opinion reflection survey, NOT in addition to.

SCHOLARSHIP & RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Merit Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Scholarship & Research Activities

Each faculty member is responsible for providing the evidence to support their evaluation rating.

Unsatisfactory Performance

All faculty who have research requirements in their Statement of Expectation are expected to achieve at least a satisfactory level of effort related to research and scholarly activities. A faculty member who achieves an unsatisfactory level for research and scholarly activity fails to meet these basic expectations. Faculty working at an unsatisfactory level for multiple years before tenure or promotion do not meet the minimum research standards for promotion or tenure.

Satisfactory Performance

A faculty member who achieves a satisfactory level of performance is an active scholar in their field and meets the standards of what is expected on a yearly basis for faculty, with no evidence of unsatisfactory performance. Depending on the research allocation of the faculty member in their Statement of Expectation, a satisfactory performance is mostly comprised of a combination of low impact research or scholarly activity (as generally described by the SBS College and GPR Department guidelines) during the review cycle. The satisfactory level also applies to a faculty member who has not demonstrated higher levels of research quality in their field. It should be

noted, that faculty working only at a satisfactory level for multiple years before tenure or promotion could be in jeopardy of not meeting minimum research standards for promotion or tenure.

Meritorious Performance

A faculty member who achieves a meritorious level of performance is a strong and active researcher in their field, doing above and beyond what is expected on a yearly basis for faculty. They are engaging in research or scholarly activities of demonstrated quality and breadth in their field. Depending on the research allocation of the faculty member, a meritorious rating recognizes a greater mix of activities that could include both low and high impact activities (as generally described by the SBS College and GPR Department guidelines) reflecting quality and time attributes. The faculty member justifies in a narrative the outlet for their work showing that it is the most appropriate outlet for demonstrating impact in their field.

Highly Meritorious Performance

A faculty member who achieves a highly meritorious level of performance is truly working at an exceptional level in their field and has justified this ranking through a well-argued narrative evaluation. Depending on the research allocation of the faculty member, a highly meritorious rating includes at least one high impact activity, along with a mix of other impact activities. This overall set of outputs clearly demonstrate exceptional research output, as indicated by scholarly norms in the department or discipline. The narrative self-evaluation clearly justifies and demonstrates that the outlets are the most appropriate to disseminate the faculty member's work and have a significant scholarly impact and contribution.

STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS & ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION NOTES

- The Minimum points required to be considered Effective in one year is dependent upon the percent of work load allocated to Scholarship & Research in the faculty member's Statement of Expectations.
- Tiered Research (books, journal articles, and applied report). The points below are for Upper tier publishers (for books), Upper tier journals, and Upper tier consultancy. Middle Tier publishers, journals and consultancies receive 80% of the Upper tier points. Unranked or unknown publishers, journals and consultancies receive 60% of the Upper tier points. Tier is determined by the Department Faculty Status Committee (FSC), with author input, and may be appealed to the full Department faculty. The term 'Journal' only includes peer-reviewed academic journals.
- SBS Research Impact Guidelines (provided for reference)
 - High impact research activities include: peer reviewed articles, peer reviewed book chapters, peer-reviewed creative works, awarded outside grant funding or contracts, and peer-reviewed published books. Publication through self-publication or "vanity" presses is not considered active research participation for faculty. It is accepted that a book is the equivalent of three peer-reviewed articles.
 - Low impact research activities include: peer-reviewed book contracts, conference participation, invited research talks, peer-reviewed published book review or creative review, submission or revise and resubmit of peer reviewed article or creative work, submission of outside grants, and non-peer reviewed publications. In most instances, conference participation indicates active participation. Conference participation means engaging in a conference role that requires participation, such as a roundtable participant, conference panel participant, presenting a paper or creative work, and conference panel discussant, discussing papers or creative works. Generally, chairing a panel and simply attending a conference does not constitute active participation.

SCHOLARSHIP & RESEARCH POINTS (per incident, except where noted)

Scholarship and Research Points are meant to be a baseline and a general guide. In your self-evaluation, please determine your effort and the impact of the activity and present a rationale for awarding more or less points in any given category. The GPR Annual Review Committee and the

Department Chair will assess your final points for this category based on available information sources.

CATEGORY	RATIONALE	POINTS
PUBLICATIONS – Books & book chapters	Points are for year published, except where indicated. Please see * below for notes related to Publications. Only include here if not listed under Teaching or Service.	
Authored book	Upper tier publisher	600
Authored book revision	Upper tier publisher - Second + editions	200
Editor of book	Upper tier publisher	150
Edited book revision	Upper tier publisher - Second + editions	75
Major self-published book		75
Major revisions of self-published book		25
Submitted book for publisher review		50
Refereed book chapter	Upper tier publisher	200
Non-refereed book chapter		150
PUBLICATIONS – Journals & other publications	Points are for year published, except where indicated. Please see * below for notes related to Publications. Only include here if not listed under Teaching or Service.	
Peer reviewed journal article	Upper tier journal	200
Peer reviewed journal commentary; book review & other similar writings		60
Monograph	Upper tier publisher	150
Applied Report (community group, NGO, Government Agency)	Upper tier consultancy. Only if NOT listed under grants/contracts.	100
Other major self-published works	Including lab manuals & internet sites.	75
Major revisions to other major self-published works	Including lab manuals & internet sites.	25
Non-peer reviewed: Journal or professional article; Commentary in a professional publication; Published database; Book review; News article or column.		40
Research paper published in proceedings		50
Abstract published in a professional journal		20
PRESENTATIONS	Only include here if not listed under Teaching or Service.	
International, National or Regional conference presentation	Oral or Poster	60
External Colloquium presentation	Invitation to present on a topic of expertise within a department or series.	50

Internal presentation	Local within the department, college, university or community. Oral or Poster	20
Panel session presenter, organizer or discussant		30
Guest lecture in university class	Only if NOT listed under teaching	10 points per hour
SCHOLARLY SERVICE & DEVELOPMENT	Only include here if NOT listed under Service.	
Editor or Guest Editor of a journal		50 Annually
Review of a refereed journal or book chapter		15
Review of a grant or book proposal		15
Review of a full book manuscript		25
Professional development in research or service: 1-8 hours (up to 1 full day)	Research/service workshops or conferences. Please provide a 1 paragraph rational outlining what was done per incident.	10
Professional development in research or service: Multiday (2 or more days)	Research/service workshops or conferences. Please provide a 1 paragraph rational outlining what was done per incident.	20
Scholarship of teaching and learning	Please provide a 1 paragraph rational outlining what was done per incident.	5 per incident. Range of points with justification up to 20
GRANTS, CONTRACTS & RELATED WORK ACTIVITIES	Please see ** below for notes related to Grants. Only include here if not listed under Teaching or Service.	
Super Grant	Over \$250 thousand. Total can equal 700 points.	Proposal: 200 Funded: 500
Major Grant	\$50 - \$250 thousand. Total can equal 450 points.	Proposal: 150 Funded: 300
Large Grant	\$10 – 50 thousand. Total can equal 300 points.	Proposal: 100 Funded: 200
Medium Grant	\$2 – 10 thousand. Total can equal 150 points.	Proposal: 50 Funded: 100
Small Grant	\$500 dollars - \$2 thousand. Total can equal 75 points.	Proposal: 25 Funded: 50
Minor Grant	Less than \$500 dollars. Total can equal 15 points.	Proposal: 5 Funded: 10

*** Publications Notes:**

- Provide complete references (i.e. authors, year, title, journal/publisher, pages, etc.) for all publications.
- First-author, Single-author, and Two-authored publications of all kinds receive full credit. Non-first author on products with 3 or more people receive 75% of the total points for both submissions and actual publications. This should be adjusted higher or lower based on your actual contribution to the publication, which should also be justified or explained in your self-evaluation.
- Submissions of any type of publication receive 25% of the full potential points in the year of submission. Authors may select to receive the remainder of full points (75%) in either

- the year of actual acceptance or in the year of publication, but not both. If submission and acceptance or publication is in the same year, then only the full points are received.
- Refereed Journal Articles are the overall baseline against which all publications are assessed.
- The quality and competitiveness of publications and grants should be considered in Self Evaluations, by the Academic Review Committee, and by Faculty Status Committee.

**** Grants Notes:**

- A grant may, instead, be listed under Student-Related Activities if the grant is clearly teaching and student related. A grant may, instead, be listed under Service Activities if the grant is clearly service related.
- Provide complete references (i.e. authors, year, title, journal/publisher, pages, etc.) for all grants.
- The "related work activities" include any academic activity that generates overhead to the GPR Department. The standard grants listed above normally generate 15% of the total amount returned to GPR as overhead.
- Grant proposal is for first submissions; revised submissions receive fewer points, as determined by the candidate.
- Credit for grant proposals is for the year that funds are initially received or expended, and for each subsequent year that funds are expended.
- External (non-NAU) grants are preferred over internal (NAU) grants.
- Submitted and unfunded grants are considered evidence of research effort.
- Contract work is equivalent to grants.

SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Merit Ratings for Annual Evaluation of Service Activities

Each faculty member is responsible for providing the evidence to support their evaluation rating.

Unsatisfactory Performance

All faculty who have a service requirement in their Statement of Expectation are expected to achieve at least a satisfactory level of effort related to service activities. A faculty member who achieves an unsatisfactory level fails to actively meet basic expectations as outlined in the Service Activities section of their Statement of Expectation or fails to align with best practices in the faculty service policy as outlined by NAU's Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS) and ABOR policies.

Satisfactory Performance

A faculty member who achieves a satisfactory level of performance actively participates in the basic service requirements of the department, college and university on a yearly basis, with no evidence of unsatisfactory performance. Depending on the service allocation in their Statement of Expectation, a satisfactory performance will meet the service requirements in terms of hours or time percentages in accordance with the SBS College and GPR Department guidelines (point system), supported by a basic narrative justification in the annual self-evaluation.

Meritorious Performance

A faculty member who achieves a meritorious level of performance in service meets the basic requirement of a satisfactory performance, based on their assigned service allocation in their Statement of Expectation document. In addition, they actively engage in additional service activities that reflect a rating of at least 15% above their Statement of Expectation requirements, as assessed in terms of hours or time percentages and leadership or other meritorious contributions in accordance with the SBS College and GPR Department guidelines (point system). This is further supported by the annual self-evaluation narrative, which clearly justifies and articulates the higher rating for meritorious performance.

Highly Meritorious Performance

A faculty member who achieves a highly meritorious level of performance in service activities meets and significantly exceeds the service allocation in their Statement of Expectation document. They provide a clear and concise annual self-evaluation articulating specific NAU service work duties, hours or time percentage, and actions performed, in accordance with the SBS College and GPR Department guidelines (point system). A highly meritorious rating cannot be based on quantitative measures alone, and must include a self-evaluation narrative that demonstrates leadership, accomplishments and contributions in service activities.

STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS & ANNUAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION NOTES

- The Minimum service expectation of all full-time faculty members is 5% of workload (50 points).
- Service Release Time for all full-time faculty: Faculty will receive 50 points per year for participation to a reasonable extent in:
 - Department & College meetings and retreats.
 - Department, College & University special events & ceremonies, including commencement.
 - University required procedures such as: The annual review process & trainings for new processes and systems.
- This category can be averaged over a two-year period for SOE purposes.

TYPES OF SERVICE (per incident, except where noted)

Service Points are determined based on time requirements and leadership roles. In general, 100 points is equivalent to an average of 4 hours a week of service activity over the academic year of 34 weeks. All service activities should be adjusted accordingly against that time measurement, with additional adjustment for leadership responsibilities. In your self-evaluation, please determine your effort and the impact of the activity and present a rationale for awarding more or less points in any given category. The GPR Annual Review Committee and the Department Chair will assess your final points for this category based on available information sources.

INTERNATIONAL, NATIONAL or REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS	Only include here if not listed under Teaching or Research.
Officer in a professional society	
Invited service on a non-university committee or board	
Major committee	
Organizer of a conference	
Organizer of a workshop	
Instructor for a workshop or short course	
Panel session presenter, organizer or discussant	
Session chair	
Award for service or achievement	
DEPARTMENT, COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY	
Major committee	Major or new program development
Minor committee	Minor program revision, sub committees or scholarship committee
Faculty Senate member	
Organizer of a conference	
Organizer of a workshop	
Instructor for a workshop or short course	
Advisor for a student organization	

Conduct student recruitment/outreach/fundraising	Going to a school or NAU campus event
Conduct Alumni Service Program	
Special Projects	Such as, but not limited to: Website design, marketing, assessment, etc. as long as NOT part of SOE.
SERVICE & DEVELOPMENT	Only include here if NOT listed under Teaching or Research.
Editor or Guest Editor of a journal	
Review of a refereed journal or book chapter	
Review of a grant or book proposal	
Review of a full book manuscript	
Professional development in research or service: 1-8 hours (up to 1 full day)	Research/service workshops or conferences. Please provide a 1 paragraph rational outlining what was done per incident.
Professional development in research or service: Multiday (2 or more days)	Research/service workshops or conferences. Please provide a 1 paragraph rational outlining what was done per incident.
Class related research	Please provide a 1 paragraph rational outlining what was done per incident.
RELEVANT COMMUNITY SERVICE	Only include here if not listed under Teaching or Service.
Community Committee	City boards, committees, non-profits
Community Presentations	Speaking at a community or city board meeting. Only list here if not under research.
Community Service	Personally volunteering at community events, please include a description of the event & what you did. Only list here if not under teaching.

GPR ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION REPORT FORM

Some important notes on the GPR Annual Faculty Self Evaluation Report Template below:

- GPR faculty are required to use this template.
- Itemize each individual activity (including classes) with appropriate points on same row.
- When giving points for something not specifically listed or which may be unclear to members of the Annual Review Committee, please indicate what you are basing the value on (e.g. “points being considered equivalent to...”).
- When points are adjusted different from the guidelines in this document, clearly indicate the rationale behind the adjustment (e.g. Faculty Senate: 50% [was active only for the Fall] of 25 = 12)

GPR ANNUAL FACULTY SELF EVALUATION REPORT

Name:	Rank:	Academic Year:
-------	-------	----------------

TEACHING & STUDENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Fall Semester YEAR: _____

Courses Taught	Credit Hours/# of students/Distance or Campus	Rational/Description (required)	Points

Additional Teaching & Advising Points – Category:	Rational/Description (required) [Add lines or a separate sheet if needed]	Points
Course Development:		
Student Activities:		
Service & Development:		
Field Instruction:		
Student Surveys:		
Subtotal Fall Points:		

TEACHING & STUDENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES (continued)

Spring Semester YEAR: _____

Courses Taught	Credit Hours/# of students/Distance or Campus	Rational/Description (required)	Points

Additional Teaching & Advising Points – Category:	Rational/Description (required) [Add lines or a separate sheet if needed]	Points
Course Development:		
Student Activities:		
Service & Development:		
Field Instruction:		
Student Surveys:		
Subtotal Spring Points:		

TEACHING & STUDENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES (continued)

Summer & Winter Terms YEAR: _____

Courses Taught	Credit Hours/# of students/Distance or Campus	Rational/Description (required)	Points
Additional Teaching & Advising Points – Category:	Rational/Description (required) [Add lines or a separate sheet if needed]		Points
Course Development:			
Student Activities:			
Service & Development:			
Field Instruction:			
Student Surveys:			
Subtotal Summer/Winter Points:			

TOTAL FOR STUDENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES	SOE POINTS	Self-Evaluation POINTS	Self-Evaluations RATING*

* Rating: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious, or Highly Meritorious

SCHOLARSHIP & RESEARCH ACTIVITIES for the Year

Category	Rational/Description (required) [Add lines or a separate sheet if needed]	Points
Publications – Books & Book Chapters:		
Publications – Journals & Other Publications:		
Presentations:		
Service & Development:		
Grants, Contracts & Related Work Activities:		

TOTAL FOR SCHOLARSHIP & RESEARCH ACTIVITIES	SOE POINTS	Self-Evaluation POINTS	Self-Evaluation RATING*

* Rating: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious, or Highly Meritorious

SERVICE ACTIVITIES for the Year

Category	Rational/Description (required) [Add lines or a separate sheet if needed]	Points
International, National or Regional Associations:		
Department, College & University		
Service Release Time (Baseline)		75
Service & Development:		
Relevant Community Service:		
Grants, Contracts & Related Work Activities:		

TOTAL FOR SERVICE ACTIVITIES	SOE POINTS	Self-Evaluation POINTS	Self-Evaluation RATING*

<u>SUMMARY & TOTAL</u>	SOE POINTS	Self-Evaluation POINTS	Self-Evaluation RATING*
STUDENT-RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES:			
SCHOLARSHIP & RESEARCH ACTIVITIES:			
SERVICE ACTIVITIES:			
TOTAL POINTS & OVERALL RATING*			

* Rating: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious, or Highly Meritorious

FACULTY NOMINATIONS

This is not mandatory but highly encouraged, recognize the people you work with for the outstanding things that they do. You can nominate for only one or all!

GPR TEACHER OF THE YEAR:
Please comment briefly:
SBS TEACHER OF THE YEAR:
Please comment briefly:
SBS RESEARCHER OF THE YEAR:
Please comment briefly:
SBS ADVISOR OF THE YEAR:
Please comment briefly:
SBS TEACHING INNOVATION AWARD
Please comment briefly:
SBS PART TIME EDUCATOR AWARD
Please comment briefly:
SBS EXCEPTIONAL SERVICE AWARD (faculty and staff)
Please comment briefly:
SBS COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD (faculty or staff)
Please comment briefly:
SBS CAREER MILESTONE AWARD
Please comment briefly:
SBS EARLY CAREER TEACHING AWARD
Please comment briefly:
SBS 20+ YEAR ACHIEVEMENT AWARD
Please comment briefly:
SBS OUTSTANDING STAFF SERVICE (staff)
Please comment briefly:
SBS LEADERSHIP & INNOVATION AWARD (staff)
Please comment briefly:

(1) PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to supplement the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service (Section 1.2.2) and guidelines for promotion and tenure of the NAU College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. It applies the standards and guidelines of these policies within the context of the academic expectations for promotion and tenure within the Department of Geography, Planning and Recreation. The GPR department's sabbatical policy is also included in this document.

(2) CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

For tenure eligible faculty to be considered for promotion or tenure, a candidate must achieve at least the minimum SBS and university criteria for each rank in the three areas under review, including: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; (2) research, scholarship and creative activities; and (3) service to the university community and the profession. In addition to meeting all the minimum requirements in the three areas under review, for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, a candidate must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in either (1) or (2) above, and minimum SBS and university criteria in other areas, as defined by the Department's criteria.

For non-tenure eligible faculty to be considered for promotion or reclassification (for instructors), a candidate must achieve at least the minimum SBS and university criteria for each rank in the areas under review. This include the following areas as they have been designates in the candidate's Statement of Expectations for the academic years under review: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; (2) research, scholarship and creative activities; and (3) service to the university community and the profession. Most non-tenure eligible faculty will have primary responsibility in (1) teaching, but some may have other areas of significant responsibilities. In addition to meeting all the minimum requirements in the areas under review, for promotion a candidate must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in their primary area of responsibility, as defined by the Department's criteria.

Procedure: Promotion and Tenure

This procedure applies to all applications for promotion and applications for tenure. It does not apply to the reclassification of an instructor to a lecturer. This is a summary of the procedure defined in the NAU Conditions of Faculty Status.

1. A candidate who meets the eligibility criteria for promotion will inform the GPR Chair of their intention to apply for promotion in the Spring semester prior the Fall semester when the application will be due. The due date for this notification will be announced by the Chair or the College. The Chair will notify the SBS College to prepare for the application.
2. By the due dates specified in the NAU Provost's Personnel Action Calendar, a candidate for promotion or tenure must prepare and submit a carefully organized and complete set of materials (the Professional Review File) that demonstrates the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of their performance in the areas relevant to the rank to which promotion is sought.
3. The candidate's application material will be evaluated by the GRP Faculty Status Committee, who will make a recommendation to the GPR Chair. The Chair will make a recommendation to the Dean, and the Dean will make a recommendation to the Provost for a final decision. The candidate may respond after each level of recommendation by the due date set in the NAU Personnel Action Calendar.
4. In addition, the GPR Department requires external letters of review of the faculty member's research and scholarly activity for the promotion of tenure-eligible faculty to Associate Professor and to Professor, and for tenure. External letter writers will be asked to assess both quantitative and qualitative indicators of research performance. The candidate and the department Chair will follow the process of the College of Social and Behavioral

Sciences for soliciting review letters, and faculty members must agree to waive access to such letters before they are included in their Professional Review File.

Procedure: Reclassification

This procedure applies to applications for the reclassification from an instructor to a lecturer.

1. The instructor who meets the eligibility criteria will write a request to the department Chair to be reclassified, which includes a self-assessment of the evaluation criteria areas as has been delineated in the Statements of Expectation for the academic years under review.
2. The department Chair may optionally consult with the Faculty Status Committee and request a recommendation.
3. If the department Chair approves the request, then he or she will nominate the Instructor for consideration of reclassification to the Dean.
4. Further evaluation will be completed by the Dean who, if he or she agrees with the request, will then recommend the reclassification to the Provost for approval.

(3) PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND ASSESSMENT

The GPR Department promotes excellence in teaching, scholarly activities, and service to its community. Faculty of all levels and assignments should contribute to both individual and departmental success. The following examples of performance indicators are listed to help faculty to understand the standards sought by the department. Unlike the annual review process, promotion and tenure decisions are based on the long-term trajectory of the applicant's activities and accomplishments, as well as the likelihood of future accomplishments.

Teaching, Mentoring, and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

Teaching, mentoring, and other student-related responsibilities include all areas in which faculty share their disciplinary knowledge with students, help students to reach their personal and professional college aspirations, and work with or otherwise support the university's higher education mission. Using the evidence presented in the candidate's online Professional Review File, an assessment will be made of the degree to which the faculty member's performance has met the criteria for promotion in the areas of teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities in this document. A variety of indicators can be used together to show a sustained record of effectiveness and performance quality in teaching related activities.

Examples of the types of criteria appropriate for teaching, mentoring and other student-related indicators provided in the SBS College Promotion and Tenure Criteria document and the GPR Department's Annual Evaluation document. Other indicators may be included if judged relevant by the candidate and evaluators. It is incumbent upon the applicant to demonstrate that they have met or exceeded the teaching and student related activities criteria for the rank being applied for, based on appropriate indicators.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities

Research, scholarship and creative activities lead to original works that expand knowledge in the discipline or field of study, extend the discipline into new fields, or improves teaching in the discipline by the dissemination of relevant pedagogical research and scholarship. Research accomplishments are assessed for all faculty who have a research assignment in their Statement of Expectations for the period under review. Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File, along with supporting documentation and letters, where relevant, evaluators will assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has demonstrated sustained, effective, and high quality accomplishments in research, scholarship and creative activities as appropriate to the rank being applied for.

Examples of indicators of research-related accomplishments are found in the SBS College Promotion and Tenure Criteria document and the GPR Department's Annual Evaluation document, the latter of which also provides a general guideline for the relative value of research

indicators. Other indicators may be included if judged relevant by the candidate and evaluators. It is incumbent upon the applicant to demonstrate that they have met or exceeded the research criteria for rank being applied for, based on appropriate indicators.

Service Activities

Service activities include the many ways that candidates support their academic program, department, college, university and academic discipline. Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File, evaluators assess the degree to which the candidate's performance has met the criteria set for service activities for the rank being applied for.

Examples of indicators of service activities and accomplishments are found in the SBS College Promotion and Tenure Criteria document and the GPR Department's Annual Evaluation document, the latter of which also provides a general guideline for the relative value of service indicators. Other indicators may be included if judged relevant by the candidate and evaluators. It is incumbent upon the applicant to demonstrate that they have met or exceeded the service activities criteria for rank being applied for, based on appropriate indicators.

(4) RECLASSIFICATION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE CRITERIA

NON-TENURE ELIGIBLE POSITIONS

Non-tenure eligible positions include instructor, lecturer, clinical faculty, professors of practice, research faculty, visiting faculty, faculty research associates, part-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and visiting scholars. Only employed faculty at these ranks may apply for promotion or reclassification to another rank.

Instructor to Lecturer Reclassification

Eligibility Criteria: An instructor is normally hired for a fixed short-term and temporary position, although exceptions to this may arise. In appropriate circumstances, an instructor may be considered for reclassification to a lecturer position if the following has occurred:

1. The instructor was hired through a competitive search process and in accordance with NAU Equity and Access policies.
2. The instructor has worked full-time in the department of Geography, Planning, and Recreation for a minimum of three consecutive semesters and is likely to continue to do so as a non-temporary position;
3. The instructor has consistently received overall positive evaluations in their areas of teaching and service over the previous and consecutive three years of performance reviews prior to reclassification. (This assumes that the instructor has no research expectations in their Statement of Expectations.)

Evaluation Criteria: Instructors meeting the eligibility criteria will be evaluated in the following areas:

1. The instructor is qualified and able to perform the tasks and functions needed by the department at a quality level.
2. The Instructor has shown significant educational contributions to the teaching, student success, and learning goals of the department including, but not limited to, course development and improvement, development of teaching knowledge and skills, participating in course and curriculum assessments, and course coordination within their program area.
3. The instructor has shown significant leadership through his or her contribution to the service goals of the department, including but not limited to serving on department committees.

Lecturer to Senior Lecturer Promotion

Eligibility Criteria: A senior lecturer is considered an expert in university teaching and student success. To be eligible for the rank of senior lecturer, the faculty member must have at least the following:

1. A record of substantial and continued commitment to student success through effective and high-quality teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.
2. A record of service to their department and the university, and professional development.
3. The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience as accepted by the SBS College and university..
4. A senior lecturer may not apply for promotion to a tenure eligible rank, but may apply for an open tenure-eligible position.

Evaluation Criteria: The performance of the candidate for the position of senior lecturer must clearly demonstrate a strong commitment to teaching and student success in the semesters since receiving the rank of lecturer, and show promise of continuing this commitment in future years. This includes improving their pedagogical knowledge, skills and contributions as evidenced in appropriate indicators assessed for the period under review, including but not limited to, the following:

1. A record of a sustained pattern of positive evaluations by peers and the department Chair.
2. Evidence of sustained effective classroom teaching and mentoring based on annual reviews, student opinion surveys, and other documentation accepted as relevant by the department for the years served at the rank of lecturer.
3. The regular acquisition of new pedagogical knowledge and skills to be used in their teaching.
4. A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the department, college, university, and profession, and illustrates contributions that advance departmental and university educational goals and programs.

Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer Promotion

Eligibility Criteria: In addition to the teaching and student success mastery of the senior lecturer rank, a principal lecturer is a leader in curriculum and program development and department success. To be eligible for the rank of principal lecturer, the faculty member must have at least the following:

1. A record of substantial and continued commitment to student success through effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities, especially in program and curricular development.
2. A record of service and leadership to their department and the university, and continued professional development.
3. The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of senior lecturer or other relevant professional experience as accepted by the SBS College and university.
4. A principal lecturer may not apply for promotion to a tenure eligible rank, but may apply for an open tenure-eligible position.

Evaluation Criteria: In addition to the criteria for a senior lecturer role, the performance of the candidate for the position of principal lecturer must clearly demonstrate a leadership role in teaching and student success in the semesters since receiving the rank of senior lecturer, and show promise of continuing this leadership role in future years. This includes contributing the educational success of their program and the GPR department overall, as evidenced in appropriate indicators assessed for the period under review, including but not limited to, the following:

1. A record of a sustained pattern of excellence and leadership in teaching, as exhibited in evaluations by peers and Chair.
2. A record of sustained excellence and leadership in service and professional development related to the teaching.
3. Evidence of sustained effective classroom teaching and advising based on annual reviews, student opinion surveys, and other documentation accepted by the department.
4. Evidence of effective development and delivery of courses, program and curriculum development, and program and course assessments.

5. Evidence of commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience, such as mentoring and directing independent studies and student research, and other student-related activities.
6. A record of active and sustained service and leadership to the profession and the university community and evidence of leadership within the department.

PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE RANKS

Professors of practice are non-tenure eligible faculty who is primarily responsible for teaching courses, including seminars and independent studies, to undergraduate and graduate students that model the intersection of theory and practice in the relevant field upon which the faculty member has a documented record of expertise, professional history, or sustained involvement. A professor of practice is appointed to one of the following academic ranks: assistant professor of practice, associate professor of practice, or professor of practice.

Assistant Professor of Practice to Associate Professor of Practice Promotion

Eligibility Criteria: An associate professor of practice is considered an expert in university teaching and in their field of specialized knowledge and skills. To be eligible for the rank of associate professor of practice, the faculty member must have at least the following:

1. A record of commitment to student success through substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student related responsibilities.
2. A record of service their department & the university, professional development, and research (if relevant).
3. The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience.
4. An associate professor of practice may not apply for promotion to a tenure eligible rank, but may apply for an open tenure-eligible position.

Evaluation Criteria: The performance of the candidate for the position of associate professor of practice must clearly demonstrate a strong commitment to teaching and student success, especially in their areas of specialization, and show promise of continuing this commitment in future years. This includes improving their knowledge, skills and contributions as evidenced in appropriate indicators assessed for the period under review, including but not limited to, the following:

1. A record of a sustained pattern of positive evaluations by peers and the department Chair.
2. Evidence of sustained effective teaching and mentoring based on annual reviews, student opinion surveys, and other documentation accepted as relevant by the department for the years served at the rank of assistant professor of practice.
3. The regular acquisition of new knowledge and skills to be used in their teaching and related specialized activities.
4. A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the department, college, university, and profession, and illustrates contributions that advance departmental and university educational goals and programs.

Associate Professor of Practice to Professor of Practice Promotion

Eligibility Criteria: In addition to the teaching and disciplinary mastery of the associate professor of practice rank, a professor of practice is a leader in curriculum and program development, their area of specialization, and department success. To be eligible for the rank of professor of practice, the faculty member must have at least the following:

1. A record of commitment to student success through substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student related responsibilities.
2. A record of service their department & the university, professional development, and research (if relevant).
3. The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of associate professor of practice or other relevant professional experience.
4. A professor of practice may not apply for promotion to a tenure eligible rank, but may apply for an open tenure-eligible position.

Evaluation Criteria: In addition to the criteria for associate professor of practice, the performance of the candidate for the position of professor of practice must clearly demonstrate a leadership role in teaching and student success and other areas of specialization in the semesters since receiving the rank of associate professor of practice, and show promise of continuing this leadership role in future years. This includes contributing the educational success of their program and the GPR department overall, as evidenced in appropriate indicators assessed for the period under review, including but not limited to, the following:

1. A record of a sustained pattern of excellence and leadership in teaching and in their areas of specialization, as exhibited in evaluations by peers and Chair.
2. A record of sustained excellence and leadership in service and professional development related to the teaching and their areas of specialization.
3. Evidence of sustained effective classroom teaching and advising based on annual reviews, student opinion surveys, and other documentation accepted by the department.
4. Evidence of effective development and delivery of courses, program and curriculum development, and program and course assessments.
5. Evidence of commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience, such as mentoring and directing independent studies and student research, and other student-related activities, especially in their area of expertise.
6. A record of active and sustained service and leadership to the profession and the university community and evidence of leadership within the department.

TENURE ELIGIBLE POSITIONS

The tenure eligible positions include assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Tenure eligible faculty shall have a maximum probationary period no longer than seven (7) years in full-time service at tenure eligible rank, except in cases of waiver by the President for an individual faculty member. All tenure eligible positions require an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the appropriate discipline. Any exception to this degree requirement must be recommended by the faculty and Chair of the academic unit, and approved by the Dean and Provost.

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor Promotion

Eligibility Criteria: An associate professor is considered an expert in university teaching and student success, and in their field of research specialization. The rank of associate professor is a tenure eligible position. A faculty member may not be promoted to associate professor unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured associate professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of associate professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor at NAU. Any prior service credit to be counted must be agreed to in writing at the time of hire.

Evaluation Criteria: To hold the rank of associate professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must demonstrate:

1. A record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.
 - a. Minimum: As a minimum, a continuous pattern of positive peer and chair evaluations as an Assistant Professor are acquired in the teaching areas to be promoted to Associate Professor. The Faculty member must be defined in positive terms using chair and peer review evidence. The candidate must have promoted the teaching goals of the department, and demonstrated concern for the improvement of course content through the re-evaluation of such items as course materials and course requirements.
 - b. Outstanding: Excellence is defined as a pattern of meritorious evaluations in teaching as an Assistant Professor. The candidate must have promoted the teaching goals of the department, and demonstrated concern for the improvement of course content through the re-evaluation of such items as course materials and course requirements.
2. A record that shows a sustained pattern of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline. External letters of research assessment will supplement this evaluation following SBS College guidelines.
 - a. Minimum: The faculty member should have completed professional work such as books, monographs, refereed journal publications, technical or research reports, grant applications, projects, professional presentations.
 - b. Outstanding: The faculty member should have completed professional work such as books, monographs, refereed journal publications, technical or research reports, grant applications, projects, professional presentations. These accomplishments should be of high quality and reflect favorably upon the department, college, or university.
3. A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the university community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of professor.
 - a. As a minimum the faculty member should demonstrate active participation in departmental affairs, which includes contributions in program development and administration, as well as departmental representation on college and university committees as appointed.

In addition, a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in either (1) or (2) above.

Associate Professor to Professor Promotion

Eligibility Criteria: In addition to the teaching and research mastery of the associate professor rank, a professor is a leader in program development, their area of specialization, and in department success.

A faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the Notice of Appointment indicates it is at the rank of professor without tenure. Professors are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of

professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of associate professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as associate).

Evaluation Criteria: To hold the rank of professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have:

1. A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement and other student-related responsibilities.
 - a. Minimum: A pattern of positive peer and chair reviews in teaching. The candidate must have promoted the teaching goals of the department, and give evidence of course revisions and enhancements. Advisement of students is expected.
 - b. Outstanding: A predominant pattern of meritorious peer and chair reviews in teaching, a record of commitment to the teaching mission of the department, and the enhancement of courses, programs or student experience. Advisement and mentoring of students is expected.
2. A sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.
 - a. Minimum: The faculty member should have completed professional work such as books, monographs, refereed journal publications, chapters, technical or research reports, grant activity, contract work, community/agency projects, presentations or other research related activities as determined by the department since promotion to Associate Professor. National or international recognition is demonstrated by such measures as level of journal published in, book chapters, presentations or invited presentations, attendance at conferences or meetings, agency recognition or work, grants, or other examples deemed acceptable by the department. The scholarly endeavors are determined by the department to be the equivalent of three refereed articles.
 - b. Outstanding: The faculty member should have completed professional work such as books, monographs, refereed journal publications, chapters, technical or research reports, grant activity, contract work, community/agency projects, national or international presentations, or other research related activities as determined by the department since promotion to Associate Professor. National or international recognition is demonstrated by such measures as level of journals published in, book chapters, presentations or invited presentations, attendance at conferences or meetings, agency recognition or work, and grants, or other examples deemed acceptable by the department. The scholarly endeavors are determined by the department to be the equivalent of five refereed articles.
3. A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's department (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the department, college, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty).

In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of Professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (1) or (2) above.

(5) DEPARTMENT SABBATICAL POLICY

The department's sabbatical policy provides additional guidelines to those provided by the SBS Dean and the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service. These guidelines are primarily to avoid multiple faculty from taking sabbaticals simultaneously. Sabbatical content is determined by the NAU Provost and is a secondary consideration in this policy.

1. The GPR department gives highest priority for a sabbatical to faculty who submit for a full year sabbatical, over those who apply for a single semester.
2. The second level of evaluation for sabbaticals considers the following, in order of priority:
 - a. First time sabbaticals have a higher priority over others.
 - b. Faculty who have more years since their previous sabbatical have priority over those with fewer years.
 - c. Junior faculty have higher priority over more senior faculty.

- d. Higher quality proposals have higher priority over lower quality proposals.
- 3. Non-tenure eligible faculty sabbatical proposals must include a teaching element that will be of benefit to the department; the teaching element must clearly be beyond what would be expected in a normal update of a course; and must include some form of sharing or disseminating the sabbatical results. Additional criteria may be required by the SBS Dean and the Provost, and may include a research element and dissemination of research results.
- 4. Tenure eligible proposals in most cases must include a strong research element; the research element must be beyond what would be expected in a normal research expectation for the faculty member; and must include some form of sharing or disseminating the research results, preferably through publications and professional presentations.
- 5. All instructional needs of the department must be approved by the department Chair for a sabbatical to be recommended by the department to the Dean. Final approval for all sabbaticals is made by the Provost.

Politics and International Affairs

Annual Review

Approved by PIA: March 31, 2010 (Yes-9, No-0, Abstain-1)

Amendments Approved by PIA: March 26, 2014 (Yes-16, No-0, Abstain-0)

Membership and Role of the Annual Review Committee

Full-time faculty are evaluated annually by an elected Annual Review Committee. The Committee may comprise the members of the Committee on Faculty Status (COFS), or may be extended to include an elected non-tenured faculty member or members for the purpose of the annual evaluations. Alternatively, it may be a completely separate committee to COFS. The committee is elected annually by the members of the Department.

Faculty are evaluated in three areas: (1) Teaching/Advising/Curriculum Development (hereinafter 'Teaching'); (2) Scholarship and Research (hereinafter 'Scholarship'); and (3) Service. The Annual Review Committee's evaluations are based on materials submitted by each faculty member within an Accomplishments Portfolio. This Portfolio includes an Annual Performance Accomplishment report, a Statement of Expectations document for the year under review, and all other necessary documentation requested by the Committee (including syllabi, copies of publications and conference papers, evidence of book contracts, etc.).

Faculty are assessed in each of the three areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, and then ranked in each using the university terminology of Highly Meritorious, Meritorious, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory. In addition, each faculty member is given an overall evaluation in one of the same four categories.

Work Distribution Percentage (Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty)

Each faculty member's Work Distribution Percentage (formerly called Percentage Allocation of Effort), recorded in the respective Statement of Expectations written prior to the year being evaluated, is to be presented in the Accomplishments Report. The percentage distribution is used by the Committee to help determine the weights by which a faculty member's accomplishments are to be evaluated. As a general rule, the higher the percentage distribution for a particular area, the more that is expected of that faculty member to score highly. The three categories for distribution of effort are as follows: low percentage, medium percentage and high percentage.

The guidelines to be used by the Committee are recorded below:

	<u>Low % Dist.</u>	<u>Medium % Dist.</u>	<u>High % Dist.</u>
Teaching	45-54	55-64	65-70
Scholarship	20-25	26-35	36-40
Service	5-8	9-12	13-15

Teaching load is to be determined using the Department Workload Assignment Guidelines. Generally, a 2-2 teaching load (or less) is equivalent to a "low" distribution, a 3-2 a "medium" distribution, and 3-3 or above a "high" distribution. However, even a small number of classes can be equivalent to a "high" distribution of workload, depending on individual conditions (e.g. new class preps, thorough revisions, team-teaching). Faculty will determine workload and allocations annually in the Statement of Expectations, approved by the Chair and Dean. Normally all faculty should have a total of 100 percent distribution allocated across Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. However, those who have administrative assignments should document these and have the percentage distribution adjustment noted in the annual SOE (revised if necessary) approved by the Chair and Dean.

Evaluation Rankings

In each area of assessment, the annual Review Committee scores according to the following rating and performance guidelines:

Highly Meritorious	9-10 points
Meritorious	7-8 points
Satisfactory	4-6 points
Unsatisfactory	0-3 points

In each of the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service, the scores are multiplied by the pertinent work distribution percentage, and then added together to make a faculty member's total score. Consequently, the maximum total score for an evaluation is 1000 points (100% x 10).

The Annual Review Committee uses these total scores to help determine the overall evaluation of each faculty member as follows:

Highly Meritorious	900-1000 points
Meritorious	700-899 points
Satisfactory	400-699 points
Unsatisfactory	0-399 points

In addition, each faculty member needs to meet the following criteria:

- To be Highly Meritorious, a faculty member must be evaluated as Highly Meritorious in at least two out of three areas (Teaching, Scholarship and/or Service);
- To be Meritorious, a faculty member must be evaluated with a combination of either Highly Meritorious or Meritorious in at least two out of the three areas
- To be Satisfactory, a faculty member must be evaluated with a combination of either Highly Meritorious, Meritorious or Satisfactory in at least two out of the three areas;
- To be Unsatisfactory, a faculty member must be evaluated as Unsatisfactory in at least two out of the three areas.

Consistent with university policies, the deliberations of the Annual Review Committee are confidential. The Committee can only divulge the evaluation and pertinent information to the Chair of the department and to the respective faculty member.

Work Distribution Percentage (Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Principal Lecturers)

Each faculty member's Work Distribution Percentage (formerly called Percentage Allocation of Effort), recorded in the respective Statement of Expectations written prior to the year being evaluated, is to be presented in the Accomplishments Report. The percentage distribution is used by the Committee to help determine the weights by which a faculty member's accomplishments are to be evaluated. As a general rule, the higher the percentage distribution for a particular area, the more that is expected of that faculty member to score highly. The three categories for distribution of effort are as follows: low percentage, medium percentage and high percentage.

The guidelines to be used by the Committee are recorded below:

	<u>Low % Dist.</u>	<u>Medium % Dist.</u>	<u>High % Dist.</u>
Teaching	60-69	70-79	80
Scholarship	0-10	11-20	21-30
Service	10-15	16-20	20-25

Teaching load is to be determined using the Department Workload Assignment Guidelines. Generally, a 3-3 teaching load (or less) is equivalent to a “low” distribution, a 3-4 a “medium” distribution, and 4-4 or above a “high” distribution. However, even a small number of classes can be equivalent to a “high” distribution of workload, depending on individual conditions (e.g. new class preps, thorough revisions, team-teaching). Faculty will determine workload and allocations annually in the Statement of Expectations, approved by the Chair and Dean.

Normally all faculty should have a total of 100 percent distribution allocated across Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. However, those who have administrative assignments should document these and have the percentage distribution adjustment noted in the annual SOE (revised if necessary) approved by the Chair and Dean.

Evaluation Rankings

In each area of assessment, the annual Review Committee scores according to the following rating and performance guidelines:

Highly Meritorious	9-10 points
Meritorious	7-8 points
Satisfactory	4-6 points
Unsatisfactory	0-3 points

In each of the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service, the scores are multiplied by the pertinent work distribution percentage, and then added together to make a faculty member’s total score. Consequently, the maximum total score for an evaluation is 1000 points (100% x 10).

The Annual Review Committee uses these total scores to help determine the overall evaluation of each faculty member as follows:

Highly Meritorious	900-1000 points
Meritorious	700-899 points
Satisfactory	400-699 points
Unsatisfactory	0-399 points

In addition, each faculty member needs to meet the following criteria:

- To be Highly Meritorious, a faculty member must be evaluated as Highly Meritorious in Teaching and Meritorious in at least one of the other two areas (Scholarship and/or Service);
- To be Meritorious, a faculty member must be evaluated no less than Meritorious in at least two out of the three areas;
- To be Satisfactory, a faculty member must be evaluated no less than Satisfactory in at least two out of the three areas;
- To be Unsatisfactory, a faculty member must be evaluated as Unsatisfactory in at least two out of the three areas.

Consistent with university policies, the deliberations of the Annual Review Committee are confidential. The Committee can only divulge the evaluation and pertinent information to the Chair of the department and to the respective faculty member.

Work Distribution Percentage (Instructors)

Each faculty member's Work Distribution Percentage (formerly called Percentage Allocation of Effort), recorded in the respective Statement of Expectations written prior to the year being evaluated, is to be presented in the Accomplishments Report. The percentage distribution is used by the Committee to help determine the weights by which a faculty member's accomplishments are to be evaluated. As a general rule, Instructors are expected to contribute to the department primarily in the area of teaching. The three categories for distribution of effort are as follows: low percentage, medium percentage and high percentage. The guidelines to be used by the Committee are recorded below:

	<u>Low % Dist.</u>	<u>Medium % Dist.</u>	<u>High % Dist.</u>
Teaching	NA	70-79	80-100
Scholarship	0-10	11-20	NA
Service	0-10	11-20	NA

Teaching load is to be determined using the Department Workload Assignment Guidelines. Generally, a 3-4 load is a "medium" distribution, and 4-4 or above a "high" distribution. Faculty will determine workload and allocations annually in the Statement of Expectations, approved by the Chair and Dean.

Evaluation Rankings

In each area of assessment, the annual Review Committee scores according to the following rating and performance guidelines:

Highly Meritorious	9-10 points
Meritorious	7-8 points
Satisfactory	4-6 points
Unsatisfactory	0-3 points

In each of the areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service, the scores are multiplied by the pertinent work distribution percentage, and then added together to make a faculty member's total score. Consequently, the maximum total score for an evaluation is 1000 points (100% x 10).

The Annual Review Committee uses these total scores to help determine the overall evaluation of each faculty member as follows:

Highly Meritorious	900-1000 points
Meritorious	700-899 points
Satisfactory	400-699 points
Unsatisfactory	0-399 points

In addition, each faculty member needs to meet the following criteria:

- To be Highly Meritorious, a faculty member must be evaluated as Highly Meritorious in Teaching
- To be Meritorious, a faculty member must be evaluated Meritorious in Teaching and no less than Satisfactory in any other area noted on their Workload Distribution
- To be Satisfactory, a faculty member must be evaluated no less than Satisfactory in all Workload Distribution areas
- To be Unsatisfactory, a faculty member must be evaluated as Unsatisfactory in Teaching

Consistent with university policies, the deliberations of the Annual Review Committee are confidential. The Committee can only divulge the evaluation and pertinent information to the Chair of the department and to the respective faculty member.

Criteria for Evaluation

I. Teaching, Advising, and Curriculum Development

Faculty performance is evaluated in the three inter-related areas of teaching, advising, and curriculum development, and the evaluation in these areas is done by taking into account the work distribution percentage and the number of teaching, advising, and curriculum development activities listed on the faculty member's Faculty Accomplishments Report. A mini-portfolio of supporting materials (syllabi, curriculum development work, awards and nominations, and the like) should be provided. Faculty are encouraged to provide a narrative informing the Faculty Status Committee (FSC) of how their work meets the criteria listed in this document.

The Annual Review Committee's evaluation of faculty performance in Teaching, Advising, and Curriculum Development must reward activity in the categories listed below. A faculty member can be rewarded for more than one activity in a category.

1. Number of courses taught in the academic year, with faculty receiving credit for unremunerated overload teaching, defined as teaching more courses than required under the Department Workload Assignment Guidelines, or teaching more courses than listed in the person's Statement of Expectations. Size and level of class sections, as well as type of course (primarily for POS majors, other majors, liberal studies, diversity) should also be taken into account.
2. Student opinion survey evaluations, with a comparison of quantitative "scores" to the department averages. (Scores are just one of the many factors that must be considered in the evaluation of the faculty member's teaching; qualitative comments should be considered along with quantitative scores.)
3. Number of course preparations; new course preparations; significant revisions to courses; quality and organization of syllabi.
4. Innovative teaching techniques/ teaching enhancements—for example, adoption of web-based technologies in the classroom; the integration of different media into the classroom; developing methods to promote creative and critical thinking, writing, and oral skills; class participation exercises; service and/or engaged learning projects.
5. Other teaching responsibilities—for example, supervision of independent studies/research projects, supervision and/or planning of internships, etc.
6. Teaching in programs outside of the department (Honors, Applied Indigenous Studies, Ethnic Studies, Environmental Sciences, Environmental Studies, Asian Studies, Latin American Studies, Women's and Gender Studies, Sustainable Communities, and the like)
7. Guest lectures in other faculty's classes.
8. Teaching-related awards or nominations, student mention in Sophomore Survey, senior survey, exit interviews, etc.
9. Presenting in, or attending, teaching workshops.
10. Curriculum development work for the department, college, or university, including new course writing, program planning, and significant course and program revisions.
11. Supervision or advising of Model United Nations, Pi Sigma Alpha, or other student groups.
12. Number of undergraduate advisees.
13. Chair of M.A. and Ph.D. theses/dissertations, especially in the year of completion.
14. Serving on MA and PhD committees
15. Participation on Ph.D. Exam Committees as an Exam Board member or reader and evaluator.
16. Serve as teaching mentor for instructors or new faculty.
17. Letters of recommendation written for undergraduate and graduate students.
18. Other teaching, advising, or curriculum development activities not mentioned above.

Evaluation of Teaching, Advising, and Curriculum Development

The Annual Review Committee's evaluation of Teaching, Advising, and Curriculum Development considers the number and quality of activities listed on the Faculty Accomplishments Report in the context of the work distribution percentage. The parameters listed below are based on the assumption that the faculty member taught the number of courses listed in their Statement of Expectations.

1. Faculty with a high work distribution percentage in the area of teaching, advising, and curriculum development (1) Ranking of Highly Meritorious - must show evidence of having performed work of high quality in at least five recognized activities; (2) Ranking of Meritorious - must show evidence of having performed strongly in four recognized activities; (3) Ranking of Satisfactory - must show evidence of having performed well in two recognized activities. (4) Ranking of Unsatisfactory - given when the faculty member does not teach the courses listed in their Statement of Expectations or performance is substandard.
2. Faculty with a medium work distribution percentage in the area of teaching, advising, and curriculum development (1) Ranking of Highly Meritorious - must show evidence of having performed work of high quality in at least three recognized activities; (2) Ranking of Meritorious - must show evidence of having performed well in two recognized activities; (3) Ranking of Satisfactory - must show evidence of having performed well in one recognized activity. (4) Ranking of Unsatisfactory - given when the faculty member does not teach the courses listed in their Statement of Expectations or performance is substandard.
3. Faculty with a low work percentage distribution in the area of teaching, advising, and curriculum development (1) Ranking of Highly Meritorious - must show evidence of having performed work of high quality in at least two recognized activities; (2) Ranking of Meritorious - must show evidence of having performed well in one recognized activity; (3) Ranking of Satisfactory - must have taught the courses specified in the Statement of Expectations. (4) Ranking of Unsatisfactory - given when the faculty member does not teach the courses listed in their Statement of Expectations or performance is substandard.

II. Scholarship and Research

Faculty's performance in the area of scholarship and research is evaluated by taking into account their accomplishments in light of the work distribution percentage allocated to scholarship and research. A mini-portfolio of supporting materials (copies of materials such as books, manuscripts, articles, book reviews, papers, grants, etc.) should be provided. Faculty are encouraged to provide a narrative which informs the FSC of how their work meets the criteria of this document.

The Annual Review Committee's evaluation of a faculty member's performance in the area of Scholarship and Research considers the following areas:

1. Published Research

Both paper and electronic refereed publications will be given equal weight in the evaluations. If a faculty member judges that a publication s/he has written is equivalent to any of the published research listed below, s/he can explain the "equivalence" to the committee in the accompanying narrative.

A. Refereed Publications

- a. Books: refereed books based on original research/theorizing; refereed edited volumes with new and original contributions.
- b. Refereed journal articles or book chapters.
- c. Texts, anthologies, or readers, with demonstrable changes.

B. Non-refereed Publications

Non-refereed books, book chapters, articles, commentaries, and or review essays; contracted and/or disseminated research reports, applied research reports

C. Other Publications

Book reviews, research and teaching notes (in a non-refereed journal), newspaper or news-magazine articles, other published work related to the discipline.

2. Other Research

Work in Progress:

Contracts in hand; articles submitted for review; book proposals; or other evidence of research activity (e.g. completion of survey, draft of articles to be submitted, etc.).

Professional Conference Work:

Papers presented at academic conferences; chair and/or discussant participant; conference attendance.

Grants:

Research grants applied for (both to external funding agencies and internal funding sources); funded and unfunded; other grant applications; all work in preparation for future research grant applications.

Presentations:

Research presentations; sabbatical presentations, colloquia presentations or invited lectures outside the department or university.

Editorial Work:

Journal editor; book series editor; reviewing manuscripts for journals or publishers.

Professional Development Work:

Relating to research (e.g.: conference organization; attendance at workshops or taking courses/instructions to improve research skills); awards or other recognition for scholarship; other activities related to scholarship or that facilitate further scholarly accomplishments.

Other Research/Scholarship Related Work

3. Qualitative Indicators

Faculty should provide evidence of the quality of research scholarship, including but not limited to: citation of scholarly work in refereed papers, essays and books; reviews of one's scholarly work, such as books, in professional journals; invited chapters in edited collections; invitations to speak at academic meetings, universities, or community groups; reprints of published scholarship in anthologies and edited volumes; awards from professional associations for scholarship; sustained scholarly work for the profession, e.g. reviewing manuscripts for journals and/or publishers; organizing symposia at refereed conferences and meetings; public relations/media or legal expert work directly related to a scholarly field; influence of one's ideas on the work of others, including graduate students.

Evaluation of Scholarship/Research

As stated earlier, the Annual Review Committee's evaluation of Scholarship/Research considers the amount of research/scholarship activities listed on the Faculty Accomplishment Report in the context of their work distribution percentage. No distinction will be made between single authored research or jointly authored research. No distinction will be made between refereed journals.

Appropriate documentation (e.g., copies of all materials, letters of acceptance, copies of book proposals and contracts, letters from contracting agencies regarding dissemination of research reports; outside reviews of manuscripts) must be submitted in one's portfolio to be reviewed by the Annual Review Committee. If appropriate documentation is provided the faculty member can decide the year in which s/he wishes to count a publication (or its equivalent). However, the publication can be used for only one year's evaluation. Refereed books will carry three years credit, with the choice of years up to the faculty member.

Tenure track faculty with a high work distribution in the area of scholarship and research (1) Ranking of Highly Meritorious must show evidence of 1a, 1b or 1c. In case of 1b or 1c, faculty must have either another publication or have performed strongly in two recognized activities in the Other Research or Qualitative Indicators categories. (2) Ranking of Meritorious must show evidence of activity from 2 or 3 under Published Research and two other activities from the Other Research or Qualitative Indicators categories OR three activities from the Other Research or Qualitative Indicators categories (one must involve written work). (3) Ranking of Satisfactory - three activities from Other Research or Qualitative Indicators categories (one must involve written work).

Tenure track faculty with a medium work distribution percentage and Lecturers with a high work distribution percentage in the area of scholarship and research (1) Ranking of Highly Meritorious must show evidence of 1a, 1b or 1c and have performed strongly in one recognized activity in the Other Research or Qualitative Indicators categories. (2) Ranking of Meritorious - must show evidence of activity from 2 or 3 and one other activity from the Other Research or Qualitative Indicators categories OR two activities from the Other Research or Qualitative Indicators categories (one must involve written work). (3) Ranking of Satisfactory - one activity from Other Research category (it must involve written work).

Tenure track faculty with a low work distribution percentage and Lecturers with a medium work distribution percentage in the area of scholarship and research: (1) Ranking of Highly Meritorious must show evidence of 1a, 1b or 1c. (2) Ranking of Meritorious - must show evidence of two activities from the Other Research or Qualitative Indicators categories (one must involve written work) (3) Ranking of Satisfactory - one activity from Other Research category.

Lecturers with a low work distribution in the area of scholarship and research: 1) Ranking of Highly Meritorious must show evidence of 1a, 1b or 1c. (2) Ranking of Meritorious - must show evidence of one activity from the Other Research or Qualitative Indicators categories (3) Ranking of Satisfactory - one activity from Other Research. NOTE: If a lecturer has chosen a ZERO work distribution then no evaluation will be made.

The ranking of unsatisfactory will be given to tenure track faculty when there is no evidence of scholarly activity.

III. Service

Faculty performance in the area of service is evaluated by taking into account the work distribution percentage and the number and type of service activities listed on the faculty member's Faculty Accomplishments Report. Service is defined as a faculty member's contribution within the department, college, university, community, and professional associations. Service to the department involves committee assignments and other substantial responsibilities that advance the work of the department. Service to the college includes college-level committee assignments and other substantial responsibilities that advance the work of the college. Service to the university involves participation in university committees, boards, task forces, and the like. Public or community service involves professional assistance to the public using the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues, e.g., workshops, public forums, unremunerated consultations. Professional service includes serving on committees of professional organizations within the discipline, holding office within a professional association within the discipline, and the like.

Please note that faculty with administrative responsibilities (serving in a coordinator or administrative position inside or outside the department that merits significant reassigned time) must have these responsibilities listed in a separate section, "Administrative Responsibilities," in both the Statement of Expectations and the Faculty Accomplishments Report. These responsibilities will not be evaluated by the department's Faculty Status Committee; they will be evaluated by the faculty member's supervisor.

The Annual Review Committee's evaluation of faculty performance in the area of Service must reward activity in the categories listed below and give recognition to service activities performed for the department. A faculty member can be rewarded for more than one activity in a category. Faculty members are encouraged to provide a narrative that informs the FSC of how their work meets the expectations of this document.

The following types of service activities are recognized:

1. Service to the department, which includes committee assignments (standing, ad hoc, and recruiting committees) and other substantial responsibilities that advance the work of the department and do not fall in the other two evaluation areas. Chairing a committee or working group is given more weight than membership on the committee/working group. For work that falls in the category of "substantial responsibilities that advance the work of the department," these responsibilities must be listed in the Statement of Expectations and described on the Faculty Accomplishments Report.
2. Service to the college, which includes college-level committee assignments and other substantial responsibilities that advance the work of the college and do not fall in the other two evaluation areas. For work that falls in the category of "substantial responsibilities that advance the work of the college," these responsibilities must be listed in the Statement of Expectations and described on the Faculty Accomplishments Report.
3. Service to the university, which includes participation in university committees, boards, task forces, and the like.
4. Community service, which involves professional assistance to the public using the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues, e.g., workshops, public forums, and unremunerated consultations.
5. Professional service, which includes serving on committees of professional organizations within the discipline, holding office within a professional association within the discipline, and the like.

Evaluation of Service

The Annual Review Committee evaluates the area of Service by considering the number of activities listed on the Faculty Accomplishments Report in the context of the work distribution percentage. The following parameters must be used:

Faculty with a high work distribution percentage in the area of service: (1) Ranking of Highly Meritorious - must show evidence of having performed well in at least three recognized activities that carry a heavy workload, one of which is in the department; (2) Ranking of Meritorious - must show evidence of having performed well in two recognized activities, one of which is in the department; (3) Ranking of Satisfactory - must have participated in one recognized activity. (4) Ranking of Unsatisfactory - given when the person did not do any service work.

Faculty with a medium work distribution percentage in the area of service (1) Ranking of Highly Meritorious - must show evidence of having performed well in at least two recognized activities that carry a heavy workload, one of which is in the department; (2) Ranking of Meritorious - must show evidence of having performed well in one recognized activity that carries a heavy workload; (3) Ranking of Satisfactory - must have participated in one recognized activity. (4) Ranking of Unsatisfactory - given when the person did not do any service work.

Faculty with a low work distribution percentage in the area of service: (1) Ranking of Highly Meritorious - must show evidence of having performed well in at least two recognized activities, one of which is in the department; (2) Ranking of Meritorious - must show evidence of having performed well in one recognized activity that carries a moderate workload; (3) Ranking of Satisfactory - must have participated in one recognized activity. (4) Ranking of Unsatisfactory - given when the person did not do any service work.

IV. Sabbatical and Other Leaves

A. Sabbatical

- a. Full Year: A faculty member who is on a full year sabbatical must submit a sabbatical portfolio which includes their sabbatical proposal, a report on what they accomplished during their sabbatical year and any documentation that they can provide about their work during the year. Faculty members should have clearly stated objectives for their sabbatical since this can help the FSC evaluate their accomplishments more easily.

If the faculty member has accomplished what they stated in their sabbatical proposal and provided the necessary documentation, they will have earned a meritorious ranking. To obtain a Highly Meritorious ranking, the tenured or tenure track faculty member must have published an article in a refereed journal or its equivalent. A lecturer must present evidence that demonstrates completion of a substantive activity related to teaching or research. This could include publishing an article in a referred journal or its equivalent, major grant activity, major curriculum development or redesign, or research projects involving teaching.

- b. Half Year: A faculty member who is on a one semester sabbatical should be evaluated for the one semester based on the criteria mentioned above for a full sabbatical. The second semester should then be evaluated based on their distribution of workload and using our annual evaluation document. To obtain a Highly Meritorious ranking, the tenured or tenure track faculty member must have published an article in a refereed journal or its equivalent. A lecturer must present evidence that demonstrates completion of a substantive activity related to teaching or research. This could include publishing an article in a refereed journal or its

equivalent, major grant activity, major curriculum development or redesign, or research projects involving teaching.

B. Leave

A faculty member who is on leave (personal reasons, grants, fellowships, visiting professorships, etc.) must abide by the conditions of the Leave as approved by the Provost. If the leave is granted for scholarly purposes, the faculty member must submit a proposal which clearly states her/his scholarly objectives for the year or semester s/he is on unpaid leave. For evaluation purposes, s/he must submit a leave portfolio which includes a proposal, a report or accomplishments and additional documentation s/he chooses to provide.

If the faculty member has accomplished the conditions of the Leave as approved by the Provost, and has otherwise achieved objectives of an initial proposal as evidenced by providing necessary documentation, s/he will have earned a meritorious ranking. To obtain a Highly Meritorious ranking, the faculty member must have published an article in a refereed journal or its equivalent.

C. Phased Retirement

A faculty member who has signed an agreement for the Phased Retirement Program must complete an annual review document indicating how s/he fulfilled the Duties and Responsibilities outlined in Section C of their Phased Retirement Agreement and Release and/or any subsequent agreements between the faculty member, department chair, and Dean.

If the faculty member has accomplished the Duties and Responsibilities, s/he will have earned a meritorious ranking. To obtain a Highly Meritorious ranking, the faculty member must have successfully accomplished activities beyond those specified in the Statement of Expectations.

Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria

Approved:

March 31, 2010 (Yes-8, No-0, Abstain-2)

Amendments Approved:

March 26, 2014 (Yes-16, No-0, Abstain-0)

Approved by the Office of the Provost:

March 10, 2015

Associate Professor of Practice and Professor of Practice approved March 21, 2018

The Faculty Status Committee makes recommendations to the Chair based upon the criteria specified in this document. The committee ensures that each candidate meets acceptable minimum standards for the University (see ABOR Policy 6-201-H:4 and the NAU Faculty Handbook, “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Sections 7.5 and B.2.1) and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences in teaching, research, and service. This document defines the Department’s indicators of faculty performance to be used in evaluating a candidate and the standards required in each area for promotion and/or tenure.

Evaluation Criteria and Indicators of Faculty Performance

General

To be considered for promotion and/or tenure as a tenure eligible faculty, a candidate must achieve at least the minimum SBS and university criteria for each rank in the three areas under review: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; (2) research, scholarship and/or creative activities; and (3) service to the university community and the profession. In addition to meeting all the minimum requirements in the three areas under review, for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, a candidate must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in either (1) or (2) above as defined by the Department criteria. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements.

For non-tenure eligible faculty holding the rank of Lecturer to be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer, a candidate must achieve the minimum SBS and university criteria for each rank in the following areas: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; and (2) a record of service and professional development related to the teaching role.

Evaluation of a candidate by the Department of Politics and International Affairs Faculty Status Committee shall be confined to the materials included in a faculty member’s Professional Review File that adhere to the requirements set forth by the University’s “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.4.5.2.

In addition, the Department requires external letters of review of the faculty member’s research and scholarly activity for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor. External letter writers will be asked to assess both quantitative and qualitative indicators of research performance. The candidate for promotion and the Department Chair must follow the process of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences for soliciting such letters. Faculty members must agree to waive access to such letters before they are included in the Review File.

By the deadlines specified in the University’s Personnel Action Calendar, a candidate for promotion and/or tenure must submit a carefully organized and complete set of materials (the Professional Review File) that demonstrates the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of their performance in the areas relevant to the rank to which promotion is sought.

Indicators of Performance in the Area of Teaching, Advisement, and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

Besides classroom and/or online instruction, teaching activities include curriculum development and planning that meets the needs of contemporary students; reflects current knowledge, research, and trends in the discipline; and creates an awareness of gender and diversity issues. Advising activities include guiding progress toward graduation and post-graduation planning. Other student-related activities may include (but are not limited to) the following: student mentoring, student research supervision, and supplemental instruction sections.

Teaching, advisement, and student-related responsibilities include:

- Classroom and/or online instruction;
- Creation and updating of course materials;
- Teaching innovations and use of technology;
- Teaching-related publications;
- Supervision of students' scholarly activities and independent studies, including graduate thesis and dissertation work;
- Curriculum development;
- Advisement;
- Other student related activities (student mentoring, student research supervision, supplemental instruction sections, and the like);
- Organization of or participation in professional development activities related to teaching.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File, the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities in this document. The criteria consist of numerous indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate's performance in this area. Candidates do not necessarily have to show activity and success in all of the possible indicators, but the following are offered as a guide for both faculty and the evaluation committee.

EXAMPLES OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IN THE AREA OF TEACHING, ADVISEMENT, AND OTHER STUDENT-RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES

- Sustained pattern of positive evaluations by the chair and peers, as illustrated in annual reviews.
- Sustained pattern of positive evaluations from student opinion surveys and any other documentation believed by the Department/School to be relevant.
- Evidence of effective classroom teaching and/or advising based on comments and letters from students, student exit interviews, examples of student work, and student achievements, including awards, presentations, and/or further education.
- Student/Faculty/University award nominations for excellence in teaching or teaching-related activities.
- Development of new or updated courses on a regular basis, as reflected in the quality of syllabi
- Award of a grant for pedagogical innovation
- Acquisition of new skills to be used in teaching on a regular basis, including new teaching technologies.
- Development and delivery of online courses.
- Evidence of being instrumental in the development or redevelopment of Department/School curriculum and programs.
- Commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience including: directing independent studies, internships, and student research; organizing and/or directing fieldtrips; facilitating student participation at professional meetings;

supervising presentation and/or publication of student scholarly work in professional venues.

- Sustained pattern of commitment to student professional growth through supervision of internships and practicums.
- Service as Undergraduate Coordinator, Graduate Coordinator, or Distance Learning Coordinator.
- Supervising Master's and/or Ph.D. students.
- Career and professional advising of students including letters of recommendation, informal meetings, and organized work sessions.
- Successful publication of instructional/teaching related materials.
- Sustained involvement in professional development activities related to teaching.
- Advising of clubs and organizations that promote student learning, research, creative expression and/or public service.

Indicators of Performance in the Area of Research and Scholarship

Research and scholarship includes activities that lead to original works that expand the knowledge base of the discipline or field, extend the discipline into new fields, and/or improve teaching in the discipline by the dissemination of pedagogic scholarship. These activities include publications related to a candidate's discipline and academic interests and efforts to increase, synthesize, or disseminate knowledge.

Research and scholarship includes:

- Peer-reviewed, professional publications – articles, chapters, and books
- Other non peer-reviewed professional papers, chapters, reviews, and commentaries;
- Applied research reports and projects;
- Grants, contracts, and/or fellowships
- Papers or posters presented at professional meetings, seminars, and/or invited talks; and
- Other tangible works related to the scholarly process germane to a candidate's discipline and field.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File (and the external letters), the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for research, scholarship and/or creative activities in this document. The criteria consist of operational definitions or indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate's performance in this area.

EXAMPLES OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IN THE AREA OF RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

- Publication of peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, and books Publication of non peer-reviewed papers, chapters, and monographs
- Publication of non peer-reviewed commentaries, book reviews, or review essays Editing (or co-editing) a scholarly book or conference proceedings
- Research reports and applied projects.
- Presentation of research at peer-reviewed professional meetings Creation of a database for shared scholarly and/or creative works Creation and dissemination of computer software for scholarly purposes
- Preparation, submission and/or administration of grants for scholarly activities.

ADDITIONAL QUALITY AND IMPACT INDICATORS OF RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

- Citation of scholarly work in refereed papers, essays and books
- Reviews of one's scholarly work, such as books, in professional journals Invited chapters in edited collections

- Invited talks and/or poster sessions at refereed conferences and meetings Research talks given in non-refereed formats, e.g., an invited speaker series Reprints of published scholarship in anthologies and edited volumes
- Public presentations of scholarly work to community groups Awards from professional associations for scholarship
- Sustained scholarly work for the profession, e.g. reviewing manuscripts for journals and/or publishers
- Organizing symposia at refereed conferences and meetings
- Public relations/media or legal expert work directly related to a scholarly field

Indicators of Performance in the Area of Service

Service activities include participation in committee work and administrative tasks within the University (at Department, College, and University levels), leadership and/or participation in the work of the profession, and contributing one's professional expertise to activities involving a variety of organizations, such as schools, industry, and local, state, and federal government agencies.

Service activities include:

- Department/School, College, and University service such as participation on boards, panels, committees, task forces, or the like;
- Leadership at various levels within the University;
- Public or community service, such as workshops, public forums, consultations, and technical assistance to the public that uses the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues; and
- Professional service, such as reviewing journal articles and other publications, reviewing or judging creative works, reviewing grant applications, editing journals, serving on professional committees, holding office within an organization of a candidate's discipline.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File (and the external letters when appropriate), the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for service activities in this document. The criteria consist of operational definitions or indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate's performance in this area.

EXAMPLES OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS IN THE AREA OF SERVICE

- Officer, committee chair or other significant leadership role in an academic or professional association. Chair and/or membership on University or College committee or sub-committee.
- Chair and/or membership on a Department/School committee or subcommittee Editor or editorial board of professional journal
- Receipt of an award for service.
- Professional service to the campus and/or the larger community (may include public issue oriented consulting, volunteer coordination, and technical assistance).
- Volunteer service in elementary and/or secondary schools.
- Volunteer service relevant to scholarly or creative expertise on community boards and commissions.
- Development and presentation of public lectures and workshops. Judge and/or reviewer for University or community events.
- Articles and/or invited opinion essays in community publications based on one's academic expertise. Working with community colleges in curriculum development and transfer policies.
- Session organizer for a professional association. Organizer and host for professional meetings.

- Developing and/or managing websites that support stakeholder interests relevant to scholarly or creative expertise.
- Grant reviewer for funding agencies.
- Editorial board membership and/or manuscript referee.
- Review of book manuscripts for university presses and other scholarly publishers.

Standards for Promotion to Specific Ranks

Associate Professor (a tenure eligible or tenured position)¹

As stated in the NAU “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.2.1, to hold the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must possess a doctorate or other terminal degree in the discipline area. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor at NAU; the faculty member, however, may have prior service credit that was agreed to in writing at the time of hire. To hold the rank of Associate Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.
2. A record that shows a sustained pattern of scholarly activity, with a minimum of five publications in refereed journals or their equivalent since appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor. (An equivalent publication includes a refereed book chapter or a refereed book, the latter of which may count for 3 refereed journal publications.)
3. A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the Department, University, and profession, that illustrate contributions that advance departmental goals and programs. The record should show the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of Professor.

In addition, a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in either (1) or (2) above.

To demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in teaching, advisement, and other student-related activities, a candidate must show a consistent pattern of outstanding performance in teaching, as measured by the quantitative and qualitative criteria and indicators in this document (such as outstanding evaluations, award nominations, quality of syllabi, involvement in advising, etc. as listed above).

To demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in research and scholarship, a candidate must have a minimum of eight publications in refereed journals or their equivalent; the quality of this research should be measured by the criteria and indicators in this document, such as citations, reviews of one’s book(s), invited professional talks, grants and/or awards, or other qualitative indicators as listed above. External letters solicited by the Chair shall evaluate scholarly quality.

Professor (a tenured position)

As stated in the NAU “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.2.1, a faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the written notice of appointment indicated the hire was at the rank of Professor without tenure. Professors are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as an Associate). To hold the rank of Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must have the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

¹ For Faculty appointed at NAU August 2015 and after.

1. A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.
2. A sustained pattern of high-quality research and scholarship, with a minimum of five publications in refereed journals or their equivalent since appointment to the rank of Associate Professor. (An equivalent publication includes a refereed book chapter or a refereed book, the latter of which may count for 3 refereed journal publications.) The quality of such scholarship must be demonstrated through evidence of impact on the discipline (as demonstrated in external letters, citations, invitations to speak or contribute scholarship, awards, etc. as listed above).
3. A record that shows a mix of active and sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the Department (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the Department, College, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty).

In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of Professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (1) or (2) above.

To demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in teaching, advisement, and other student-related activities, a candidate must show a consistent pattern of outstanding performance in teaching, as measured by both quantitative and qualitative criteria and indicators in this document (such as outstanding evaluations, award nominations, grants, etc. as listed above).

To demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in research and scholarship, a candidate must have a minimum of eight publications in refereed journals or their equivalent since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor²; the quality of this research should be measured by the criteria and indicators in this document, such as reviews of one's book(s), citations, invited professional talks, grants and/or awards, or other indicators as listed above. Candidates for the rank of Professor must demonstrate an impact on, and a national or international reputation in, their field of study. External letters solicited by the Chair shall evaluate scholarly quality and impact on the discipline.

Senior Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. Record of a sustained pattern of positive evaluations by peers and Chair.
2. Sustained pattern of positive evaluation from student opinion surveys or other documentation accepted by the department as relevant.
3. Evidence of effective classroom teaching and/or advising based on annual review narratives and other documentation.
4. Acquisition of new skills to be used in teaching on a regular basis.
5. Record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the department, university, and profession that illustrates contributions that advance departmental goals and programs.

² Effective for faculty who reach the rank of Associate Professor after August 2015.

Principal Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Principal Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of Senior Lecturer or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. Record of a sustained pattern of excellence in teaching evaluations by peers and Chair at the Senior Lecturer rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.
2. A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role as evidenced by student opinion survey results while having served at the rank of Senior Lecturer.
3. Evidence of sustained effective classroom teaching and advising based on annual reviews as demonstrated for the years served at the rank of Senior lecturer.
4. Evidence of effective development and delivery of courses.
5. Evidence of commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience such as directing independent studies and student research as noted during the period served at the rank of Senior Lecturer.
6. Record of active and sustained service to the profession and the university community and evidence of leadership within the department.

Associate Professor of Practice (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, professors of practice are primarily responsible for teaching courses, including seminars and independent studies, to undergraduate and graduate students and for modeling the intersection of theory and practice in the relevant field. To be eligible for the rank of Associate Professor of Practice, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record as an Assistant Professor of Practice that demonstrates effectiveness in teaching and other student-related responsibilities.
2. A record that supplies evidence of substantial scholarly, creative, or professional achievements.

Professor of Practice (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, professors of practice are primarily responsible for teaching courses, including seminars and independent studies, to undergraduate and graduate students and for modeling the intersection of theory and practice in the relevant field. To be eligible for the rank of Professor of Practice, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record as an Associate Professor of Practice that demonstrates effectiveness in teaching and other student-related responsibilities.
2. A record that supplies evidence of outstanding scholarly, creative, or professional achievements.

Psychological Sciences

Annual Review

Approved April 19, 2017, by Department

Approved May 3, 2017, by Dean Karen Pugliesi

As per the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS) document (section 1.4.2, approved May 2007), faculty members are evaluated annually. "Faculty performance evaluations will take several forms. For tenured faculty these include annual review and promotion review. For tenure eligible faculty these include annual review, probationary (retention) review, promotion review, and tenure review. For non-tenure eligible faculty these can include annual review, reappointment review, and promotion review." (COFS section 1.4.1; <http://nau.edu/faculty-senate/faculty-resources/>). The goal of the departmental Annual Review Committee (hereafter ARC) is to evaluate and provide feedback regarding the accomplishments of individual faculty members in the areas of Teaching, Advising, and Student-Related Activities, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, and Service. The Annual Review Committee provides an independent recommendation of annual performance to the Chairperson of the Department.

The Committee realizes that faculty make both unique and common contributions to the success of the Department of Psychological Sciences and that these activities can be evaluated by multiple processes, including quantitative methods and qualitative judgment. Composition of the Annual Review Committee is described in section B.1 of the current COFS document. Each spring semester, the Department of Psychological Sciences will elect faculty members to serve on the Annual Review Committee. The ARC will consist of a minimum of four full-time faculty members. The Committee should have at least one full-time faculty member from each instructional rank and represent the existing makeup of faculty.

Workload allocation, annual review, and the Statement of Expectations (hereafter denoted as SOE) are related in that workload assignments are described for each faculty member in the annual Statement of Expectations. The development of the SOE is negotiated between the faculty member and the Department Chair prior to the academic year under review. When there is agreement on the SOE, the faculty member and Department Chair will each electronically approve the document. If a faculty member's workload allocation changes during the review cycle, an updated SOE, as negotiated by the faculty member and the Chair, should be agreed to and appended into FAAR180. Faculty members should denote the change in the review narrative.

A rating of Unsatisfactory may be warranted if, in addition to or independent from the criteria outlined below, documentary materials suggest that the faculty member engaged in conduct that deviated from her/his/their agreement to abide by the University expectations of civility and a safe working environment as found in the NAU Conduct, Ethics, Reporting, and Transparency (CERT) disclosure document (<http://nau.edu/Comptroller/Conflict-of-Interest/Standards/> and http://nau.edu/Diversity-NAU/_Forms/Safe-Working-and-Learning-Environment-Policy/).

The annual evaluation time period is an Academic Year with materials submitted for the Fall and Spring semesters. Faculty members may – and, in fact, frequently do – include workload activities that fall outside of the review cycle; these may include, if it is part of the AY workload, documentation of teaching during the Summer or Winter or documentation of providing service to the Department during the summer when faculty are not on the AY contract. This documentation can provide a more complete portrait of a faculty member's annual activities which, in turn, allows faculty members to bridge different segments of their workload activities (e.g., the writing and submission of a manuscript during the summer based on work with students during the proceeding Fall and Spring semesters in the context of Psychology 485/486c). Thus, a more complete compilation of materials, including work that has been completed outside of the normative Review cycle, allows faculty to document their ongoing workload effort. The actual deadline for

submission of evaluation materials and completion of the Committee's recommendation to the department chair is determined by the Academic Personnel Calendar on the [Provost's website](#).

Following the annual review of the period outlined in the SOE, faculty members receive an evaluation report from the Department's Annual Review Committee). The annual performance of faculty is measured within the context of the SOE; therefore, annual workload assignments must consider approved unit criteria for annual review as well as tenure and/or promotion. These criteria apply to tenure-eligible and tenured faculty as well as non-tenure eligible faculty. Typically, non-tenure eligible faculty members have a different workload allocation relative to tenure-eligible and tenured faculty. Activities will be recorded on the Annual Faculty Performance Report and documentation materials provided to the Committee according to the instructions on the Report. Vita are to be updated annually on FAAR180. All materials will be available to the Department Chair along with a copy of the Annual Review Committee's summary letter of evaluation provided to the faculty member. Following receipt of that report, faculty members will receive a written report from the Department Chair reviewing their contributions in the categories of 1) Teaching, Advising, and Student-Related Activities, 2) Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, and 3) Service. Both reports will be based upon the expectations agreed to in the SOE and this document. Faculty members will be provided an opportunity to respond to both reports as a form of appeal; the timeline for faculty responses is stated in the Academic Personnel Calendar (<http://nau.edu/Provost/Reviews- Tenure/>). The Department Chair will address the concerns raised in the faculty member appeals in his/her evaluation letter. If the faculty member appeals the Department Chair's evaluation, the Dean will address the concerns raised.

Faculty Workload

Total workload for full-time faculty is equivalent to 15 units (or credit hours) per semester. The SOE is based upon patterns of workload within the Department. For instance, some faculty members teach 3 courses one semester (9 units) and 2 courses the other semester (6 units) with mentoring, and supervision of student research throughout the year (3 units); they are heavily involved in research (9 units) and less involved in service (3 units). This equates to 30 units, and the SOE would apportion faculty time as Teaching/Advising/Student-Related activities 0.6, research 0.3, and service 0.1, all summing to 1.0. SOE models in Appendix A provide illustrative examples; other models are possible.

Each year the Annual Review Committee and the Department Chair will evaluate faculty performance within the context of the SOE with the appropriate weights. Weights are determined by the distribution of effort specified in the Statement of Expectations for the faculty member. Some weights may be zero, reflecting no activity in that area for a given year. In assigning faculty workloads, the colleges and departments of NAU recognize that supervision and direction of student research and independent study, administrative assignments, and research/creative activity in the interest of the university, are legitimate partial equivalents of credit-hour workload, and legitimate demands upon a faculty member's time. In the SOEs, "supervision of student research or teaching" denotes faculty involvement in individualized study courses, including PSY 279, 401, 485, 486C, 497, 685, 697, and 699. Typically, faculty members devote 4-5 hours per week (equivalent to a 10% annual allocation in SOE) to the supervision of undergraduate and graduate student research throughout the academic year. The SOEs do not preclude other effort allocations.

Sabbatical Leave

According to COFS 1.7.1, "Sabbatical leave will be for research and other creative endeavors, or professional development." A sabbatical leave should be planned in consultation with the Departmental Chair who must balance sabbatical requests as part of the Department's staffing plan. Per processes outlined in COFS and documented on the Provost's Academic Personnel Calendar, the ARC, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost must approve a sabbatical leave proposal. Faculty members with full-time appointments are eligible for sabbaticals after their sixth consecutive year of service to the Department and University, subject to university and college policies.

Given that faculty workload allocation during the sabbatical leave is typically (100%) devoted to Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, faculty members are evaluated for their productive outcomes of research or scholarship efforts using the criteria specified under Guidelines for Evaluating Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities. Given that individual sabbatical activities must be taken into consideration as specified and approved in the sabbatical proposal, a rating of meritorious will be given if the faculty successfully completes the activities specified in the approved proposal and meets the criteria specified in the meritorious category. If the faculty member's performance during the sabbatical exceeds the criteria specified in the meritorious category, the rating will be highly meritorious for the evaluation period under review. A rating of satisfactory would be given if the faculty member successfully completes the activities specified in the approved proposal, yet does not meet the criteria specified in the meritorious category. An unsatisfactory rating would be given if the faculty member does not fulfill the activities specified in the sabbatical proposal and there is an absence of those criteria that are the minimum for a satisfactory rating in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities.

Annual Review Rating Procedures

Procedures for determining annual review ratings in each of the areas of Teaching, Advising, and Student-Related Activities, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, and Service, and Overall Evaluation are specified by the Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS) in Section 1.4.6.2.1.c.

Every faculty member shall be evaluated in each of the areas specified on a four point scale, with one (1) corresponding to an unsatisfactory rating, two (2) corresponding to a satisfactory rating, three (3) corresponding to a meritorious rating, and four (4) corresponding to a rating of highly meritorious. No faculty member can be rated unsatisfactory overall unless he or she is rated unsatisfactory in one or more areas. Whether a rating of unsatisfactory in one or more areas is a basis for an overall evaluation of unsatisfactory will depend upon the percentage of the faculty member's efforts assigned to those area(s) in the Statement of Expectations and the application of the applicable academic unit criteria to the faculty member's performance.

An evaluation for each of the non-zero weighted areas in the SOE will be performed in light of the above categories and their assigned percentage. The numeric value for the evaluation category for each area of effort is incorporated in an equation for the appropriate SOE in order to generate an overall evaluation of Meritorious, Highly Meritorious, etc., The evaluative score places the faculty member into one of the four overall performance categories. Numerical thresholds for placing faculty into the categories for the overall rating are:

Highly meritorious	=	3.5 or greater
Meritorious	=	2.5 to 3.4
Satisfactory	=	2.0 to 2.4
Unsatisfactory	=	1.9 or less

Guidelines for Evaluation in Each Area of Effort

Evaluation guidelines in Teaching, Advising, and Student-Related Activities, Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, and Service, and Administrative Activities are specified below. Each area contains thresholds for unsatisfactory, satisfactory, meritorious, and highly meritorious. The SOE is designed to clearly delineate faculty work. Activities reasonably could be considered in 1) Teaching and Student-Related Activities, 2) Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, or 3) Service. Such activities can only be counted in one category.

Guidelines for Evaluating Teaching and Student-Related Activities

Based on materials in the Personnel Review File (described in COFS section 1.4.5.2), Committee members independently evaluate each faculty member's Teaching and Student-Related Activities. Each committee member will vote for a rating category (e.g., meritorious, highly meritorious) for Teaching and Student-Related Activities. The list below has activities ranked with their likely merit categories. Accomplishments should be commensurate with the SOE proportion of the faculty member's time that is devoted to this area. The Annual Review Committee and Department Chair should evaluate accomplishments on the basis of quality as well as quantity. The thresholds described below are based on the model in which 60% of a faculty member's time is directed to teaching and student-related responsibilities (as per the statement of expectations). In cases where the SOE proportion is greater or less than 60%, the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair are responsible for adjusting the thresholds accordingly. The Annual Review Committee and Department Chair should evaluate quality of teaching efforts by faculty on the basis of materials in the Personnel Review File. The thresholds presented below are based on the presumption of at least satisfactory quality. Teaching and student-related activities that are judged to be of high or exceptional quality should be given greater weight by the Annual Review Committee and the Department Chair, in the context of thresholds. The qualitative dimension of the evaluation of Teaching and Student-Related Activities is necessarily at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair. Committee members and the Department Chair should utilize appropriate professional/disciplinary standards to evaluate teaching and explain in the memo reporting the evaluation how and on what basis qualitative factors affected the rating. Faculty must submit copies of syllabi and other teaching-related materials in order for the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair to evaluate the quality of work and the accomplishment of the thresholds described below.

Quality teaching refers to excellence in both classroom teaching, and in other teaching and student-related activities that contribute to the educational mission of the Department, College, and/or University. Advising and mentoring may also be counted under this category if so stated in the faculty SOE. The evaluation of teaching is ultimately more subjective than the evaluation of other areas. However, two key domains can be used to guide decisions about teaching excellence.

Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Methodology refers to the idea that sound, effective teaching requires pedagogical methods that promote student learning. Elements of teaching effectiveness include strong and effective communication, knowledge of the subject matter and competency in conveying disciplinary knowledge in ways that maximize student understanding, fairness in the development and grading of work to be evaluated (e.g., exams, term papers), and working to create a supportive classroom environment for all students. Teaching effectiveness and quality of teaching are evidenced by written and numerical student opinion surveys (required per university criteria) and additional information that faculty may provide, including faculty interpretations of student opinion surveys, a narrative description of pedagogy and instructional methods, peer and Department Chair evaluations, unsolicited letters from students, examples of student work, awards or recognition for outstanding teaching, and other documentation related to teaching effectiveness. Sole reliance on student opinion surveys is discouraged because of variable response rates (across both courses and instructors), discrepancies in the ways in which students may approach the completion of surveys such as factors including class size, if the class is a curricular requirement or an elective, and graduate courses with low enrollment. Faculty members also are strongly encouraged to collect assessment information from their students to

gauge learning goal outcomes (e.g., mid-semester evaluations, other forms of determining whether pedagogical methods are successful). These data may be submitted by the faculty member as a complement of her/his/their narrative, or as documentation that the faculty member endeavored to garner information from students that might be helpful to students in mastering course material.

Course Content and Organization refers to the idea that quality teaching depends upon a coherent and intentionally useful approach to teaching disciplinary and interdisciplinary subject material. Course objectives and student learning outcomes should be stated clearly in syllabi and correlate strongly with the course assessment strategies and instruction methods. Other aspects of strong organization include material that is applicable, meets academic standards in the discipline, and appropriate for the level of the course. Course Content and Organization is evidenced by: course syllabi (required); descriptions of projects, papers, and exercises used in class (may be in syllabus but may also be attached as separate documents); descriptions of innovative teaching strategies employed (described in self-evaluation); evidence that courses are revised regularly to remain current (self-evaluation); evidence of appropriate content for course and course level (syllabus and self-evaluation), and additional course materials related to content and organization.

Based on materials in the Personnel Review File (described in COFS section 1.4.5.2) or otherwise documented with the Department, College, or University, Committee members independently and qualitatively evaluate the faculty member's teaching activities using the guidelines below. The Committee's final rating for Teaching is the average of Committee members' scores of materials submitted by the faculty member.

Faculty members are evaluated on their performance for the following indicators for a selection of teaching-related efforts and accomplishments during the review period. Given differentiated activities and professional development needs, it is imperative the following indicators are not established as set criteria for the rating categories, but, rather, are used as guidelines by the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair to evaluate teaching and student-related activities.

To obtain a **Satisfactory** rating the minimum requirements for the academic year are:

- Completion of teaching load stated in the SOE.
- For each Teaching-related activity listed in a faculty member's SOE, all course syllabi and student- opinion-surveys (if available) are uploaded and accessible on FAAR180. This includes documentation for all in-person classes as well as individual student instruction (such as PSY 485, 486c, 497).
- Course syllabi contain at least one Department-approved learning goal that is linked to student learning outcomes and assessment, and all required NAU syllabus components, all of which are judged to be adequate by the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair.
- Documentation the Committee assesses to be a pattern of demonstrated satisfactory teaching effectiveness.

An **Unsatisfactory** rating should be given if there is an absence of those criteria that are specified as the minimum for a Satisfactory, Meritorious, or Highly Meritorious rating. A rating of Unsatisfactory is warranted if documentary evidence suggests minimal or ineffective teaching effectiveness OR the Annual Review Committee judges one or more course syllabi for the year to be incomplete, ineffective, or inappropriate (course content is inappropriate for the course and curriculum, content is inappropriate for the level of the class, material/information used in the course is outdated, instructional methods do not facilitate achievement of course objectives, evaluation/assessment methods are incongruent with course objectives). A rating of Unsatisfactory may be warranted if, in addition to or independent from these criteria, documentary materials suggest that the faculty member engaged in conduct that deviated from her/his/their

agreement to abide by the University expectations of civility and a safe working environment as found in the [NAU Conduct, Ethics, Reporting, and Transparency \(CERT\) disclosure document](#).

To obtain a ***Meritorious*** rating the minimum requirements for the academic year, each faculty member must fulfill minimum requirements for satisfactory performance in addition to:

- Course syllabi and instructional materials are judged to be effective and appropriate by the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair.
- Supportive evidence of additional efforts to enhance or further teaching, which can include items in the Auxiliary Teaching-Related Efforts and Accomplishments list that the committee determines to be evidence of meritorious, such as participation at faculty development teaching workshops.
- Predominantly positive student comments in the NAU student-opinion surveys for the academic year.
- Documentation of quality instruction for undergraduate and graduate student research participation and involvement (if included in workload allocation). The documentation of this activity might include, but not be limited to, a teaching philosophy, course syllabus, details about student research involvement and activities, and tangible outcomes, such as presentations submitted to or presented at local, regional, national, or international conferences.
- Engagement in advisement/mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students.

To obtain a ***Highly Meritorious*** rating the minimum requirements for the academic year, each faculty member must fulfill minimum requirements for meritorious performance in addition to:

- Course syllabi and instructional materials submitted by the faculty member are assessed to be of high-quality, such as comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating by the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair.
- Supportive evidence of additional efforts to enhance or further teaching, which can include items in the list below that the Committee judges to be evidence of highly meritorious, such as participation at faculty development teaching workshops.
- Near uniform positive student comments in the NAU student opinion surveys for the academic year, nomination for a teaching award, or receipt of a teaching award.
- Documentation of high-quality instruction for undergraduate and graduate student research participation and involvement (if included in workload allocation). The documentation of this activity might include, but not be limited to, a teaching philosophy, course syllabus, details about student research involvement and activities, and tangible outcomes, such as presentations submitted to or presented at local, regional, national, or international conferences.
- One new course preparation OR documentation of two other activities from the Auxiliary Teaching- Related Efforts and Accomplishments list.
- Engagement in advisement/mentoring of undergraduate and/or graduate students.

Examples of Auxiliary Teaching-Related Efforts and Accomplishments

- Preparation of a course which has not been taught for three consecutive years and the faculty member dedicates substantial time in the updating and revising of course materials
- Major modifications (substantial changes in materials and assignment(s) of an existing course)
- Creation of new course resource material (handouts, study guides, visuals, models)
- Three or more different course preparations per semester
- Uncompensated development of Web-based courses (i.e., no payment or release time)
- Teaching Junior-Level Writing or Capstone Courses
- Monitoring of Teaching Assistants that extends beyond assignment of responsibilities/tasks and provision of directions
- Extensive writing or research assignments in courses not designated as capstone or junior-level writing
- Thesis chair for two (2) or more active students (List students and describe activities)
- Independent study (three hours minimum-faculty may put this type of work either in teaching or research). (List students and describe activities)

- PSY 297, 401, 485, or 685 supervision (List students and describe activities). Note: research output (posters, publications, etc.) from these activities counts under teaching or research.
- Mentoring/assisting students in preparation of professional papers (faculty may put this type of work either in teaching or research)
- Peer (e.g., other faculty) review reports of teaching based on classroom visits and/or student interviews
- Refereed articles in teaching journal (faculty may put this type of work either in teaching or research)
- Teaching-related grant (faculty may put this type of work either in teaching or research)
- Publishing conference papers related to teaching (faculty may put this type of work either in teaching or research)
- Teaching workshops with active participation
- Preparation and/or delivery of workshops, seminars, training, etc. on teaching and student learning
- Courses taken related to teaching performance and/or pedagogy
- Panel participation in teaching forum
- Evidence of additional assessment regarding learning outcomes

Guidelines for Evaluating Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities

According to the COFS document, “All faculty members are expected to maintain levels of professional activity appropriate to their disciplines to ensure that they will remain current in their disciplines...” The Department values scholarship that is current, programmatic, involves students (when possible) and can or will be presented and published in appropriate and professional outlets.

Based on materials submitted and documented in the Personnel Review File (as described in COFS section 1.4.5.2), ARC members will independently evaluate each faculty member’s research and scholarly activities. Each committee member will make an independent vote for a category rating (e.g., meritorious, highly meritorious) in the area of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities. The lists (below) suggest types of activities/accomplishments commensurate with merit categories, but are not meant to be used in place of qualitative judgment of quality and productivity. Scholarship is an arena in which accomplishments should be commensurate with the proportion of the faculty member’s time dedicated to this area (i.e., as documented in the SOE). The Annual Review Committee and Department Chair should evaluate accomplishments on the basis of quality as well as quantity. The rating guidelines described below are based on the model in which one-fifth (.2) of a faculty member’s time is directed to Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (as per the Statement of Expectations). In cases where the amount of effort in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities is greater or less than one-fifth, the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair are responsible for adjusting rating guidelines to match the SOE.

The Annual Review Committee and Department Chair should evaluate quality as well as quantity of scholarly efforts by faculty on the basis of materials submitted. Greater weight should be given to scholarship that is judged to be of high or exceptional quality (e.g., the impact and the substantial nature of the research). The qualitative dimension of the evaluation of scholarship is necessarily at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair. ARC members and the Department Chair should utilize appropriate professional standards (e.g., such as journal ISI impact factors, rejection rates, rankings, order of authorship, and the contribution to each research product) provided by faculty members in the submission of their review materials. Faculty must submit documentation on FAAR180 of papers presented, published, or accepted for the status of manuscripts in order for the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair to evaluate the quality of scholarly work and the accomplishment of the thresholds described below. The annual evaluation letters will include factors that influenced how evaluations were determined.

Below are some activities in the area of scholarship that often reflect an evaluation as Satisfactory in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities.

- Attendance and participation with professional development workshops or seminars
- Internal grant submission, such as Internal Grant Program or other internal or local research-based grant
- Evidence of an on-going research program
- Poster presentation at a local or regional conference
- Article in a newsletter unrelated to academic psychology
- Invited presentation for a non-academic or community audience
- Non-refereed journal article, typically targeting non-academic or non-professional populations or readerships.

An **Unsatisfactory** rating should be given if there is an absence of those criteria that are specified for a Satisfactory, Meritorious, or Highly Meritorious rating. A rating of Unsatisfactory may be warranted if, in addition to or independent from these criteria, documentary materials suggest that the faculty member engaged in conduct that deviated from her/his/their agreement to abide by the University expectations of civility and a safe working environment as found in the [NAU Conduct, Ethics, Reporting, and Transparency \(CERT\) disclosure document](#).

Below are some activities in the area of Research and Scholarship, when taken together, that often reflect an evaluation as **Meritorious** or **Highly Meritorious** in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities. To reiterate on the main points stated above, the list presented below is not a checklist whereby accomplishing a certain number of listed items ensures the rating of Meritorious or Highly Meritorious. The spirit of ARC's evaluation rests in evaluating the faculty member's entire research program and quality of research for the year, given his or her particular SOE allocation for research.

- Internal grant award, such as Internal Grant Program or other research-based grant
- Subsequent editions of edited volumes (provide details of changes from prior editions)
- Poster presentation at a national, or international conference
- Manuscript submitted for refereed publication
- Professional (e.g., peer- or committee-reviewed) meeting oral presentation
- Published refereed conference proceedings
- Needs assessment, planning, or technical report
- Unremunerated contract for research or professional service
- Submission of external grant proposal
- Invited presentation or lecture in a scholarly context
- Contribution to a book chapter, refereed journal article, grant, or other scholarly effort
- Refereed journal article (accepted/forthcoming or published)
- Book chapter (accepted/forthcoming or published)
- Authored book (accepted/forthcoming or published)
- External research grant award or contract or administration thereof (amount and impact will be taken into consideration during evaluation)
- First edition of edited book (accepted/forthcoming or published)

Guidelines for Evaluating Service

Based on materials submitted to and documented in the Personnel Review File (as described in COFS section 1.4.5.2), Committee members will independently evaluate each faculty member's service activities. Each committee member independently will vote for a category rating (e.g., Meritorious, Highly Meritorious) in the area of Service. Service activities and guidelines for evaluation categories are listed below. Credit for service efforts is based on active participation in Department, College, University, and broader professional and community efforts (committees, task forces, editorial boards, pro bono consultations, etc.). Faculty are to document a list of all memberships as well as their degree of effort on activities and tasks performed in relation to each listed service role. Activities in categories below may be considered for higher evaluations with

appropriate documentation of a greater workload (e.g., reviewing a large number of NAU Intramural Grants, reviewing a large number of manuscripts submitted to journals).

Service, as with Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, is an arena in which the quantity of effort should be commensurate with the proportion of the faculty member's time dedicated (by weight of SOE) to this area.

The guidelines described below are based on the model in which one-fifth (.2) of a faculty member's time is directed to service efforts (as per the Statement of Expectations). In cases where the amount of effort in service is greater or less than one-fifth, the Annual Review Committee and Departmental Chair are responsible for adjusting the rating guidelines accordingly. As with all aspects of faculty workload, the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair will assess quality of performance of these service indicators.

The Statement of Expectations will outline minimum responsibilities and specific additional goals for the review cycle for administrative assignments (e.g., Graduate Coordinator, buy-out from another department or unit on campus), which partially are counted under Service. Given that administrative assignments (e.g., special committees, PSY 101 Coordinator, Graduate Coordinator) have clearly articulated responsibilities, faculty in these roles will be assessed relative to their performance on these activities by persons or bodies outside of the Annual Review Committee. Non-administrative related service activities are assessed following the criteria specified below.

Service activities in the SOE are negotiated with the Chair and constructed at a level, that, if completed, would lead to a rating of Satisfactory. To obtain a rating of Meritorious or Highly Meritorious, a faculty member would need to demonstrate that her/his/their service activity exceeds this minimum level of service.

To obtain **Satisfactory** in Service.

1. Active Departmental, College, and/or University committee membership commensurate with SOE effort toward Service (e.g., attend Department meetings and participate in Departmental governance).
2. See Appendix B for typical SOE allocations for specific committees.

An **Unsatisfactory** rating should be given if there is an absence of those criteria that are specified for a Satisfactory, Meritorious, or Highly Meritorious rating.

Faculty should provide evidence in their annual review materials if they wish to have a Service activity treated differently than described above. Unusual committee effort should be rewarded but this needs to be documented by the faculty member. In order for activities to count in the category of Service, service activities cannot be ones that are remunerated.

Below are some activities that, when taken together, often reflect an evaluation as Meritorious or as Highly Meritorious.

- Department, College, and/or University Committee membership above that commensurate with SOE effort for Satisfactory in Service – Department
- Curriculum or program development efforts not encompassed by committee memberships or administrative release
- Professional organization participation
- Professional organization, panel organizer at conference
- Technical reports or manuals (professional or public service)
- Serving on professional public service boards, task forces, or committees
- Preparations of workshops, seminars, training, etc. for public service or profession
- Chairing professional public service boards, task forces or committees
- Journal referee, reviewing manuscripts for a journal

- Unpaid review of scholarly book or textbook manuscript
- Grant proposal reviewer-intramural or local funding source
- Advisor to university organization (includes Psi Chi)
- Other activities not covered above
- Conference organizer
- Professional organization officer
- Unusual effort as chairperson or member of a university body with significant charge
- Grant proposal reviewer
- Journal editorial board
- Journal editor/associate editor
- Committee chairperson for a major Department, College or University committee (other than administrative assignments with release time which is evaluated independently by the Chair)

If applicable, the SOE will outline minimum responsibilities and specific additional goals for the year for coordinator assignments (Graduate Coordinator, PSY 101 Coordinator), which may be partially counted under Teaching and Student-related responsibilities or may be distinguished as a separate evaluative category (e.g., service). Given that the coordinator roles have clearly articulated responsibilities, faculty members in these roles are assessed relative to their performance on these activities. In some circumstances (e.g., administrative responsibilities associated with the duties of the Associate Chair, Graduate Coordinator), the Chairperson of the Department provides that portion of the faculty member's review. For example, if the SOE for Associate Chair duties is 30%, the ARC defers evaluation on this portion of the SOE to the Chair. For those portions of the annual review under the purview of the ARC, if the individual fulfills these activities and responsibilities in a highly competent manner and receives a favorable review from colleagues in the yearly evaluations, he/she will earn a meritorious rating at the minimum. If the individual does not accomplish the specified activities and responsibilities in a competent manner and receives an unfavorable review from colleagues in the yearly evaluations, he/she will earn an unsatisfactory rating for the coordinator-related student responsibilities. Non- coordinator related teaching activities should be assessed following the Teaching criteria specified above. The Annual Review Committee and the Department Chair will make an informed decision to determine the final rating for Teaching and Student-related Activities taking into account the individual's performance for the specialized assignment and overall teaching activities.

The following was approved by Psychology Department March 26, 2013

Appendix A

Model #1

Annual Review (1.0) = teaching/advising/student-related activities (0.6) + Scholarship (0.2) & Service (0.2). This model reflects a 3/3 teaching load with research expectations. All weights add to 1.0. Tenured faculty members with research expectations and a typical level of service often have this effort allocation.

Model #2

Annual Review (1.0) = teaching/advising/student-related activities (0.5 for courses and 0.1 for supervision of student research) + Scholarship (0.3) & Service (0.1). This model reflects a 3/2 course load and reassigned time (equivalent to one course) for scholarship that involves students. Research active faculty who involve students in their research and have a typical level of service often have this effort allocation. All weights add to 1.0.

Model #3

Annual Review (1.0) = teaching/advising/student-related activities (0.5 for courses and 0.1 for supervision of student research) + Scholarship (0.2) & Service (0.2). This model reflects a 3/2 course load and reassigned time (equivalent to one course) for scholarship that involves students. Research active faculty who involve students in their research and have a relatively high level of service often have this effort allocation. All weights add to 1.0.

Model #4

Annual Review (1.0) = teaching/advising/student-related activities (0.3 for courses, 0.1 for supervision of student research, and 0.1 for student-related activities associated with coordination responsibilities) + Scholarship (0.2) & Service (0.3). This model reflects departmental coordinator roles (i.e., graduate program coordinator, clinic director, and Psychology 101 coordinator) with a 2/1 course load, reassigned time (equivalent to one course) for scholarship that involves students, and reassigned time (equivalent to two courses) from teaching to administer these programs.

Model #5

Annual Review (1.0) = teaching/advising/student-related activities (0.8) + Scholarship (0.0) & Service (0.2). This model reflects faculty who teach four classes per semester and do not devote time to scholarship. In this case scholarship is weighted at zero. This would be an appropriate model for non-tenure eligible faculty or a tenured faculty member without a research program.

As specified in the Psychology Department promotion and tenure document, there are research expectations for faculty working toward tenure and/or promotion. Thus, model #5 is inappropriate for those who wish to be considered for promotion or tenure.

Model #6

Annual Review (1.0) = teaching/advising/student-related activities (0.5) + Scholarship (3.0) & Service (0.2). This model reflects a 3/2 course load and reassigned time (equivalent to one course) for scholarship (for example, an external grant buyout would provide 10% of a faculty member's salary to buy out a single 3-credit course). Tenured faculty members, with a relatively high level of research expectations, and have a relatively high level of service often have this effort. All weights add to 1.0.

Model #7

Annual Review (1.0) = teaching/advising/student-related activities (0.7) + Scholarship (0.2) & Service (0.1). This model reflects a 4/3 teaching load with typical research expectations. All weights add to 1.0. Faculty who are research active but with a reduced level of service would have this effort allocation. All weights add to 1.0.

Model #8

Annual Review (1.0) = teaching/advising/student-related activities (0.6 for courses and 0.1 for supervision of student research) + Scholarship (0.2) & Service (0.1). This model reflects a 3/3 course load and reassigned time (equivalent to one course) for scholarship that involves students. Research active faculty who involve students in their research and have a reduced level of service often have this effort allocation. All weights add to 1.0.

Appendix B

The following SOE allocations exemplify typical percentages for some Departmental Committees. These percentages are intended to provide guidance to faculty in determining SOE workloads for the AY and meeting performance expectations in Service Activities. Percentages are based on the expectation that each 5% SOE Service allocation should result in approximately two hours of weekly effort for the academic year, including meetings, preparation, assignments, etc. Most committees have a concentrated effort during specific times of the semesters. Committee workloads differ from one academic year to the next; efforts should be documented in the Annual Faculty Performance Report. (These examples do not include service and administrative activities with course releases.)

SOE Percentage (AY)	Average minutes per week (AY)	Hours per semester (AY)
1%	30 minutes	6 (12 for year)
5%	2 hours	30 (60 for year)
10%	4 hours	60 (120 hours for year)

Department of Psychological Sciences Committees

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee	5%
Graduate Curriculum Committee	5%
Search Committee	5%
Chair/Co-Chair Search Committee	10%
Annual Review Committee/Faculty Status Committee	7.5%
Chair Annual Review Committee/Faculty Status Committee	10%
Committees that meet once or twice a year	<5%
Advisor to Departmental Student Organizations	Variable % according to documented workload
Ad Hoc Committees	Variable % according to documented workload

Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria

Approved May 8, 2008 by Department

Revised at request of Dean in 08-09 and re-revised in Fall 2009

Approved April 28, 2010 by Department

Revised April 8, 2011

The Department of Psychology Faculty Status Committee reviews department recommendations for tenure and/or promotion and makes recommendations to the SBS Promotion and Tenure Committee based upon the criteria specified in this document. The committee ensures that each candidate meets acceptable minimum standards for the University (see ABOR Policy 6-201 and the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service" [CoFS] document, Sections 1.2 and 1.4) and the College (see SBS P&T Document) in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; research, scholarship, or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline; and service to the university community and the profession. As stated in the CoFS (Section 1.4.6.1.3), "in making promotion decisions, the entire record of the faculty member, including accomplishments at other institutions and other professional activity, shall be considered." This document defines the Department's indicators of faculty performance to be used in evaluating a candidate, and the standards required by the Department in each area for promotion and/or tenure.

Each fall semester, the Psychology Department will elect faculty members to serve on the Annual Review committee (ARC) and the Faculty Status Committee (FSC). The ARC will consist of a minimum of three full-time tenure-stream faculty members and must have at least one full-time faculty from each professorial rank. Typical membership includes 5 faculty members. The membership of the FSC is limited to tenured faculty members and must have at least one full-time faculty from each professorial rank. Membership of the two committees can overlap, with the exception that FSC membership is limited to tenured faculty.

I. Evaluation Indicators of Faculty Performance

A. General

To be considered for promotion and/or tenure as a tenure eligible faculty, a candidate must achieve at least the minimum Department of Psychology, SBS and University criteria for each rank in the three areas under review: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; (2) research and scholarship; and (3) service to the university community and the profession. In addition to meeting all the minimum requirements in the three areas under review, for promotion to the rank of Professor, a candidate must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in either (1) or (2) above as defined by College and Department criteria. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements.

For non-tenure eligible faculty holding the rank of Lecturer to be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer, a candidate must achieve the minimum Department of Psychology, SBS, and university criteria for each rank in the following areas: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; and (2) a record of service and professional development related to the teaching role. For non-tenure eligible faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professor of Practice to be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor of Practice, a candidate must achieve the minimum Departmental, SBS, and university criteria for each rank in the following areas:

(1) teaching and other student-related responsibilities; and (2) scholarly or professional achievements. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements. For promotion to other non-tenure eligible faculty positions, see the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2.

Evaluation of a candidate by the Department of Psychology Faculty Status Committee shall be confined to the materials included in a faculty member's Professional Review File that adhere to the requirements set forth by the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.4.5.2. By the deadlines specified in the University's Personnel Action Calendar, a candidate for promotion and/or tenure must submit a carefully organized and complete set of materials (the Professional Review File) that demonstrates the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of his/her performance in the areas relevant to the rank to which promotion is sought.

The Department of Psychology promotes excellence in teaching, scholarly activities, and service. In supporting this goal, the Department recognizes that an innovative and dynamic faculty should develop performance standards that foster both individual and departmental success. The Department of Psychology at Northern Arizona University has as its major goal providing challenging and enriching undergraduate and graduate programs through the efforts of talented faculty who are dedicated to university teaching. Toward that end it offers courses covering the entire range of modern psychology. Faculty able to contribute to this broad coverage will by definition bring a multitude of backgrounds, strengths, and visions of the future. An evaluation process of their contributions in teaching, advising, research or scholarship, and service must acknowledge each person's strengths and contributions. It is imperative that the FSC committee and departmental chairperson evaluate the candidate's accomplishments in relation to the candidate's workload allocations for the period under consideration. Therefore, promotion and tenure decisions will be made on an individual basis, taking into account the specific mission of the Department of Psychology and the unique assignments and performance of each person.

B. Indicators of Performance in the Area of Teaching, Advisement, and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

The candidate, at a minimum, must demonstrate a record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities. The evidence that is provided must demonstrate both the quality and quantity of the candidate's performance in this area in the context of the responsibilities found in his/her statement of expectations. The quantity of the evidence provided for each indicator should reflect its importance in affecting overall effectiveness in this area. The candidate is responsible for explaining this importance. In addition, the candidate is responsible for explaining why his/her performance on the indicators is offered as evidence of a quality performance.

Teaching, advisement, and student-related responsibilities may include:

- Classroom and/or online instruction;
- Creation and updating of course materials to reflect current knowledge, research, and trends in the discipline;
- Create an awareness of diversity issues;
- Teaching innovations;
- Teaching-related presentations and publications;
- Supervision of students' scholarly activities including undergraduate research, graduate thesis, and dissertation work;
- Supervision of students' independent studies;

- Curriculum development;
- Advising activities include guiding progress toward graduation and post-graduation planning;
- Other student related activities (student mentoring, supplemental instruction sections, etc.);
- Organization of or participation in professional development activities related to teaching.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File, committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities in this document.

Examples of Departmental Indicators for the Area of Teaching, Advisement, and Other Student-- Related Responsibilities

- A sustained pattern of positive evaluations by the chair, peers, and from student opinion surveys and any other documentation specified by the Department
- Evidence of effective classroom instruction and/or advising based on annual review narratives, letters from students, exit interviews, examples of student work, and other forms of documentation
- Development of new courses
- Update courses on a regular basis
- Student/faculty/university award nominations for excellence in teaching or teaching---related activities
- Award of a grant for pedagogical innovation
- Acquisition of new skills to be used in teaching on a regular basis
- Development and delivery of online courses
- Evidence of being instrumental in the development or redevelopment of Department programs
- Commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience including: directing independent studies and student research; organizing and/or directing fieldtrips; facilitating student participation at professional meetings; supervising presentation and/or publication of student scholarly work in professional venues
- A sustained pattern of commitment to student professional growth through supervision of fieldwork placements and practica.
- Supervising Master's and/or Ph.D. students
- Career and professional advising of students including letters of recommendation, informal meetings, and organized work sessions
- Successful publication of instructional/teaching related materials
- Sustained involvement in professional development activities related to teaching
- Student---related duties and responsibilities of the Coordinator of the Graduate Programs should be documented and evaluated relative to the Duties for the Coordinator of the Graduate Programs Department of Psychology document.
- Student---related duties and responsibilities of the Introduction to Psychology (PSY 101) Coordinator should be documented and evaluated relative to the Duties for the Coordinator of the Introduction to Psychology document.
- Student---related duties and responsibilities of the Health Psychology Center Director should be documented and evaluated relative to the Health Psychology Center Director Duties document.

Faculty being considered for promotion should include the following materials in their dossier, as appropriate*:

- a. Syllabi, sample examinations, handouts, etc., for all courses for period under consideration (graduate and undergraduate) that have been taught.
- b. Class supplementary materials
- c. Development of new course materials
- d. Grants from NAU (e.g., e-learning, Office of the Provost, Office of the President) for development of new didactic methods of materials
- e. Innovative classroom projects
- f. Workshops attended that address issues of teaching; membership in professional organizations, (e.g., The Teaching of Psychology)
- g. Participation in activities that foster the development of new and better teaching methods and activities
- h. The number of theses, dissertations, and independent study projects that they have been involved in during the period of time under consideration for promotion and tenure decisions
- i. The number of student advisees per year that a person counsels and advises
- j. Faculty may also request that the Faculty Status committee observe a lecture as evidence of teaching expertise but this form of peer evaluation is optional.

**This list is not exhaustive and others items and materials that faculty members feel should be evaluated as related to their accomplishments and contributions should be included in their dossier, along with supportive comments as to their importance.*

C. Indicators of Performance in the Area of Research and Scholarship

The evidence of a candidate's scholarship and research that is provided must demonstrate both the quality and quantity of the candidate's performance in this area in the context of the responsibilities found in his/her statement of expectations. The quantity of the evidence provided for each indicator should reflect its importance in documenting overall effectiveness in this area. The candidate is responsible for explaining this importance. In addition, the candidate is responsible for explaining why his/her performance on the indicators is offered as evidence of a quality performance. Research and scholarship are activities that lead to tangible, original works that expand the knowledge base of Psychology or related-fields, extend the discipline into new fields of application, and/or improve teaching in Psychology by the dissemination of pedagogic scholarship. Dissemination of scholarship is an essential component of this process, particularly via peer-reviewed venues.

Research and scholarship may include:

Professional publications, papers, presentations, books, chapter contributions to books, monographs;

Refereed scholarly work accepted for publication;

Grant and contract work, including applied projects and grant applications;

Applied research reports and other professional contributions;

Papers and research findings presented at professional meetings; and

Other tangible works related to the scholarly process germane to the discipline of psychology.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File, the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for research and scholarship in this document. Please note: Scholarship work refers to work within the discipline of Psychology.

Examples of Departmental Indicators for Research and Scholarship

- Successful publication of journal articles, book chapters, research/technical reports, applied project reports, and other peer-reviewed works
- Presentation of research at peer-reviewed professional meetings
- Invited talks and/or poster sessions at refereed conferences and meetings
- Publication relevant to scholarly expertise in non-peer reviewed outlets
- Editing (or co-editing) a scholarly book or conference proceedings
- Creation of a database for shared scholarly work
- Creation and dissemination of computer software for scholarly purposes
- Research talks given in non-refereed formats, e.g., an invited speaker series
- Preparation, submission and/or administration of grants for scholarly activities
- Awards from professional associations for scholarship and research-related activity
- Public presentations of scholarly work to community groups
- Citation of scholarly work in refereed papers, essays and books
- Reprints of published scholarship in anthologies and edited volumes

Faculty being considered for promotional decisions should include the following items and/or documentation, as appropriate, in their professional dossiers**:

- a. Publications in all journals, both within and external to the discipline
- b. Books, chapters in books, monographs, etc.
- c. All presentations (panel discussions, symposia, lectures, slides, posters, etc.) at professional meetings
- d. Reports and professional projects that involve psychology-related activities, including any types of interdisciplinary projects
- e. Grants that have been submitted, that are ending, or that have been funded should be identified (both intramural and extramural).
- f. Workshops, symposia, other developmental activities (related to scholarly work) that have been attended
- g. Independent research projects in which the faculty member has taken an active role in working closely with a student (undergraduate or graduate)

***This list is not exhaustive, and others items and materials that the faculty member feels should be evaluated as related to their accomplishments and contributions, should be included in their dossier, along with supportive comments as to their importance.*

D. Indicators of Performance in the Area of Service

The evidence that is provided must demonstrate both the quality and quantity of the candidate's performance in this area in the context of the responsibilities found in his/her statement of expectations. The quantity of the evidence provided for each indicator should reflect its importance in affecting overall effectiveness in this area. The candidate is responsible for explaining this importance. In addition, the candidate is responsible for explaining why his/her performance on the indicators is offered as evidence of a quality performance.

Service activities may include:

- Department, College, and University service such as participation on boards, panels, committees, task forces, or the like;
- Leadership at various levels within the University;
- Public or community service, such as workshops, public fora, and consultations that uses the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues; and
- Professional service, such as reviewing journal articles and other publications, reviewing grant applications, editing journals, serving on professional committees, holding office within an organization of a candidate's discipline

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File, the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for service activities in this document.

Examples of Departmental Indicators for the Area of Service

- Officer, committee chair or other significant leadership role in an academic or professional association
- Chair and/or membership on University or College committee or sub---committee
- Chair and/or membership on a Department committee or subcommittee
- Receipt of an award for service based on expertise in the field of Psychology
- Professional service to the campus and/or the larger community (may include public issue oriented consulting, volunteer coordination, and technical assistance)
- Volunteer service in elementary and/or secondary schools (relevant to scholarly expertise)
- Volunteer service relevant to scholarly expertise on community boards and commissions
- Development and presentation of public lectures and workshops based on scholarly expertise
- Judge and/or reviewer for University or community events based on scholarly expertise
- Articles and/or invited opinion essays in community publications based on one's academic expertise
- Working with community colleges in curriculum development and transfer policies
- Session organizer for a professional association
- Organizer and host for professional meetings
- Advising of clubs and organizations that promote student learning, research, and/or public service
- Grant reviewer for funding agencies
- Editorial board membership and/or manuscript referee
- Unremunerated review of book manuscripts for university presses and other scholarly publishers
- Developing and/or managing websites (journal and/or scholarly group listserv) relevant to scholarly expertise
- Administration---related duties and responsibilities of the Coordinator of the Graduate Programs should be documented and evaluated relative to the Duties for the Coordinator of the Graduate Programs
- Department of Psychology document.
- Administration---related duties and responsibilities of the Introduction to Psychology (PSY 101) Coordinator should be documented and evaluated relative to the Duties for the Coordinator of the
- Introduction to Psychology document.
- Administration---related duties and responsibilities of the Health Psychology Center Director should be documented and evaluated relative to the Health Psychology Center Director Duties document.

Faculty being considered for promotional decisions should include the following items in their professional dossiers***:

- a. List of committees served on within the department since appointment. Identify those committees on which one has served as chair.
- b. List of all college and university committees (e.g., Graduate Council, Institutional Research, Faculty Senate, SBS Promotion & Tenure, University Planning, etc.). Identify those committees on which one has served as chair.
- c. Description of community involvement related to the discipline, workshops, lectures, that have been presented to a community agency or any types of contribution to the community at large.

****This list is not exhaustive and others items and materials that the faculty member feels should be evaluated as related to their accomplishments and contributions should be included in their dossier, along with supportive comments as to their importance.*

II. Standards for Promotion to Specific Ranks

A. Associate Professor (a tenure eligible or tenured position)

As stated in the NAU “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.2.1, to hold the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must possess a doctorate or other terminal degree in the discipline area. A faculty member may not be promoted to this rank unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured Associate Professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor at NAU; the faculty member, however, may have prior service credit that was agreed to in writing at the time of hire.

To hold the rank of Associate Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record that shows substantial evidence of a sustained pattern of high quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities since appointment at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors listed in IB (p. 3) of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate's courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Evidence that the candidate's courses contribute to the mission of the academic unit is also important. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer valid evidence when used in conjunction with other material.
2. A record that shows a sustained pattern of research and scholarly activity related to the faculty member's discipline since appointment at NAU. A sustained pattern of scholarly activity is defined as having an active research agenda (for example, equivalent of three refereed journal articles since appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor) in the discipline prior to the application for promotion and the production of the types of scholarship described below. The demonstrated scholarly activity is determined by such factors listed in IC (pp. 4-5) of this document.
 - a. Primary evidence of scholarship includes published work in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters or scholarly books published by respected academic publishers, and grants. Presentations at regional and national meetings and

manuscripts accepted for publication supplement a record of published work. Minor work, such as book reviews, or incomplete work, such as working papers, are considered evidence of professional activity, but are not alone sufficient for promotion. For evaluation of a candidate's published work, the department relies on the judgment of its own members, the faculty member, and discipline specific ratings.

3. A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the University community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of Professor.
 - a. Membership on a variety of departmental, college, and university committees is expected. Assistant Professors are expected to primarily focus their service contributions to departmental committees. However, it is expected that Assistant Professors will also serve, to a lesser extent, on college, and/or university committees.

The candidate must demonstrate satisfactory service for each year prior to the year of application. Satisfactory service is to be determined by such factors as listed in ID (p. 6) of this document.

B. Professor (a tenured position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.1, a faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the written notice of appointment indicated the hire was at the rank of Professor without tenure. Professors are faculty members who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as an Associate).

To hold the rank of Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must have the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities since submission of materials for last promotion or appointment at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors as listed in IB (p. 3) of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate's courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Evidence that the candidate's courses contribute to the mission of the academic unit is also important. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer one indicant when used in conjunction with other material.
 - b. The Associate Professor must have maintained a record of pedagogical excellence, continued to develop as a teacher, developed innovative course materials, participated in graduate education through service on thesis committees and successfully chaired completed theses. Awards or recognition for teaching or mentoring, and other indicators of outstanding instructional contributions enhance a candidate's record.
2. A sustained pattern of high-quality research and scholarship related to the faculty member's discipline since submission of materials for last promotion or appointment at NAU (for example, equivalent of three refereed journal articles since appointment to the

rank of Associate Professor). Performance in this area is determined by such factors listed in IC (pp. 4-5) of this document.

- a. Primary evidence of scholarship includes published work in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters or scholarly books published by respected academic publishers, and grants. Presentations at regional and national meetings and manuscripts accepted for publication supplement a record of published work. Minor work, such as book reviews, or incomplete work, such as working papers, are considered evidence of professional activity, but are not alone sufficient for promotion. For evaluation of a candidate's published work, the department relies on the judgment of its own members, the faculty member, and discipline specific ratings.
 - b. The Associate Professor must have maintained a record of high quality, and scholarly contributions. Evidence of outstanding scholarship, including evidence supporting the significance of a candidate's contributions to the literature, typically include articles in respected peer reviewed journals, books, book chapters in scholarly edited works, grant proposals receiving external funding, invited scholarly presentations, and special honors or awards. In assessing the quality of the work under consideration, the committee will make a judgment following their own close readings, and then weigh these reactions against other evidence—contemporary reviews and citations in other scholarly work. Scholarship may include significant conceptual and theoretical works as well as quantitative and qualitative research. Evidence of scholarship may also be visible in other professional activities, for example, instruction and service activities that are informed by the relevant professional and scholarly literature. Other recognized forms of professional activity include presenting papers at professional meetings; serving on editorial boards of scholarly journals; holding offices in professional organizations; and participating in workshops and seminars.
3. A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's Department (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the Department, College, and/or the University, and to mentor junior faculty since appointment to Associate Professor).
 - a. Membership on a variety of departmental, college, and university committees is expected, including leadership responsibilities. Associate Professors are expected to take on increasing responsibilities in committees, such as chairing department committees, chairing and/or serving on college, and/or university committees or making contributions to the administration of programs. Ongoing service to the profession is expected from candidates for promotion to Full Professor. Examples of service to the profession include participation in professional organizations (serving on a committee, organizing a conference, etc.) and serving as a reviewer for refereed journals. Evidence of outstanding service contributions for example, service awards, appointment to journal editorships, or election as an officer of a professional organization, further attest to the quality of university, community, and professional service.
 4. In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of Professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (1) or (2) above as defined by the criteria and indicators in this document.
 - a. The faculty performance in research/scholarship must exceed the performance level required as a minimum. The faculty member must demonstrate outstanding, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in research/scholarship. The faculty member's reputation in research should extend beyond the university. Primary evidence of scholarship includes several published works in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters

or scholarly books published by respected academic publishers, and grants. Presentations at national or international meetings and manuscripts accepted for publication supplement a record of published work. Minor work, such as book reviews, or incomplete work, such as working papers, are considered evidence of professional activity, but are not alone sufficient for promotion. For evaluation of a candidate's published work, the department relies on the judgment of its own members, the faculty member, and discipline specific ratings.

- b. The faculty performance in teaching/advising/student-related responsibilities must exceed the performance level required as a minimum. Outstanding accomplishments include demonstration of superior ability and interest in stimulating in students a genuine desire for learning. Evidence of outstanding teaching may include indications of the success of students, student evaluations, publication of textbooks or teaching materials, active participation in organizations devoted to teaching, and so forth.

C. Senior Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record of substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors listed in IB (p. 3) of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate's courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer valid evidence when used in conjunction with other material.
2. A record of service and professional development related to the teaching role.
 - a. Primary evidence of professional development and service includes participation at teaching seminars, teaching conferences, mentoring students, and student-related activities, such as serving as an advisor for Psi Chi, the national honorary society for psychology.

D. Principal Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Principal Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of Senior Lecturer or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record of sustained excellence at the Senior Lecturer rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors listed in IB (p. 3) of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate’s courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer valid evidence when used in conjunction with other material.
2. A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role.
 - a. Primary evidence of professional development and service includes participation at teaching seminars, teaching conferences, mentoring students, and student-related activities, such as serving as an advisor for Psi Chi, the national honorary society for psychology.

E. Associate Professor of Practice (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.2.2, professors of practice are primarily responsible for teaching courses, including seminars and independent studies, to undergraduate and graduate students and for modeling the intersection of theory and practice in the relevant field. To be eligible for the rank of Associate Professor of Practice, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record of sustained excellence as an Assistant Professor of Practice in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors listed in IB (p. 3) of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate’s courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer valid evidence when used in conjunction with other material.
2. A record that supplies evidence of professional achievements.
 - a. Primary evidence of professional achievement includes participation and leadership at workshops and conferences related to the practice of psychology. Published work in journals, book chapters or scholarly books, and grants related to psychological practice are also considered. Presentations at regional and national meetings and manuscripts accepted for publication supplement a record of published work. Minor work, such as book reviews, or incomplete work, such as working papers, are considered evidence of professional activity, but are not alone sufficient for promotion. For evaluation

of a candidate's published work, the department relies on the judgment of its own members, the faculty member, and discipline specific ratings.

F. Professor of Practice (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, professors of practice are primarily responsible for teaching courses, including seminars and independent studies, to undergraduate and graduate students and for modeling the intersection of theory and practice in the relevant field. To be eligible for the rank of Professor of Practice, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record as an Associate Professor of Practice that demonstrates effectiveness in teaching and other student-related responsibilities including a sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities since last promotion or appointment at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors as listed in IB (p. 3) of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate's courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Evidence that the candidate's courses contribute to the mission of the academic unit is also important. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer valid evidence when used in conjunction with other material.
 - b. The Associate Professor must have maintained a record of pedagogical excellence, continued to develop as a teacher, developed innovative course materials, participated in graduate education through service on thesis committees and successfully chaired completed theses. Awards or recognition for teaching or mentoring, and other indicators of outstanding instructional contributions enhance a candidate's record.
2. A record that supplies evidence of outstanding scholarly and professional achievements.
 - a. Primary evidence of professional achievement includes participation and leadership at national workshops and conferences related to the practice of psychology. Published work in journals, book chapters or scholarly books, and grants related to psychological practice are also considered. Presentations at regional and national meetings and manuscripts accepted for publication supplement a record of published work. Minor work, such as book reviews, or incomplete work, such as working papers, are considered evidence of professional activity, but are not alone sufficient for promotion. For evaluation of a candidate's published work, the department relies on the judgment of its own members, the faculty member, and discipline specific ratings.

School of Communication

Annual Review

As approved at the March 24, 2010, full faculty meeting

Updated by director and dean on May 15, 2014 (to reflect FAAR on-line rather than hard-copy reports)

Evaluation Standards Draft Proposal

This document establishes guidelines and procedures for (1) annual review of faculty performance, and (2) performance criteria for renewal in the School of Communication. The guidelines described in this document were developed for use for faculty annual review for the School of Communication. This document is in accordance with:

- Arizona Board of Regents Policy 6-201 constitutes the conditions of employment as a faculty member (revised date 1992),
- Northern Arizona University (NAU) Conditions of Faculty Service (CoFS) section 1.4 which requires all academic units establish annual performance criteria (May, 2007),
- The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Faculty Review document (February 2008).

Types of Reviews

Each year, all faculty members undergo an annual review that covers only the previous academic year. The annual review is also used for renewal purposes for non-tenure eligible lecturers and instructors.

Additionally, some faculty will undergo a cumulative review for one of the following reasons:

- Retention review (tenure eligible 1st to 5th year faculty)
- Promotion and tenure (tenure eligible faculty)
- Promotion (tenured faculty and lecturers seeking promotion to the next highest rank)

The evaluation standards for annual review and cumulative reviews are different; however, the materials are compiled in the same file. Please refer to the school promotion and tenure evaluation standards document for requirements for cumulative review.

Annual Faculty Performance Review

The purpose and spirit of the annual faculty performance review process is to assess the accomplishments of individual faculty members. These guidelines have been established to conduct evaluations in a manner that is flexible enough to recognize the unique nature and diversity among individuals within the School of Communication.

The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) has prepared documentation concerning faculty review in a document titled Faculty Review: Professional Review Files. The document defines the Professional Review File (PRF) and explains the documents that are included in the professional review file. Additionally, SBS has developed several checklists to assist faculty in preparing review materials. The document and checklists are available on the SBS website. Faculty members are encouraged to seek counsel from mentors and/or colleagues in preparing their professional review file. A model professional review file will be made available to faculty to help them in organizing materials. The PRF that is submitted by the faculty to FAAR for review in SBS must contain the following documents and materials:

1. Routing form. One routing form is submitted for annual review and cumulative review.
2. Statement of expectations (SOE). The SOE must be for the year under review and must be signed by the faculty member, director, and dean.
3. Annual performance report. This 2 – 4 page report discusses significant achievements relating to teaching/advising, creative/research/scholarship activities, and service as designated on the statement of expectations. This report should cover only the previous

annual review period and should directly discuss the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the annual evaluation criteria outlined below.

4. Current vitae.
5. Professional statement or narrative (only for faculty who are undergoing a cumulative review – promotion and/or promotion and tenure review – in addition to the annual review). This narrative should be a cumulative summary of the faculty member's accomplishments since her/his last promotion or, in the case of a tenure-track retention or a final tenure and promotion review, since his/her date of hire (although accomplishments prior to date of hire may be relevant and included). This narrative should address the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. This statement is not reviewed as part of the annual review process; it is only reviewed as part of the promotion and tenure process.
6. Letters of evaluation and recommendations written by relevant review committees and administrators for the years covered by the review(s). For annual review this would include the prior year's Annual Review Committee (ARC) evaluation, the director's prior year's evaluation, and current annual review evaluations added to the PRF file as it moves through the levels of review. (For cumulative review only, this includes the evaluation and recommendations for annual review and letters and evaluations since the last promotion and all letters and recommendations that are added to the PRF file as it moves through the levels of review.)
7. Formal evaluation of teaching for the years covered by the review, which includes printed/paper copies of SBS student opinion survey results and student comments.
8. Supporting materials evidencing work done in the years covered by the review.
 - a. Supporting evidence for teaching, advisement and other student-related responsibilities.
 - b. Supporting evidence for research, scholarship and/or creative activities.
 - c. Supporting evidence for service to the university, community and the profession.

Periods for review and evaluation shall be in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar*, which shall be prepared annually by the Provost and furnished through the Deans to all academic units conducting evaluations. Published dates for review of tenured, tenure eligible, and non-tenure eligible faculty will be set by the administration by the first day of the fall semester. This calendar will specify the due dates for faculty submission, committee consideration and recommendations, administrators' consideration and recommendations, and actions by the Provost and President.

Procedures for Evaluation

All tenured, tenure eligible, and non-tenure eligible, full-time faculty members shall be evaluated by an Annual Review Committee (ARC) according to their progress toward meeting the criteria established in their statement of expectations. The committee shall recommend to the director the level of achievement (highly meritorious, meritorious, meets expectations, or unsatisfactory) for each of four evaluation categories: (1) teaching, advisement and other student-related responsibilities; (2) research, scholarship and/or creative activities; (3) service to the university, community and the profession; and, (4) overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance.

The Personal Review File, which is not expected to be lengthy, should consist of an annual report (and a cumulative narrative for tenure-track faculty being reviewed for retention and those faculty applying for promotion) and support material for the three areas (student-related, research/creative, and service).

Faculty are strongly encouraged to inform the ARC of the significance and importance of their work in their annual report, addressing relevant criteria for the annual review (see below), and should be aware that the ARC will only evaluate performance based upon information presented in the PRF.

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to document efforts and accomplishments during the academic year. Evaluation shall be based solely on the written report and supporting materials contained in the faculty member's performance review file. If particular categories are not required in a faculty member's annual SOE, then this category shall be rated as Not Applicable (N/A). However, the faculty member can request that activities that fall into a category not represented on the SOE be used to determine overall merit. This is done to encourage faculty member's professional growth and development, as well as to recognize the benefits of such accomplishments to the knowledge and reputation of the school, college, university, and community. Failure to provide necessary files may result in an unsatisfactory rating. No materials can be placed in the faculty's review file without the knowledge of that faculty member. Materials previously placed in the report can only be removed by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the director.

Statement of Expectations

Each year, in accordance with dates furnished by the dean and the director, all full-time faculty will have a statement of expectations (SOE) covering the next academic year. The SOE, which is individualized for each faculty member, is negotiated between the faculty member and the director of the School of Communication. The SOE will encompass the faculty member's anticipated activities for the next academic contract year indicating the percentage of effort (workload distribution) devoted to the activities. The SOE should be constructed to maximize the education, skills and talents of the faculty member as they relate to the missions of the discipline, school, college, university, and/or community. In addition, the SOE should be constructed so that it conforms to the Meets Expectations level of the annual evaluation criteria (see below); for tenure-track faculty, it should also reflect adequate progress towards tenure.

The SOE is the basis for the annual performance review and the performance of the faculty member will be measured within the context of his or her statement of expectations. The SOE will be signed by the faculty member, director of the School of Communication, and the dean of the college. These signatures indicate common understanding and agreement to the expectations for the forthcoming contractual period.

If, during the period covered by the statement of expectations, there are significant changes in the faculty member's responsibilities or the faculty member has experienced significant changes in individual circumstances, then the SOE may be revised through a negotiation process involving the faculty member and the director of the School of Communication. The revised SOE must show the signatures of all relevant parties to be considered the statement of record against which performance is evaluated.

The Annual Review Committee will only evaluate the non-administrative percentage as identified on the SOE.

Workload Distribution

Total workload for all full-time faculty in the School of Communication is equivalent to 15 units (or credit hours), per semester.

Workload Factors in Teaching, Advising and Student Related Responsibilities

Each three-credit class typically accounts for 10% of a faculty member's load per year. The standard expected teaching load is 3 courses per semester for tenure/tenure track faculty, which equals a 60% load per year. The standard expected teaching load for non-tenure/tenure track faculty is 4 courses per semester, which equals an 80% load. Advising typically accounts for 10% of a faculty member's load. There may be mitigating circumstances that affect the teaching load and require an exception, such as class size, administrative responsibilities, research/creative or service load. All exceptions must be negotiated with and approved by the School director.

Workload Factors in Research, Scholarship and/or Creative Activities

The standard expected research load for tenure/tenure track faculty is the equivalent of one course release per semester, which equals 20% load per year. The criteria listed for highly-meritorious, meritorious, or meets expectations evaluation assume a 20% load. If a lesser or greater percentage is recorded on the SOE, the criteria should be adjusted accordingly. A research load is not expected of non-tenure track faculty. There may be mitigating circumstances that affect the load assigned to research, scholarship and/or creative activity. All exceptions must be negotiated with and approved by the School director.

Workload Factors in Service

The standard expected service load for all full-time faculty (tenured/tenure-track/non-tenure track) is 10% of a faculty member's load. The criteria listed for highly-meritorious, meritorious, or meets expectations evaluation assume a 10% load. If a lesser or greater percentage is recorded on the SOE, the criteria should be adjusted accordingly. There may be mitigating circumstances that affect the load assigned to service activity. All exceptions must be negotiated with and approved by the school's director.

Teaching, Advisement and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

Faculty's performance in the area of teaching, advisement and other student-related responsibilities is evaluated by taking into account accomplishments in relation to the percentage of their workload allocated to this activity as recorded on their annual statement of expectations document.

Student related activity includes teaching and advising. Besides classroom and/or online instruction, teaching activities include curriculum development and planning that meets the needs of contemporary students; reflects current knowledge, research, and trends in the discipline; and creates an awareness of gender and diversity issues. Advising activities include guiding progress toward graduation and post-graduation planning. Other student-related activities may include (but are not limited to) the following: student mentoring, student research/independent study supervision, directing or serving on graduate committees, and supplemental instruction sections.

Using the evidence presented in the faculty member's professional review file, the Annual Review Committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities in this document.

Student opinion survey results are required for inclusion. Student opinion survey results will be used to identify themes regarding an instructor's effectiveness. In no case are student opinion survey results to be used as a baseline for measuring teaching effectiveness. They should be only one of many factors to be considered in evaluating a faculty member's teaching.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to express the qualitative nature of the performance indicator they are using for evaluation. The Annual Review Committee will also evaluate the qualitative nature based on the faculty member's report.

Meets Expectations Performance Indicators

To receive a *Meets Expectations* rating a faculty member is expected to briefly explain in the report achievement of all of the following:

1. Perform expected teaching duties,
2. Meet classes regularly,
3. Hold a minimum of 3 office hours/week as scheduled,
4. Conduct courses as described in the syllabus,
5. Maintain a clean and safe work environment,
6. Maintain an advising load as described in SOE,
7. Improve areas that were identified as concerns from prior ARC review.

Getting a meets expectations rating means you have adequately met your responsibilities and obligations under criteria set by the School of Communication. The School values this contribution.

Meritorious and Highly Meritorious Performance Indicators

For a *Meritorious* rating, a faculty member must completely fulfill the *Meets Expectations* criteria plus achieve a minimum of 3 of the criteria listed below. For a *Highly Meritorious* rating a faculty member must completely fulfill the Meets Expectations criteria plus achieve a minimum of 6 of the criteria listed below.

Faculty members in their first year are reviewed after their first semester of teaching. Therefore, the performance indicators used to evaluate first year faculty members will be adjusted to reflect work performed during one semester. Be aware that a criterion may be used more than once. For example, a faculty member may have developed two new courses; in that case, developing a new course may be used twice. Some activities are listed under student-related and service to allow the faculty member flexibility when writing their PRF. Faculty members should use an activity in the one best place. The same activity should not be used in multiple reporting areas (e.g., teaching and service). When writing the report, a faculty member should make an argument as to why they deserve the ranking that they believe they have achieved using the criteria below:

1. Substantial contribution to School teaching load including:
 - a. Number of different course preps,
 - b. Number of contact hours above the minimum of three hours/week for a three-credit course,
 - c. Course enrollment or type of class (e.g., junior level writing, capstone, writing intensive course that is not a “w” course, undergraduate honors thesis preparation, etc.).
2. Course development including:
 - a. Develop a new course (e.g., creating a new course through the curriculum process),
 - b. Substantially update an existing course (e.g., develop enhanced methods to promote creative and critical thinking and writing and oral skills),
 - c. Teach a new preparation,
 - d. Develop a course for alternative delivery (e.g., face-to-face class delivered as an online course or vice versus).
3. Submission of a teaching-related grant.
4. Award of a teaching-related grant.
5. Evidence of curriculum development or redevelopment of department/school or interdisciplinary program.
6. Commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience including:
 - a. Direct an independent study or student research,
 - b. Organize and/or direct a field trip (include length of time, degree of supervision, and outcomes),
 - c. Facilitate student participation at a professional meeting,
 - d. Be an advisor of an active, university-related student organization or group,
 - e. Advise a student activity (co-curricular, without release time),
 - f. Supervise presentation and/or publication of student scholarly or creative work in a professional and/or academic venue,
 - g. Internship assistance/coordination/supervision (without release time),
 - h. Maintain equipment and laboratories.
7. Chair a Master's or Doctoral supervisory committee.

8. Successful publication of instructional/teaching related materials (e.g., a workbook that goes through editorial review and is used beyond the instructor's course).
9. Involvement in professional development activity related to teaching (e.g., acquisition of new skill to be used in teaching).
10. Presentation or written article to a campus class or a student group using subject material or concepts taught in your field.
11. Student/Faculty/University award nomination for excellence in teaching or teaching-related activities (excluding self-nominations, awards that have no set criteria for nomination, and survey results). These nominations must be meaningful and include a description of who nominated the faculty member and what criteria were used for the nomination).
12. Additional consideration may be given to evidence of effective classroom teaching and/or advising based on:
 - a. Annual reviews,
 - b. Examples of rigorous student work,
 - c. Other forms of documentation.
13. Substantial advising involvement (include a list of advisees).
14. Other Teaching, Advisement and Other Student Related Activities.

Research, Scholarship and/or Creative Activities

Faculty's performance in the area of research, scholarship and/or creative activity is evaluated by taking into account accomplishments in relation to the percentage of their workload allocated to this activity as recorded on their annual statements of expectations document.

Operational Definitions

Research, scholarship and/or creative activities are activities that lead to tangible, original works that expand the knowledge base, extend into new fields of application, and/or improve teaching by the dissemination of pedagogic scholarship. These activities include publications, exhibitions or productions related to a faculty member's academic interests and efforts to increase, synthesize, or disseminate knowledge in subject areas germane to a faculty member's academic interest. It is assumed that the faculty member's output would make an original contribution to the body of knowledge. All scholarship must be externally reviewed – peer, editorial, juried, or other documented forms of external review.

In the case of co-authored/co-produced works, the faculty member should include a statement clarifying the nature of their contribution to the project. If the publication is the result of a complete collaboration, the faculty member should receive full credit. If the faculty member's contribution was limited (e.g., was only involved in data collection, only wrote a small portion of the work) then they should receive partial credit commensurate with their contribution.

Research. Publications in this category have gone through a peer-review process (anonymous blind-review by experts in the field). Publications are completed written documents or other tangible works such as refereed journal articles, books, book chapters, monographs, research/technical reports, or the like. Both print and on-line refereed publications carry the same weight. Supporting documentation should be included in the faculty member's annual review file. Conference papers also fall within this category, with greater weight given to peer-reviewed papers versus abstracts, and less weight given to papers/presentations that do not involve peer review.

Creative Production. Creative works in this category have gone through a juried review process. Supporting documentation should be included in the faculty member's annual review file.

Non-refereed Publications, Creative Works, Works of Professional Practice. Publications and other creative works in this category have been reviewed before

publication/exhibition/production by an editor or contracted sponsor or equivalent evaluator. It is assumed that output would represent a creative and intellectual stretch. It is the obligation of the faculty member to explain the creative and intellectual dimension of the work in their annual review file.

Documentation

Faculty members should include a representative sample of supporting materials as appropriate that provide evidence that the faculty member produced scholarly and/or creative work. Representative samples of materials include photocopies of a small portion of a published or exhibited work, letter of acceptance or contract, conference program listing, and/or letter or certificate of award. Entire documents or exhibits do not need to be presented. Both research and creative work will be given equal weight in evaluations.

Using the evidence presented in the faculty member's professional review file, the ARC members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for research, scholarship and/or creative activities in this document. The faculty member is encouraged to inform the ARC of the importance of their work in the report.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to express the qualitative nature of the performance indicator they are using for evaluation. The Annual Review Committee will also evaluate the qualitative nature of the work based on the faculty member's report. The performance levels outlined below assume a 20% research/creative load (as per the faculty member's statement of expectations). Performance levels should be adjusted for faculty members who have a research/creative load greater or less than 20%. If a faculty member was on sabbatical during all or half of the review period, then her/his SOE will generally indicate 100% or 50-60% devoted to research/creative activity and the performance levels below should be adjusted accordingly.

Meets Expectations Performance Indicators

To receive a meets expectations rating a faculty member is expected to briefly explain in the narrative achievement of 1 of the following activities and provide supporting evidence. When writing the narrative, a faculty member should make an argument as to why they deserve the ranking that they desire using the criteria below.

Getting a Meets Expectations rating means you have adequately met your responsibilities and obligations under criteria set by the School of Communication. The School values this contribution.

Meritorious and Highly Meritorious Performance Indicators

For a Meritorious rating, a faculty member must completely fulfill the meets expectations criteria plus achieve a minimum of 1 of the criteria listed below. For a Highly Meritorious rating a faculty member must completely fulfill the meets expectations criteria plus achieve a minimum of 2 of the criteria listed below.

Tenure-eligible faculty members in their first year are reviewed after their first semester of teaching. The Annual Review Committee realizes that research, scholarship and/or creative activities may not be evident for evaluation after one semester. Therefore, if evidence is presented the performance indicators used to evaluate first year faculty members will be adjusted to reflect work performed during one semester. If evidence is not presented, the ARC will not evaluate this component of the workload. However, the ARC will evaluate this component of workload during the second and subsequent year's reviews.

Be aware that some of the listed criteria may be used more than once (e.g., acceptance and presentation of two peer-reviewed conference papers). When writing the report, a faculty member should make an argument as to why they deserve the ranking that they believe they have achieved using the criteria below:

Publications

1. Published or produced book, screenplay or equivalent work based on original work, or edited volume with new and original contributions;
2. Revision of an existing work;
3. Refereed journal article;
4. Invited contribution (chapter in a book or other refereed publication such as a review essay, monograph, bibliographic essay, encyclopedia entry, or research note);
5. Newspaper or magazine article (national) related to the discipline;
6. Disseminated research report, applied research report, research note in a non-refereed work.

Exhibitions

1. Solo or collective public exhibition of work;
2. Commissioned/collected work;
3. Professional competition/exhibition;
4. Grants and Contracts
5. Contract-in-hand received in the evaluation year; and/or a submitted proposal, and/or other work submitted to a journal/publisher/juried show/creative director/agent;
6. Preparation and submission of a research/creative grant or fellowship from external or internal funding sources;
7. Receipt of a research/creative grant or fellowship.

Presentations/Conference Work

1. Professional conference work (e.g., panel discussant/participant);
2. Presentation (e.g., research or creative invited presentation, keynote address, poster presentation, colloquia or invited lecture outside the department and/or university);
3. Organize symposia or conference related to research/scholarship/creative activity;
4. Paper presented at a conference that has gone through a peer-review process.

Miscellaneous

1. Editing a journal or other publication;
2. Creation and dissemination of computer software for scholarly/creative purposes;
3. Reprint or reproduction or exhibition of published scholarship or creative work in anthology, edited volume or other publication, or online;
4. Award or recognition, or extensive or prominent citation (not self-cited) for research, scholarship or creative activity;
5. Professional development work relating to research/scholarship/creative work;
6. Equivalent work which has been peer-reviewed, editorial reviewed, juried, or equivalent external review. Please explain the “equivalence” to the committee in the accompanying report;
7. Work in progress. In all cases work in progress must have accompanying documentation. Examples include studying relevant literature as documented by an annotated bibliography or a literature review; collecting data or conducting fieldwork as documented by field notes, transcripts, survey data, logs, or images; drafting thumbnails or preliminary images for future creative exhibition as documented by draft images; drafting scripts for future production; seeking out training in preparation for conducting future creative or research activities. Work in this category must be substantial and indicate progress from previous years.

Service to the University, Community and the Profession

Faculty's performance in the area of service to the university, community, and the profession is evaluated by taking into account accomplishments in relation to the percentage of their workload

allocated to this activity as recorded on their annual Statement of Expectations document. Service is evaluated by taking into account faculty service to the school, college, university, professional associations and the community.

Using the evidence presented in the faculty member's professional review file, the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for service activities in this document. Faculty are strongly encouraged to inform the ARC of the significance and importance of their work in a report, addressing relevant criteria, and should be aware that the ARC will only evaluate performance based upon information presented in the PRF. It may be helpful for faculty to include the approximate number of hours devoted to the service activity, documented in the report.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to express the qualitative nature of the performance indicator they are using for evaluation. The Annual Review Committee will also evaluate the qualitative nature based on the faculty member's report. The performance levels outlined below assume a 10% service load (as per the faculty member's statement of expectations). Performance levels should be adjusted for faculty members who have a service load greater or less than 10%.

Meets Expectations Performance Indicators

To receive a *Meets Expectations* rating a faculty member is expected to briefly explain in the report achievement of all of the following with support documentation as needed:

1. Is an active member of at least one working committee at the program, department, university and/or discipline-level, or equivalent service;
2. Regular attendance at all faculty meetings and retreats.

Getting a Meets Expectations rating means you have adequately met your responsibilities and obligations under criteria set by the School of Communication. The School values this contribution.

Meritorious and Highly Meritorious Performance Indicators

For a *Meritorious* rating, a faculty member must completely fulfill the *Meets Expectations* criteria plus achieve a minimum of 2 of the criteria listed below. For a *Highly Meritorious* rating a faculty member must completely fulfill the meets expectations criteria plus achieve a minimum of 4 of the criteria listed below. In some cases a single service activity can justify a highly meritorious ranking due to the quantitative and qualitative nature of the activity.

Faculty members in their first year are reviewed after their first semester of teaching. Therefore, the performance indicators used to evaluate first year faculty members will be adjusted to reflect work performed during one semester.

Be aware that some of the listed criteria may be used more than once (e.g., a faculty member may be a member of several committees). Some activities are listed under student-related and service to allow the faculty member flexibility when writing their PRF. Faculty members should use an activity in the one best place, not using the same activity in multiple reporting areas. When writing the report, a faculty member should make an argument as to why they deserve the ranking that they desire using the criteria below:

1. Work intensive service that involves frequent meetings and/or extensive preparation (e.g., UCC, ARC, FSC, Senate). In addition to being used for the meets expectations criteria, these committee obligation may be considered for higher merit;
2. Additional university service (e.g., school, college, university committees; senate; commissions; task forces; boards; advisor of an active student organization; coordinators; and/or event coordination beyond the activities used to meet expectations in the area of service);

3. State, regional, national, and/or international service (e.g., elected or selected to office in a professional organization, serving as a member of an editorial board, serving as a reviewer, and/or organizing a conference or symposium);
4. Public or community service that uses the expertise of the faculty member, or directly contributes to the mission of the university (e.g., workshops, public forums, consultation; writing and technical assistance);
5. Professional service (e.g., reviewing journal articles and other publications, reviewing or judging creative works, reviewing grant applications, serving on professional committees);
6. Takes leadership role on a committee;
7. Service activities that significantly enhance the visibility and reputation of the school, college, or university (e.g., presentations to a group using subject materials or concepts taught in your field);
8. Service awards;
9. Maintaining equipment and laboratories;
10. Other service activities.

Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria

Current Revision Underway by Department – Expected Final Edition in Spring 2021

Arizona Board of Regents Policy 6-201 constitutes the conditions of employment as a faculty member. The complete ABOR Policy Manual is available at the Cline Library, the Deans' offices, the Faculty Senate Office and the Office of the Provost. The ABOR Policy Manual may be obtained online at <http://www.azregents.edu/>.

ABOR Policy 6-201 provides for local university implementation and definition of conditions of faculty service. If a provision of the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service is in conflict with ABOR policy, the ABOR policy shall govern.

Unless noted otherwise, language in this document is drawn directly from the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS); School of Communication language is noted in italics. Section numbers are linked to the COFS document. Appendices A, B, and C are created for School of Communication use.

This document establishes guidelines and procedures for use by the School of Communication related to (1) annual review of faculty performance, (2) performance criteria for renewal, (3) promotion in rank, and (4) tenure. This document is in accordance with:

- Arizona Board of Regents Policy 6-201 which constitutes the conditions of employment as a faculty member (rev. 2012),
- Northern Arizona University (NAU) Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS) section 1.4 which requires all academic units to establish annual performance criteria (2007, rev. 2015),
- The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Faculty Review document (2008).

Faculty members who are preparing applications and files for retention, promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review are advised to insure they have met guidelines that have been established for the School of Communication, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Northern Arizona University. NAU standards can be found on the provost's webpage; SBS standards can be found on the SBS webpage (see Appendix C).

1.1 Definitions

The following definitions are consistent with the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS), and shall apply as the words or phrases are used in the School of Communication Evaluation Standards Document.

Academic area (disciplinary unit): *Disciplinary units in the School of Communication. As of January 2016, these are Communication Studies, Creative Media & Film, Journalism, Photography, Strategic Communication, and Visual Communication.*

Academic criteria: Guidelines developed at the academic unit and college level to describe the performance expectations for retention, promotion, tenure, and annual review. These criteria must be approved in writing by the Dean and the Provost.

Academic unit: Any degree-granting department, school, or college [School of Communication].

Administrator: Someone who either has a notice of appointment issued under the ABOR Conditions of Administrative Service, or a faculty contract with administrative duties.

Annual Review Committee (ARC): This elected committee conducts annual reviews at the unit level. See Appendix B [COFS] for additional information including committee alternatives for ARC.

Chair: The administrator immediately responsible for management of the academic department, division, unit, or other entity. *In the School of Communication, this role is assumed by the Director.*

College: A freestanding college [College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, or SBS].

Day: This means calendar day, except that where the last day of any specific time period falls on a Saturday, a Sunday, or a university-recognized holiday. In these cases the time period shall run until 5:00 pm of the next day, or close of business as specified by university policy of the next day which is not a Saturday, a Sunday or a university-recognized holiday.

Dean: Any person who is designated as the head of a college [SBS].

Faculty Status Committee (FSC): This elected committee of tenured faculty performs a department level review and evaluation. See Appendix B [COFS] for additional information.

Full-time Faculty: Faculty employed in a 50% or greater capacity for an academic or fiscal year.

Part-time Faculty: Individuals whose appointment is 49% or less Full-Time Employed (FTE) and who are not eligible for university benefits.

President: The President of Northern Arizona University or the President's designated representative.

Promotion and Tenure Committee: An elected committee from the tenured faculty in the school or college which reviews and makes recommendations regarding promotion, tenure, and Regents' awards. See Appendix B [COFS] for additional information.

Provost: The chief academic officer responsible for academic affairs within the university; the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

School: An academic unit within a college [the School of Communication, or COM].

Statement of Expectations [SOE]: The description of the annual Workload Assignment based on the academic unit criteria by which the performance of that workload will be evaluated. The Statement of Expectations is the result of a negotiation between the faculty member and the Chair and, when indicated by department policy, the Faculty Status Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Temporary Faculty: This term refers to the following two categories: faculty, whether full-time or part-time, who have appointments restricted to one year [Instructor] and faculty [Part-time] who have appointments for less than six months and are not benefit eligible.

Workload Assignment: The allocation of a faculty member's time and effort across categories of responsibility consistent with the mission of the University and the faculty member's academic unit. These categories may include teaching and other student-related responsibilities; scholarship, research, and/or creative activities; service to the University and to the profession; and other activities as appropriate. *Throughout this document, references to these categories will include (but not necessarily be limited to) the following activities:*

A. *Teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities include:*

- Classroom and/or online instruction;
- Creation and updating of course materials;
- Teaching innovations;
- Teaching-related publications;
- Supervision of students' scholarly activities and independent studies, including graduate thesis and dissertation work;
- Curriculum development;
- Academic and/or career advisement;
- Advising of clubs and organizations that promote student learning, research, creative expression and/or public service;
- Other student related activities (student mentoring, student research supervision, supplemental instruction sections, and the like); and/or
- Organization of or participation in professional development activities related to teaching.

B. Research, scholarship, and/or creative activities include:

- Professional publications, papers, exhibitions, or productions;
- Research projects that can be documented in the form of laboratory reports, research logs, diaries, field notes, interim progress reports, or the like, as defined by the candidate's Department/School;
- Scholarly or creative work accepted for publication, exhibition, or production;
- Grant and contract work, including applied projects, as defined by the candidate's Department/School;
- Applied research reports, exhibitions, productions, and other professional contributions;
- Papers, exhibitions, or productions presented at professional meetings; and
- Other tangible works related to the scholarly or creative process germane to a candidate's discipline.

C. Service activities include:

- Department/School, College, and University service such as participation on boards, panels, committees, task forces, or the like;
- Leadership at various levels within the University;
- Public or community service, such as workshops, public forums, consultations, and technical assistance to the public that uses the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues; and/or
- Professional service, such as reviewing journal articles and other publications, reviewing or judging creative works, reviewing grant applications, editing journals, serving on professional committees, holding office within an organization of a candidate's discipline, or the like as defined by the candidate's Department/School.

1.2 Faculty Classifications

1.2.1 Tenure Eligible Positions

The NAU Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS) document identifies and defines “tenure eligible positions” (COFS 1.2.1) and “non-tenure eligible positions” (COFS 1.2.2). Positions most common in the School of Communication are addressed in this document; however, information about other positions can be found in COFS 1.2.2.

The tenure eligible positions include assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Tenure eligible faculty shall have a maximum probationary period no longer than seven (7) years in full-time service at tenure eligible rank, except in cases of waiver by the President for an individual faculty member.

All tenure eligible positions require an earned doctorate or other terminal degree (e.g., MFA) in the appropriate discipline. Any exception to this degree requirement must be recommended by the faculty and Chair [Director] of the academic unit, and approved by the Dean and Provost.

Achievement of a faculty rank at NAU shall be determined by evaluation and recommendation using written academic unit criteria, which must be approved by the Dean and Provost before implementation. Academic unit criteria may exceed, but must not be less than ABOR standards (6-201 I.) and the NAU standards below.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

The rank of Assistant Professor is a tenure eligible position. To hold the rank of Assistant Professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must:

1. Demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities, or, in the case of a new appointment, show promise of effectiveness.
2. Show promise of scholarly and/or creative activity related to the faculty member's discipline.
3. Show promise of service to the profession and the university community.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

The rank of Associate Professor is a tenure eligible or tenured position. A faculty member may not be promoted to Associate Professor unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured Associate Professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of Associate Professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor at NAU. Any prior service credit to be counted must be agreed to in writing at the time of hire.

To hold the rank of Associate Professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have:

- A. A record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.

For promotion to Associate Professor in the area of teaching and other student related activities, the successful candidate will have documented the following:

1. *A continuing record of high quality and effective teaching. This will be measured primarily by input from students and faculty colleagues in the form of evaluative statements selected from the following as available: student opinion questionnaires, student interviews, letters from former students, peer evaluations conducted by faculty in the unit, evaluation of course syllabi, and teaching portfolios.*
2. *Sustained contributions to the disciplinary unit's teaching load and the school as a whole by cooperating in meeting teaching needs in class offerings and scheduling.*
3. *Fulfillment of advising and/or mentoring commitments as assigned.*

- B. A record that shows a sustained pattern of scholarly and/or creative activity related to the faculty member's discipline.

The successful candidate will demonstrate accomplishments that are consistent with the school, college, and university missions and goals and that establish the individual as a significant contributor to the field or profession, with potential for distinction. This status will be measured in part by letters of assessment solicited by the director from distinguished representatives in the field. SBS adds, "External letters of recommendation, to which the faculty member has agreed to waive access, may be used only by those units that have listed such letters as requirements in their criteria for promotion and/or tenure and have followed the College policy on the soliciting of such letters. The SBS Promotion and Tenure Review Committee will use external letters of recommendation in their evaluation of a candidate when these two conditions have been met."

For promotion to Associate Professor in the area of scholarly and/or creative activity, the successful candidate will have documented the following:

1. *A minimum of three major works (publication, exhibition, and/or production) that survive a competitive review process (external peer, editorial, and/or blind review) in appropriate venues for the faculty member's discipline by the time he or she submits materials for review for promotion. At least one of these must be published/exhibited in a nationally recognized high quality journal/gallery/medium in the discipline.*
2. *Establishment of a sustained program of quality original scholarly/creative activity as evidenced by publication/exhibition record; recognition at regional and national levels; and/or significant grant and contract activities.*
- C. A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the university community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of Professor.

Appropriate levels of service to the school, the college, the university, the community, and the profession should be maintained. For promotion to Associate Professor in the area of service, the successful candidate will have documented the following:

1. *The faculty member must be an active participant in his/her assigned unit within the school as well as in the school as a whole, as demonstrated primarily through participation in relevant unit and school-wide faculty meetings.*
2. *Substantial service to the school, college, and/or the university community. Contributions may include service on committees and participation in other activities important to the university community.*
3. *Contributions to the profession through service to professional organizations, professional journals, and the like, and/or public or community service (at the local, state, national, or international level), such as workshops, public forums, consultations, and technical assistance to the public that uses the expertise of the faculty member to examine or manage public issues.*
4. *An ongoing level of professional activity, appropriate to the candidate's discipline, which assures s/he will remain current in the discipline and capable of delivering present and future curricula that enable graduates to be up-to-date with current practices and be competitive in the job market. Professional activity includes professional development, service to the profession, and/or service to the community consistent with the missions of the school, the college, and the university.*

PROFESSOR

A faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the Notice of Appointment indicates it is at the rank of Professor without tenure. Professors are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and scholarly and/or creative activities. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of Professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as Associate).

To hold the rank of Professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have the following (*note that to be promoted to the rank of Professor, the candidate must show outstanding accomplishment in either A or B below*):

- A. A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.

For promotion to Professor in the area of teaching and other student-related activities, the successful candidate will have met the following minimum expectations:

1. *Instructional effectiveness based on input taken from student, peer, and administrative reviews.*
2. *Cooperation in meeting the instructional needs of the academic area and the school.*
3. *Ongoing revision of courses to keep current with the discipline, student, and curricular needs.*
4. *Having met advising and mentoring commitments as assigned.*

Evidence of outstanding accomplishment in teaching and other student-related activities is shown when a faculty member establishes leadership or exemplary performance in endeavors such as:

- *Consistently earning highly positive ratings on annual teaching evaluations, as well as exit evaluations and/or alumni surveys if available.*
- *Providing challenging academic experiences for students.*
- *Providing significant leadership in academic program development.*
- *Developing substantial job placement and/or student internship opportunities.*

- B. A sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly and/or creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.

The successful candidate will demonstrate accomplishments that are consistent with the school's mission and goals and that establish the candidate as a significant contributor to the field or profession, with potential for distinction.

For promotion to Professor in the area of scholarly and/or creative activity, the successful candidate will have met the following minimum expectations:

1. *Publication/exhibition/production of a minimum of three major works that survive a competitive review process (external, peer, editorial, and/or blind review) in appropriate venues for the faculty member's discipline since being promoted to the associate rank.*
2. *Demonstrate a record as a productive scholar/artist through continuing publication/exhibition activity over a period of years.*
3. *Establish a clear and coherent line of inquiry/creativity.*
4. *Provide evidence of recognition at national and/or international levels.*

Evidence of outstanding accomplishment in scholarly and/or creative activities is shown when a faculty member establishes leadership or exemplary performance in endeavors such as:

- *Establishing a sustained pattern of publication/creative endeavors that substantially exceeds the minimum criteria.*

- *Exercising leadership in obtaining outside funding for research through grants and contracts.*
 - *Engaging students in collaborative research and scholarly activity.*
 - *Serving as a regular reviewer or editor for academic journals.*
 - *Receipt of substantial recognition within the discipline, as evidenced by awards, frequent citation, invitations to lecture at other institutions, or other forms of recognition.*
- C. A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's department (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the department, college, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty). This record should include the following:
1. *The faculty member must be an active participant in his/her assigned unit within the school as well as in the school as a whole, as demonstrated primarily through participation in relevant unit and school-wide faculty meetings.*
 2. *Substantial service to the school, college, and/or the university community. Contributions may include service on committees and participation in other activities important to the university community.*
 3. *An ongoing level of professional activity, appropriate to the candidate's discipline, which assures s/he will remain current in the discipline and capable of delivering present and future curricula that enable graduates to be up-to-date with current practices and be competitive in the job market. Professional activity includes professional development, service to the profession, and/or service to the community consistent with the missions of the school, the college, and the university.*
- D. In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of Professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (a) or (b) above as defined by college and academic unit criteria.

1.2.2 Non-Tenure Eligible Positions

The non-tenure eligible positions include instructor, lecturer, clinical faculty, professors of practice, research faculty, visiting faculty, faculty research associates, part-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and visiting scholars.

Non-tenure eligible faculty shall have no expectation of continued employment beyond the end of the current appointment period. Non-tenure eligible faculty will demonstrate commitment to student success through effective teaching and other student related activities. Academic unit criteria may exceed the criteria listed below.

INSTRUCTOR

Instructors are non-tenured, non-tenure eligible faculty. This title should be used in one of three ways: (1) for appointments of no more than one year; or (2) as a temporary designation for individuals who have been hired into a tenure-track assistant professor position but who have not yet completed all requirements for the terminal degree; or (3) for teaching positions without typical professional development and service requirements of lecturers. Upon completion of the dissertation or other final degree requirements, such individuals as defined in case (2) will be ranked as tenure eligible assistant professors. Units may establish criteria and procedures to move instructors to lecturer ranks after an appropriate period.

Responsibilities: Instructors are primarily responsible for teaching courses at the undergraduate level. Instructors are expected to demonstrate commitment to student success through effective teaching and other student-related activities. *Instructors typically do not have service expectations beyond the normally-expected level of participation in faculty meetings in their assigned unit and the school.*

Term of Appointment: If an individual was appointed as an instructor into a position as in case (3) above, then he/she may be reappointed according to the unit's policies. If the title of Instructor was given as in case (2) above, then his/her rank may be changed during an academic year. Should it change during the fall semester, then that academic year will be considered the first year of his/her six-year probationary period. Should it change during the spring semester, however, the mandatory probation period will not begin officially until the next fall semester. In either case, instructors shall have no expectation of continued employment beyond the end of the current appointment period.

Qualifications: For cases (1) and (3) above, an earned master's degree in the appropriate discipline and/or certification or licensing (where appropriate).

LECTURER

Lecturers are non-tenured, non-tenure eligible faculty. A faculty member in this category is appointed to one of the following academic ranks: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal Lecturer.

Responsibilities: Lecturers are primarily responsible for teaching undergraduate, graduate, or clinical courses.

Term of Appointment: Lecturers are appointed for one to three (1-3) years. They shall have no expectation of continued employment beyond the end of the current appointment period. These appointments may be renewed.

Qualifications: Lecturer ranks require an earned master's degree in an appropriate discipline.

- A. *Lecturer:* To be eligible for the rank of Lecturer, the faculty member must demonstrate a commitment to student success through effectiveness in teaching, advising, and student-related responsibilities or, in the case of a new appointment, show promise of effectiveness if the candidate has no prior teaching experience.
- B. *Senior Lecturer:* To be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, the faculty member must have at least the following:
 1. A record of substantial and continued commitment to student success through effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.

For promotion to Senior Lecturer in the area of teaching and other student related activities, the successful candidate will have documented the following:

- a. *A continuing record of high quality and effective teaching. This will be measured primarily by input from students and faculty colleagues in the form of evaluative statements selected from the following as available: student opinion questionnaires, student interviews, letters from former students, peer evaluations conducted by faculty in the unit, evaluation of course syllabi, and teaching portfolios.*
 - b. *Sustained contributions to the disciplinary unit's teaching load and the school as a whole by cooperating in meeting teaching needs in class offerings and scheduling.*
 - c. *Fulfillment of advising and/or mentoring commitments as assigned.*
2. *A record of service and professional development related to the teaching role.*

Appropriate levels of service to the school, the college, the university, the community, and the profession should be maintained. For promotion to Senior Lecturer in the area of service, the successful candidate will have documented the following:

- a. *The faculty member must be an active participant in his/her assigned unit within the school as well as in the school as a whole, as demonstrated primarily through participation in relevant unit and school-wide faculty meetings.*
 - b. *Substantial service to the school, college, and/or the university community. Contributions may include service on committees and participation in other activities important to the university community..*
 - c. *An ongoing level of professional activity, appropriate to the candidate's discipline, which assures s/he will remain current in the discipline and capable of delivering present and future curricula that enable graduates to be up-to-date with current practices and be competitive in the job market. Professional activity includes professional development (e.g., training and participation in relevant conferences or workshops), service to the profession (e.g., formal roles in professional organizations), and service to the community that is grounded in the faculty member's field, discipline, or profession and is consistent with the teaching missions of the school, college and university.*
 - d. *Scholarly and/or creative activities, either in addition to or as outlined in the faculty member's Statement of Expectations, may be used as evidence of professional activity and development.*
3. The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. Teaching outside of the academic year is credited only in the case of faculty members on fiscal-year (12-month) contracts.
- C. *Principal Lecturer:* To be eligible for the rank of principal lecturer, the faculty member must have at least the following:
1. A record of commitment to student success through sustained excellence at the senior lecturer rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.

For promotion to Principal Lecturer in the area of teaching and other student-related activities, the successful candidate will have met the following expectations:

- a. *Continued instructional effectiveness based on input taken from student, peer, and administrative reviews.*
 - b. *Cooperation in meeting the instructional needs of the academic area and the school.*
 - c. *Ongoing revision of courses to keep current with the discipline, student, and curricular needs.*
 - d. *Fulfilled advising and mentoring commitments as assigned.*
 - e. *Providing challenging academic experiences for students.*
 - f. *Leadership in academic program development.*
2. A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role.

Appropriate levels of service to the school, the college, the university, the community, and the profession should be maintained. For promotion to Principal Lecturer in the area of service, the successful candidate will have documented the following:

- a. *The faculty member must be an active participant in his/her assigned unit within the school as well as in the school as a whole, as demonstrated primarily through participation and/or leadership in relevant unit and school-wide faculty meetings.*
- b. *Substantial service to the school, college, and/or the university community. Contributions may include leadership and other service on committees.*
- c. *An ongoing level of professional activity, appropriate to the candidate's discipline, which assures s/he will remain current in the discipline and capable of delivering present and future curricula that enable graduates to be up-to-date with current practices and be competitive in the job market. Professional activity includes professional development (e.g., training and participation in relevant conferences*

- or workshops), service to the profession (e.g., formal roles in professional organizations), and service to the community that is grounded in the faculty member's field, discipline, or profession and is consistent with the teaching missions of the school, college and university*
- d. *Scholarly and/or creative activities, either in addition to or as outlined in the faculty member's Statement of Expectations, may be used as evidence of professional activity and development.*
 - 3. The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of senior lecturer or other relevant professional experience. Teaching outside of the academic year is credited only in the case of faculty members on fiscal-year (12-month) contracts.

PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE

Professors of Practice are non-tenured, non-tenure eligible faculty. A Professor of Practice is appointed to one of the following academic ranks: Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, or Professor of Practice.

Responsibilities: Professors of Practice are primarily responsible for teaching courses, including seminars and independent studies, to undergraduate and graduate students and for modeling the intersection of theory and practice in the relevant field. *Other activities, such as scholarly and/or creative activity, may be established in the candidate's Statement of Expectations in negotiation with the Director and Dean.*

Term of Appointment: Professors of Practice are appointed for one to three (1-3) years. They shall have no expectation of continued employment beyond the end of the current appointment period. These appointments may be renewed.

Qualifications: Professors of Practice are faculty members who have established themselves by expertise, achievements, and reputation over a sustained period of time to be distinguished professionals in an area of practice or discipline but who may not have the terminal degree in the discipline.

- A. *Assistant Professor of Practice:* To be eligible for the rank of Assistant Professor of Practice, the faculty member must demonstrate commitment to student success through effectiveness in teaching and other student-related responsibilities or show promise of such effectiveness if the candidate has no prior teaching experience.
- B. *Associate Professor of Practice:* To be eligible for the rank of Associate Professor of Practice, the faculty member must have at least the following:
 - 1. A record of commitment to student success through substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student related responsibilities.

For promotion to Associate Professor of Practice in the area of teaching and other student related activities, the successful candidate will have documented the following:

- a. *A continuing record of high quality and effective teaching. This will be measured primarily by input from students and faculty colleagues in the form of evaluative statements selected from the following as available: student opinion questionnaires, student interviews, letters from former students, peer evaluations conducted by faculty in the unit, evaluation of course syllabi, and teaching portfolios.*
 - b. *Sustained contributions to the disciplinary unit's teaching load and the school as a whole by cooperating in meeting teaching needs in class offerings and scheduling.*
 - c. *Fulfillment of advising and/or mentoring commitments as assigned.*
2. A record of service and professional development related to the teaching role.

Appropriate levels of service to the school, the college, the university, the community, and the profession should be maintained. For promotion to Associate Professor of Practice in the area of service, the successful candidate will have documented the following:

- a. *The faculty member must be an active participant in his/her assigned unit within the school as well as in the school as a whole, as demonstrated primarily through participation in relevant unit and school-wide faculty meetings.*
 - b. *Service to the school, college, and/or the university community. Contributions may include service on committees and participation in other activities important to the university community.*
 - c. *An ongoing level of professional activity, appropriate to the candidate's discipline, which assures s/he will remain current in the discipline and capable of delivering present and future curricula that enable graduates to be up-to-date with current practices and be competitive in the job market. Professional activity includes professional development (e.g., training and participation in relevant conferences or workshops), service to the profession (e.g., formal roles in professional organizations), and service to the community that is grounded in the faculty member's field, discipline, or profession and is consistent with the teaching missions of the school, college and university.*
 - d. *Scholarly and/or creative activities, either in addition to or as outlined in the faculty member's Statement of Expectations, may be used as evidence of professional activity and development.*
3. The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching. Teaching outside of the academic year is credited only in the case of faculty members on fiscal-year (12-month) contracts.
- C. *Professor of Practice:* To be eligible for the rank of Professor of Practice, the faculty member must have at least the following:
1. A record of commitment to student success through sustained excellence at the Associate Professor of Practice rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.

For promotion to Professor of Practice in the area of teaching and other student-related activities, the successful candidate will have met the following expectations:

- a. *Instructional effectiveness based on input taken from student, peer, and administrative reviews.*
 - b. *Cooperation in meeting the instructional needs of the academic area and the school.*
 - c. *Ongoing revision of courses to keep current with the discipline, student, and curricular needs.*
 - d. *Fulfilled advising and mentoring commitments as assigned.*
 - e. *Providing challenging academic experiences for students.*
 - f. *Leadership in academic program development.*
2. A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role.

Appropriate levels of service to the school, the college, the university, the community, and the profession should be maintained. For promotion to Professor of Practice in the area of service, the successful candidate will have documented the following:

- a. *The faculty member must be an active participant in his/her assigned unit within the school as well as in the school as a whole, as demonstrated primarily through participation in relevant unit and school-wide faculty meetings.*

- b. *Service to the school, college, and/or the university community. Contributions may include service on committees and participation in other activities important to the university community.*
 - c. *An ongoing level of professional activity, appropriate to the candidate's discipline, which assures s/he will remain current in the discipline and capable of delivering present and future curricula that enable graduates to be up-to-date with current practices and be competitive in the job market. Professional activity includes professional development (e.g., training and participation in relevant conferences or workshops), service to the profession (e.g., formal roles in professional organizations), and service to the community that is grounded in the faculty member's field, discipline, or profession and is consistent with the teaching missions of the school, college and university.*
 - d. *Scholarly and/or creative activities, either in addition to or as outlined in the faculty member's Statement of Expectations, may be used as evidence of professional activity and development.*
3. The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of Associate Professor of Practice. Teaching outside of the academic year is credited only in the case of faculty members on fiscal-year (12-month) contracts.

PART-TIME FACULTY

Responsibilities: Part-time faculty are primarily responsible for teaching undergraduate, graduate, or clinical courses. Part-time faculty are expected to demonstrate commitment to student success through effective teaching and other student related activities.

Term of Appointment: Part-time faculty are hired on a course-by-course basis. They shall have no expectation of continued employment beyond the end of the current assignment.

Qualifications: Part-time faculty shall hold the qualifications as specified by the academic unit.

1.4 Faculty Evaluation

1.4.1 Scope of Evaluation

The Arizona Board of Regents recognizes the need for a faculty performance evaluation system that identifies, assesses, and enhances performance. It is essential that the evaluation process incorporate guidelines relevant to the achievement of the academic goals and objectives of teaching, advising, mentoring, research, creative activity, and professional service while recognizing the unique nature and diversity of the units. To this end, it is necessary that guidelines be established and evaluations conducted in a manner that is flexible enough to serve the particular mission, objectives, and needs of the respective units.

Faculty performance evaluations will take several forms. For tenured faculty these include annual review and promotion review. For tenure eligible faculty these include annual review, probationary (retention) review, promotion review, and tenure review. For non-tenure eligible faculty these can include annual review, reappointment review, and promotion review.

Faculty with full-time administrative responsibilities, such as Deans or those with full-time special assignments, will be evaluated according to criteria established by the Provost or President as appropriate.

Faculty on administrative assignments, such as Chairs, will be evaluated according to the allocation of effort. Thus, their evaluations will be conducted by both peers and their supervisors. Supervisor ratings shall incorporate input from peers.

Part-time faculty will be evaluated according to the procedures established within the departments.

1.4.2 Review and Evaluation Criteria

Academic units will establish criteria for evaluation and measures of quality and will make these criteria available to the faculty member. These criteria must be approved in writing by the Dean and the Provost before implementation.

Typically, academic units will have different criteria and levels of performance expected for annual performance evaluations (e.g., unsatisfactory, satisfactory, meritorious, highly meritorious) than for retention, tenure, and promotion. Annual evaluations do not cumulate into tenure and/or promotion decisions. For probationary (tenure eligible) faculty, the annual evaluation should not be confused with the probationary (retention) review. While these may occur simultaneously and be based upon overlapping material, the probationary (retention) review incorporates the unit's estimate of the faculty member's future promise and contributions to the unit and the discipline based on the performance and accomplishments to date. Annual performance evaluations are retrospective of a single year, and summative in nature. Tenure and promotion reviews incorporate an evaluation of the quality of contributions of the faculty member to date and promise of continued excellence.

1.4.3 Calendar for Performance Evaluation Procedures

Periods for review and evaluation shall be in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar*, which shall be prepared annually by the Provost and furnished through the Deans to all academic units conducting evaluations. Published dates for review of tenured, tenure eligible, and non-tenure eligible faculty will be set by the administration by the first day of the fall semester. This calendar will specify the due dates for faculty submission, committee consideration and recommendations, administrators' consideration and recommendations, and actions by the Provost and President. The *Personnel Action Calendar* can be accessed at from the Provost's website (see Appendix C). For the purposes of Probationary Review, "first" and "second" year for tenure eligible faculty shall be determined by years of service at NAU regardless of years of prior service agreed to at the time of hire.

1.4.4 Personnel Involved with Faculty Evaluation

Depending on the type of review, the personnel involved with faculty evaluation may include

1. The faculty member;
2. Chair [*Director*];
3. Committees (Annual Review Committee, Faculty Status Committee, Promotion and Tenure Committee);
4. Dean;
5. Provost;
6. President.

Descriptions of the structure and charge of the Faculty Status, Annual Review, and College Promotion and Tenure Committees can be found in the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service document, Section B (found on the [Provost's website](#)).

1.4.5 Materials Required for Review and Evaluation

1.4.5.1 Statement of Expectations

Normally, all tenured, tenure eligible, and non-tenure eligible faculty, whether full or part-time appointees, must have a Statement of Expectations that will be used as the basis for performance evaluations. Exceptions to this policy *may* include part-time faculty.

A. Creating a Statement of Expectations:

1. A Statement of Expectations should be constructed so as to utilize the education, skills and talents of the faculty member as they relate to the missions and needs of the department, academic unit, school, college and/or the university. The performance of the faculty member will be measured within the context of his/her Statement of Expectations.
 2. By April 1 of each year, all those holding faculty appointments at Northern Arizona University will have a Statement of Expectations covering the next academic contract (usually the academic year). The Statement of Expectations is the result of negotiation between the faculty member and the Chair [Director]. Consultation with the Dean may be required to reach final agreement. The Statement of Expectations will be individualized for each faculty member. It will encompass the faculty member's anticipated activities for the time period under university contract indicating the percentage of effort devoted to the activities. It will include or otherwise refer to formal, written criteria determined by the academic unit that will be the basis for the evaluation of faculty performance in that unit, both annually and for retention, promotion, or tenure, as appropriate. The Statement of Expectations for those faculty who have administrative responsibilities (such as Chairs, program coordinators, etc.) will enumerate these responsibilities, indicate the percentage of effort devoted to them, and establish the criteria for evaluation of their administrative performance.
 3. Each Statement of Expectations is to be signed by or approved electronically by the faculty member, the Chair [Director], and a copy forwarded to the Dean. These signatures indicate common understanding and agreement to the expectations for the forthcoming contractual period. If the Statement of Expectations is not signed by the faculty member by the end of the academic year, indicating acceptance of the terms of employment for the coming contractual period, the Statement is still considered operative and will be the basis upon which the faculty member is evaluated during the annual review process.
 4. *At a minimum, each faculty member must include expectations that fulfill the "meets" criteria noted in the evaluation criteria section of this document.*
 5. *It is anticipated the Annual Statements of Expectations for faculty members will differ based on the goals of the faculty member and the needs of the disciplinary area and school. The faculty member and the director shall sign the statement, as required by university guidelines.*
- B. Revising the Statement of Expectations. If, during the period covered by the Statement of Expectations, there are significant changes in the faculty member's responsibilities or the faculty member has experienced significant changes in individual circumstances, then the Statement of Expectations may be revised through a negotiation process involving the faculty member [and] the relevant administrator(s).
- C. The revised Statement of Expectations must show the signatures or electronic approval of all relevant parties to be considered the statement of record against which performance is evaluated unless the revised Statement of Expectations has become operative without the signature(s) as provided in paragraph "a" above.

D. Tenure Eligible and Tenured Faculty

Unless otherwise specified, the Statement of Expectations for tenure eligible and tenured faculty will set forth the workload assignment, including percentage of effort that is anticipated in each of the following areas for the contract period:

1. Student-related responsibilities (to include at least teaching, advising, mentoring, and student supervision);
2. Scholarship, research, and/or creative activity; and professional development; and
3. Service to the profession, the University (including administration/college/school/department/area) and to the community (local, state, national, and international) as it relates to the mission and guidelines of the University and the profession.

E. Faculty Members Not Eligible for Tenure

A Statement of Expectations for faculty who are not eligible for tenure will be developed to reflect the specific responsibilities for which those faculty have been employed.

Part-time and temporary faculty will normally have duties enumerated at the time of hire.

F. Workload Assignment

Individual departments or academic units will develop unit policies for determining workloads. These policies must be approved by the Dean and Provost. Workload Assignments are negotiated on an annual basis and described in the Statement of Expectations.

The School of Communication workload assumes a fifteen credit-hour teaching load, consistent with Arizona Board of Regents expectations. A faculty member may normally expect:

1. *A three-hour reassignment for production of scholarly and/or creative activity (tenure eligible or tenured faculty only, unless otherwise negotiated with the Director and Dean). The nature, form, and timeline for scholarly activity must be specified in the faculty member's Annual Statement of Expectations and approved by the Director.*
2. *A three-hour reassignment for service activities to the school, the college, the university, the profession, and/or the community.*
3. *Teaching assignments (courses and times) are determined by the academic area and approved by the Director. To be considered for high profile assignments such as exchange programs, and so on, faculty must demonstrate sustained excellence as evaluated by peers, the Director, and the Dean.*
4. *Other appropriate reassessments for significant leadership responsibilities may be made in consultation with the director and the dean. Such reassignment time will be granted only when the reassignment can be maintained without jeopardizing the unit's or school's ability to offer courses. The nature, form, and timeline of these reassessments must be specified in the faculty member's Annual Statement of Expectations and approved by the Director and the Dean.*

The percentages noted below are recommended but may be negotiated during the approval process of the Annual Statement of Expectations.

Tenure eligible faculty members in the School of Communication are normally expected to teach three classes each semester, advise and/or mentor students as assigned, maintain an active scholarly/creative agenda, and provide service to the university community. The percentage of effort for a tenure track faculty member with a nine hour teaching assignment, a three hour research assignment, and a three hour service assignment would normally be:

1. *Student related activity: 60% (this may be higher if supervising graduate work)*
2. *Scholarly activity: 20%*
3. *Service: 20% (this may include student advising or student-related service)*

Non-tenure eligible faculty are normally expected to teach four classes each semester, advise and/or mentor students as assigned, and provide service to the university community. The percentage of effort for a non-tenure track faculty member with a twelve hour teaching assignment and a three hour service assignment would normally be:

1. *Student related activity: 80%*
2. *Service: 20% (this may include student advising)*

Additional information regarding workload policies can be found on the SBS website (see Appendix C).

1.4.5.2 Professional Review File

Typically, there are three types of files related to personnel: the Professional Review File (PRF) which is used in the faculty evaluation processes, the Personnel File which contains the standard hiring and reappointment forms, and Supervisory Files which are used by administrators to hold notes and materials that are informal in nature and not included in the PRF. Only the PRF and any letters of reference for which the faculty member has waived access shall be considered in the evaluation processes.

The Chair has the responsibility to maintain Professional Review Files including electronic versions for all faculty members within the academic unit regardless of the nature of their appointments. Only the faculty member whose records are involved, appropriate administrators and staff, and evaluation committee members shall have access to the Professional Review File (in paper or electronic form) unless release to others is required as a matter of law or to represent the interests of the University, such as in an Appeal, Complaint, or Grievance procedure. The file shall include at least the following:

- A. All Statements of Expectations and any subsequent amendments to these documents;
- B. Each Annual Faculty Performance Report filed by the faculty member. The faculty member will retain all supporting material, documents, productions and/or creations evidencing activity and/or recognition in the areas referred to in the Statement of Expectations. These materials must be available for review upon request by any evaluating committee/administrator;
- C. Results of formal student, peer, and administrator evaluations, including recommendations and/or decisions relating to the faculty member resulting from such evaluations;
- D. All letters, documents or communications written by faculty, students, committees, and/or administrators that will be considered in the evaluation process by a Faculty Status Committee or other applicable committee. A copy of any such material shall be given to the faculty member at the time it is placed in the file;
- E. Application materials for promotion and/or tenure, including vitae. The faculty member will retain all supporting material, documents, productions and/or creations evidencing activity and/or recognition in the areas referred to in the Statement of Expectations. These materials must be available for review upon request by any evaluating committee/administrator;

- F. Material relevant to the evaluation or review of a faculty member, by a Faculty Status or other applicable committee, including materials relating to leaves of absences and sabbaticals;
- G. Any other relevant materials the faculty member may wish to include in the file, such as letters of support or reference, records of outside funding, evidence of awards and professional recognition, and responses to any other material in the file.

Any materials, such as letters of reference, that are received into the file with an understanding that access has been waived shall remain confidential and in a separate file, not available for review by the faculty member. In addition, any materials required by law to be maintained as confidential shall remain confidential and separate from the Professional Review File.

No material other than the items listed in subsections A-G above shall be placed in the faculty member's Professional Review File and nothing shall be placed in the PRF without the knowledge of the faculty member. The faculty member shall be provided with a copy of any material placed in the file by someone other than the faculty member. Materials received with an understanding of confidentiality agreed to by the faculty member remain in a separate file not available for review or challenge by that faculty member. A faculty member shall have the right to challenge, in writing, the accuracy of material included by others in the Professional Review File. Such a challenge or objection shall be addressed in writing to the Chair. If the faculty member wishes to Appeal the response of the Chair, he or she may do so in writing to the Dean if it was a Chair's response or to the Provost if the response was from the Dean. The Dean or Provost will provide the faculty member with a written response within ten (10) days.

By mutual agreement between the faculty member and the Chair, material previously placed in the Professional Review file may be removed and placed in the supervisor's file.

1.4.5.3 Annual Faculty Performance Report

Each year, all faculty members undergo an annual review that covers only the previous academic year. The purpose and spirit of the annual faculty performance review process is to assess the accomplishments of individual faculty members. These guidelines have been established to conduct evaluations in a manner that is flexible enough to recognize the unique nature and diversity among individuals within the School of Communication.

Evaluation standards for the annual review and a cumulative review are different; however, similar materials are compiled. Many of the materials from the annual reviews can/should also be used for the cumulative review.

Each faculty member shall file an Annual Faculty Performance Report with the immediate unit administrator on the appropriate working day as determined by the *Personnel Action Calendar*. *The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) has developed several checklists to assist faculty in preparing review materials. The document and checklists are available on the SBS website. Faculty members are encouraged to seek assistance from mentors and/or colleagues in preparing their annual faculty performance report.* The report shall specifically address the areas referred to in the Statement of Expectations and the workload assignment described therein for the evaluation period. A current curriculum vitae of the faculty member shall be attached to the report or made available through electronic means. *Cofs requires the components A-D below. Additional School of Communication recommendations follow in E-Q.*

- A. For the evaluation of teaching and student-related responsibilities, the faculty member will supply materials to document performance. As determined by the department/unit prior to evaluation, such materials may include a teaching portfolio

consisting of syllabi, reading lists, handouts, samples of examinations and student papers; advising logs; colleagues' peer-observation reports; and reports of participation in teaching-improvement workshops. Every annual review will include the results of student opinion surveys and every faculty member is expected to be evaluated on every course, every semester.

- B. For the evaluation of scholarship, research, and/or creative activity and professional development, the faculty member will provide evidence appropriate to the discipline and the Statement of Expectations.
- C. For the evaluation of service (including a faculty member's administrative service duties), the faculty member will supply a list of his/her service activities (including service to the profession, department/ school/ college/ university, and to the community as these activities relate to the mission of the university) as defined in a faculty member's Statement of Expectations and any other relevant materials selected by consensus within the unit.
- D. A faculty member may provide additional materials related to the three areas listed above as part of his/her performance report.
- E. *The SOE for the year under review; it must be signed or electronically approved by the faculty member and director.*
- F. *Annual performance report. This 2-4 page report discusses significant achievements relating to teaching/advising, creative/research/scholarship activities, and service as designated on the statement of expectations. This report should cover only the previous annual review period and should directly discuss the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the annual evaluation criteria outlined below.*
- G. *Letters of evaluation and recommendations written by relevant review committees and administrators for the year(s) covered by the review(s). For the annual review this would include the prior year's Annual Review Committee (ARC) evaluation, the director's prior year's evaluation, and current annual review evaluations added to the file as it moves through the levels of review.*
- H. *A professional statement or narrative is only required for faculty who are undergoing a cumulative review—promotion and/or promotion and tenure review—in addition to the annual review. This narrative should be a cumulative summary of the faculty member's accomplishments since her/his date of hire or last promotion (although accomplishments prior to date of hire may be relevant and included). This narrative should address the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. This statement is not reviewed as part of the annual review process; it is only reviewed as part of the promotion and tenure process. Tenure-eligible/probationary faculty and those faculty applying for promotion and/or tenure are therefore required to produce both an annual performance report (for the annual review) and a cumulative narrative (for retention, tenure, and/or promotion).*

1.4.6 Policies for Faculty Review and Evaluation

Evaluations of faculty members must be based upon the documentation available in the Professional Review File, including material that the faculty member has provided to clarify any documents placed in the Professional Review File. In addition, letters of reference for which the

faculty member has waived access shall be considered in the evaluation. Approved academic unit and college/school criteria will provide the basis for the judgment of faculty performance.

1.4.6.1 Tenure Eligible/Tenured Faculty

1.4.6.1.1 Annual Review

All faculty who have less than full-time administrative responsibilities will be evaluated annually by faculty peers and appropriate administrators. The Annual Review shall be conducted during the semester following the year being evaluated. For first-year faculty, the first year's review will encompass only the first semester. The Annual Review shall focus upon: 1) the Statement of Expectations, and (2) the Annual Faculty Performance Report and shall be based on the criteria and standards set forth by the individual units, the University, and ABOR. These unit criteria must be approved in writing by the Dean and Provost before implementation and will be made available to the faculty member.

The Annual Faculty Performance Report is due each fall in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar* (<http://nau.edu/Provost/Reviews-Tenure>). The Annual Review will be conducted by the Chair [Director] and either an Annual Review Committee or a Faculty Status Committee as determined by the academic unit structure.

The Annual Review shall be based on performance in the three areas specified in the Statement of Expectations (teaching/advising; scholarship, research, and/or creative activity; service). All faculty members are expected to maintain levels of professional activity appropriate to their disciplines to ensure that they will remain current in their disciplines and capable of delivering present and future curricula.

A. Annual Review Procedures

1. The Chair [Director] is responsible for providing the faculty member with a list of essential materials to be submitted and dates for the Annual Review.
2. Performance shall be evaluated overall and in the three areas of (1) student-related responsibilities (including teaching, advising, and mentoring), (2) scholarship, research and/or creative activity; and professional development, and (3) service (including service to the department/school/college/university/profession, and to the community as these activities relate to the mission of the university).
3. Every faculty member shall be evaluated in each of the areas specified on a four point scale, with one (1) corresponding to an unsatisfactory rating, two (2) corresponding to a satisfactory rating, three (3) corresponding to a meritorious rating, and four (4) corresponding to a rating of highly meritorious. No faculty member can be rated unsatisfactory overall unless he or she is rated unsatisfactory in one or more areas. Whether a rating of unsatisfactory in one or more areas is a basis for an overall evaluation of unsatisfactory will depend upon the percentage of the faculty member's efforts assigned to those area(s) in the Statement of Expectations and the application of the applicable academic unit criteria to the faculty member's performance.

See Appendix A for a list of performance indicators to be used in the annual evaluation.

Faculty are strongly encouraged to inform the ARC of the significance and importance of their work in their annual report, addressing relevant criteria for the annual review and should be aware that the ARC will only evaluate performance based upon information presented in the Annual Faculty Performance Report.

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to document efforts and accomplishments during the academic year using the professional review file. Evaluation shall be based solely on the written report and supporting materials contained in the faculty member's performance review file. If particular categories are not required in a faculty member's annual SOE, then this category shall be rated as Not Applicable (N/A). However, the faculty member can request that activities that fall into a category not represented on the SOE be used to determine overall merit. This is intended to encourage faculty member's professional growth and development, as well as to recognize the benefits of such accomplishments to the knowledge and reputation of the school, college, university, and community. Failure to provide necessary files may result in an unsatisfactory rating; however, the ARC may request materials from the faculty member. If a document is requested by the ARC, the faculty member will have five working days to provide it; after five days, the ARC will assume the related objective was not met.

4. At the request of the President, reviewers may identify "exemplary performers" based on exceptional performance vis-à-vis established criteria. See Appendix B for School of Communication criteria related to this category.

B. Steps in the Annual Review Process

1. The faculty member submits the Annual Faculty Performance Report, curriculum vitae, and any supporting materials to the Chair by the date specified in the Personnel Action Calendar.
2. The Chair reviews materials for completeness and when determined to be complete, forwards the materials to the appropriate committee (ARC, FSC or P&T).
3. The committee shall review the materials and provide a written recommendation to the Chair and a copy of the recommendation to the faculty member.
4. Upon receipt of the recommendation of the committee, the faculty member shall have the option to:
 - a. Submit a written response to the Chair within seven (7) days of receipt of the written recommendation; or,
 - b. Make no response.
5. The Chair uses the performance of each faculty member as well as the recommendation of the review committee to complete the Annual Review for each faculty member. A written copy of this Review shall be provided to the faculty member and the Dean.
6. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the Chair's Annual Review, the faculty member may submit an appeal with appropriate documentation to the next level of administration within seven (7) days of receipt of the evaluation.
7. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the outcome of that appeal, the faculty member may submit an appeal to the Provost within seven (7) days of receipt of the outcome. The decision of the Provost is final.
8. If a tenured faculty member receives an overall unsatisfactory performance rating in any category for a single year, the faculty development plan is initiated in accordance with section 1.4.7 of this document. See section 1.4.7 for full description of the post tenure review process.

C. Merit Policy

The basis for merit raises, including those for first year faculty, shall be the Annual Review. The Dean will provide to the Provost the ratings of all faculty members.

The Provost shall approve the plan for distribution of merit raises with input from the Faculty Senate.

1.4.6.1.2 Probationary (Retention) Review for Tenure Eligible Faculty

A faculty member whose appointment is tenure eligible shall have no legal right of continued employment or expectation of retention beyond the current contract period. Retention will be based on the review and evaluation procedure described below and on the approved ABOR, NAU, and unit/college criteria. In addition, retention shall consider the needs of the university/college/school/department. For the purposes of Probationary Review, "first" and "second" year for tenure eligible faculty shall be determined by years of service at NAU regardless of years of prior service agreed to at the time of hire.

Retention Review Procedure:

Tenure eligible faculty members will be reviewed for retention every year. The purpose of the retention review is to assess the faculty member's progress toward earning tenure and the University's need for the role and functions served by that individual. The review considers the faculty member's Annual Performance Reports and evaluation outcomes for the year(s) served as well as all other materials from the Professional Review File. The criteria of ABOR and the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service as well as approved unit/college criteria will be used in the evaluation of faculty for retention.

The procedure for review and evaluation shall be as follows:

- A. A review and evaluation of the faculty member shall take place in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar* (<http://nau.edu/Provost/Reviews-Tenure/>). Each of the following committees and administrators will be involved in the review process.
 1. Department Faculty Status Committee (FSC) (in non-departmentalized colleges this is the college or school Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T);
 2. Chair (no review at this level in non-departmentalized colleges);
 3. Dean of the college;
 4. Provost, who makes a recommendation to the President;
 5. President.
- B. At each review level, the Professional Review File shall be evaluated in accordance with approved criteria. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall make written recommendations to the next level, providing a copy of such recommendations to the faculty member. Upon receipt of each recommendation made, the faculty member shall have the following options:
 - a. Within seven (7) days of receipt of the written recommendation, submit to the next level of review a written intent to respond, copied to the recommending committee/administrator. The final written response shall be completed within twelve (12) days of receipt of the initial written recommendation, and shall become a part of the Professional Review File to be reviewed by subsequent reviewing levels.
 - b. Make no response.
- C. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall assess the process followed to date to ensure that it is in accordance with these Conditions of Faculty Service. Upon finding, in the opinion of the reviewing committee/administrator, that the procedure has been followed satisfactorily, the committee/administrator may then proceed with the review and evaluation. If at any level a reviewing committee/administrator believes that appropriate procedure has not been followed, the committee or administrator shall return materials to the previous reviewing level with written instructions for a re-review.
- D. For each tenure eligible faculty member, at each level of review the recommending committee/administrator must make available to the next level all materials in the faculty member's Professional Review File. Because a file may contain a large volume of material, the recommending committee/administrator may forward a subset of materials to the next level. This subset must be approved by the faculty member. The remaining contents of

the file are available upon request. At a minimum, the faculty member's current curriculum vita, all Annual Faculty Performance Reports, and all annual faculty evaluation results shall be forwarded, as well as any materials the faculty member designates.

- E. Each level of review shall specifically state either "Recommended for Retention" or "Not Recommended for Retention." "Recommended for Retention" does not imply total satisfaction with progress towards requirements for tenure or with meeting all expectations of the faculty member. If there are suggestions for improvement in areas subject to evaluation, the suggestions must accompany the decision for retention and should be addressed in subsequent Statements of Expectations. "Not Recommended for Retention" need not be construed as due to failure or poor performance by the faculty member, but may be based on other considerations as set forth in ABOR Policy 6-201-I.4b.
- F. The decision of the President shall be final as to retention or non-retention. A tenure eligible faculty member who receives an adverse decision from the President is entitled upon request to a written summary of the reasons for the final decision.
- G. A tenure eligible faculty member has no expectation of continued employment and shall not be entitled to a hearing following or prior to a decision of non-retention except as provided for in ABOR Policy 6-201M.1, except in cases involving alleged discriminatory or unconstitutional action, or violations of due process or academic freedom.
- H. First year tenure eligible faculty members shall be notified of non-retention by March 1 of the first academic-year of service. Second year tenure eligible faculty members will be notified of non-retention no later than December 15 of the second academic- year of service. Third through fifth year tenure eligible faculty who will not be retained will receive a terminal contract for the following academic year.

1.4.6.1.3 Promotion Review

Achievement of a faculty rank at NAU shall be determined by evaluation and recommendation using written ABOR and NAU criteria, and college/academic unit criteria which must be approved by the Dean and Provost before implementation. Academic unit criteria may exceed ABOR (6-201 I.) and NAU standards. In making promotion decisions, the entire record of the faculty member, including accomplishments at other institutions and other professional activity, shall be considered.

Promotion in rank and the granting of tenure are based on merit. They are never automatic or routine. In general, promotions are awarded to recognize the level of faculty members' contributions to the missions of the school, the college, and the university in teaching and other student-related activity; scholarly activity; and institutional, community, and professional service.

The school's specific criteria indicate the levels of performance that should be met for a faculty member to be considered for renewal, promotion, tenure and/or merit from the school's perspective. For all faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure, a continuing record of effective and committed teaching is expected. For tenure-eligible faculty, scholarly and/or creative activity sufficient to confer significant recognition beyond the university is also expected. In addition to these primary responsibilities, all faculty members are required to perform appropriate service that contributes to the school, the college, the university, the larger community, and/or discipline-related professional entities.

Case preparation is critical to the retention, promotion, and tenure process. Promotion and tenure decisions are based primarily on evaluation of the faculty member's achievements as described in his or her Application for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure. The application must document

and contain evaluation of the candidate's performance in teaching and other student-related activities, scholarly activity, and service, consistent with the candidate's position.

All faculty who are undergoing a review for promotion, as well as tenure-eligible faculty undergoing a probationary/retention review, should therefore produce a professional statement or narrative. This narrative should be a cumulative summary of the faculty member's accomplishments since her/his date of hire or last promotion (although accomplishments prior to date of hire may be relevant and included). This narrative should address the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. This statement is not reviewed as part of the annual review process; it is only reviewed as part of the promotion and tenure process. Tenure-eligible/probationary faculty and those faculty applying for promotion and/or tenure are therefore required to produce both an annual performance report (for the annual review) and a cumulative narrative (for retention, tenure, and/or promotion).

The professional narrative and other materials in support of the application for tenure and/or promotion is assembled and maintained in the FAAR system by the faculty member. These documents are used by the Faculty Status Committee, director, SBS Promotion & Tenure Committee, dean, provost, and president each time a faculty member with a continuing contract is reviewed for promotion and/or tenure. The application should include the annual Performance Reports, as well as many of the items found in the annual Professional Review File. While this list is neither exhaustive nor absolute, recommended components include:

- A. All approved Statements of Expectations since date of hire or last promotion.
- B. Current curriculum vitae
- C. Each Annual Faculty Evaluation Report (PER) filed by the faculty member, together with all supporting material evidencing activity and/or recognition in the three areas of teaching and student-related activities, scholarly/creative activity, and service.
 - 1. Results, recommendations, and/or decisions relating to the faculty member, including student, peer, and administrator evaluations
 - 2. All written notes of faculty, students, committees, and/or administrators that will be considered in the evaluation process. A copy of any such notes placed in the file will be given to the faculty member at the time they are placed in the file.
- D. All evaluations and recommendations from annual reviews (and annual probationary/retention reviews for tenure-eligible faculty) since the date of hire or last promotion, and all letters and recommendations that are added to the file as it moves through the levels of review.
- E. Student-related activities
 - 1. A narrative summary that focuses on key areas/items, explains pedagogical issues, and helps the reviewers understand the faculty member's teaching procedures and philosophy. This narrative should include a description of course and class preparation and revisions and any other student-related activities of the faculty member (e.g., advising, curriculum development, etc.). Of particular importance can be a narrative description of efforts undertaken to improve student learning over the course of the review period (i.e., since date of hire or last promotion).
 - 2. Student evaluation survey results for each class taught (along with a summary of the number of students enrolled, and the number of students responding)
 - 3. Student opinion surveys, course syllabi, and other relevant documentation will in most cases already be available in the FAAR system; however, faculty applying for promotion should insure such materials are available and are free to include additional documentation of student-related activities (e.g., course assignments, sample student work, and letters from students, colleagues, and other relevant parties).
- F. Scholarly and/or creative activity

1. *Narrative summary of scholarly activity that identifies and explains each accomplishment, and clarifies the programmatic nature of the applicant's scholarly and/or creative activity.*
 2. *Evidence of scholarly/creative accomplishments, including letters of acceptance, copies of relevant works, and other documents that support the accomplishments described in the narrative.*
- G. Service
1. *Narrative summary that explains the nature and scope of the applicants' contributions in the area of service to their academic area, the school, college, university, profession, and/or community, including a self-assessment of the value of contribution to the served entity, the faculty member, and/or the school, college, or university.*
 2. *Evidence of service activities and accomplishments described in the narrative, including letters of appreciation, awards, minutes from meetings, committee membership lists, and the like,*
- H. Any other relevant materials the faculty member may wish to include in the file, such as letters of support or reference, records of outside funding, evidence of awards and professional recognition, and responses to any other material in the file.

Procedure for Review and Evaluation for Promotion

The procedure for review and evaluation of faculty for promotion shall be:

- A. During the fall semester, in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar* (found on the provost's website; see Appendix C) applications for promotion must be filed in the office of the Chair [Director];
- B. A review and evaluation of the faculty member shall take place by each of the following committees/administrators:
 1. Department Faculty Status Committee (FSC) (in non-departmentalized colleges this is the college Promotion and Tenure Committee);
 2. Chair (no review at this level in non-departmentalized colleges);
 3. College Promotion and Tenure Review Committee;
 4. Dean of the college;
 5. Provost, who makes a recommendation to the President;
 6. President.
- C. A faculty member being considered for promotion who at such time is acting in an administrative capacity shall not participate as an administrator in his or her review process. The level of review at which the administrator would normally be involved shall be eliminated for review of this administrator for promotion.
- D. At each review level, the Professional Review File shall be evaluated in accordance with approved criteria. In addition, the materials such as letters of recommendation received to which the faculty member has agreed to waive access shall be made available. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall make written recommendations to the next level, providing a copy of such recommendations to the faculty member. Upon receipt of each recommendation made, the faculty member shall have the following options:
 1. Within seven (7) days of receipt of the written recommendation, submit to the next level of review a written intent to respond, copied to the recommending committee/administrator. The final written response shall be completed within twelve (12) days of receipt of the initial written recommendation, and shall become a part of the Professional Review File to be reviewed by subsequent reviewing levels.
 2. Withdraw his/her name from consideration for promotion
 3. Make no response.

- E. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall assess the process followed to date to ensure that it is in accordance with these Conditions of Faculty Service. Upon finding, in the opinion of the reviewing committee/administrator, that the procedure has been followed satisfactorily, the committee/administrator may then proceed with the review and evaluation. If at any level a reviewing committee/administrator believes that appropriate procedure has not been followed, the committee or administrator shall return materials to the previous reviewing level with written instructions for a re-review.
- F. For each faculty member, at each level of review the recommending committee/administrator must make available to the next level all materials in the faculty member's Professional Review File as well as the confidential file containing letters of recommendation to which the faculty member has waived access. Because a Professional Review File may contain a large volume of material, the recommending committee/administrator may forward a subset of materials to the next level. This subset must be approved by the faculty member. The remaining contents of the file are available upon request. At a minimum, the faculty member's current curriculum vitae, all Annual Faculty Performance Reports, and all annual faculty evaluation results shall be forwarded, as well as any materials the faculty member designates.
- G. The recommendation made at each level of review shall specifically state either "Recommended for Promotion" or "Not Recommended for Promotion."
- H. A faculty member who receives an adverse decision from the President is entitled, upon request, to a written summary of the reasons for the final decision. *Procedures related to this process can be found in COFS 1.4.6.1.3.*

1.4.6.1.4 Tenure Review

To be eligible for tenure the faculty member must meet the criteria for associate professor and, in addition, must show promise of continued productivity in all areas. The potential for long-term productivity of the faculty member to the university must be considered in making the tenure decision. Tenure is typically offered only to those faculty serving full-time in a tenure eligible position.

The process of earning promotion and tenure begins at the moment of hiring. Faculty are hired with expectations in job performance, teaching, scholarly activity, and service that are established in position descriptions. These may be revised as the unit's needs and the faculty member's assignments change. From the time of their arrival at the university, new faculty should be clearly advised of what is expected of them for promotion and tenure. A recommendation to grant tenure should be made only after careful scrutiny of the entire record and after sufficient time has elapsed to permit a sound prediction of future performance. Tenure, therefore, will be granted to faculty members whose character, achievements in serving the university mission, and potential for effective long-term performance warrants the institution's reciprocal long-term commitment. The granting of tenure is more significant than promotion in academic rank.

Normally, tenure applications and decisions are made in the sixth year of full-time service at NAU including approved prior service credit. The maximum probationary time permitted in a tenure eligible appointment shall be no longer than six (6) years in full-time service as a tenure eligible faculty member. A faculty member may withdraw his/her application at any time prior to a response from the President. A faculty member may only be reviewed for tenure once at the Presidential level. Unless otherwise negotiated, when a faculty member's initial appointment is for the spring semester, the faculty member's probationary period will commence with the following fall semester.

Upon request, the President has the discretion to extend this probationary period for the faculty member for good cause following review and recommendation by the appropriate academic administrators. The President's decision shall be final. Good cause might include serious illness, disability, exceptional family care responsibilities, and less than full-time service when the cause is shown to interfere with a faculty member's efforts to perform duties necessary to meet the criteria for tenure. Any extension of the probationary period shall be confirmed in writing and placed in the Professional Review File of the faculty member. If a faculty member takes a leave of absence during the probationary period, the Provost and the faculty member must reach agreement prior to the time of leave as to the effect of such leave on the probationary period. A leave of absence will in some cases justify an extension of the probationary period if approved in writing by the Provost prior to the start of the leave.

Procedure for Review and Evaluation for Tenure

The procedure for review and evaluation of faculty for tenure shall be the same as the policy set forth above in Procedure for Review and Evaluation for Promotion (1.4.6.1c). A faculty member may only be reviewed for tenure once at the Presidential level.

If tenure is awarded, it begins with the Notice of Appointment for the next period of employment. If tenure is not awarded, the faculty member is entitled to a final year of employment and the next Notice of Appointment will reflect that it is the faculty member's final year of employment at NAU, unless the faculty member is in the first or second year at NAU. In that case, the year of review is the final year. The faculty member shall be entitled upon request to a statement of reason in writing for the denial of tenure (ABOR Policy 6-201.I.1.)

Note: A faculty member can request to be removed from a tenure-eligible to a non-tenure eligible appointment status. This request will be evaluated according to procedures established by the academic unit and approved by the Provost. If such an agreement occurs, the faculty member forfeits all time toward tenure.

1.4.6.2 Non-tenure Eligible Faculty

1.4.6.2.1 Annual Review

All full-time faculty who have less than full-time administrative responsibilities will be evaluated annually by faculty peers and appropriate administrators. The Annual Review shall be conducted during the semester following the year being evaluated. For first-year faculty the first review will encompass only the first semester. The Annual Review shall focus upon: (1) the Statement of Expectations, and (2) the Annual Faculty Performance Report and shall be based on the criteria and standards set forth by the individual units, the University, and ABOR for non-tenure eligible faculty. These unit criteria must be approved in writing by the Dean and Provost before implementation and will be made available to the faculty member.

The Annual Faculty Performance Report is due each fall in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar* (<http://nau.edu/Provost/Reviews-Tenure/>). The Annual Review will be conducted by the Chair and either an Annual Review Committee or a Faculty Status Committee as determined by the academic unit structure.

The overall evaluation shall be based on performance in the areas specified in the Statement of Expectations as measured against the approved unit criteria.

Annual Review Procedures

- A. The Chair is responsible for providing the faculty member with a list of essential materials to be submitted and dates for the Annual Review.

- B. Performance shall be evaluated overall and in the areas of designated responsibility. These areas would include one or more of the following: (1) student-related responsibilities (including teaching, advising, and mentoring), (2) scholarship, research, and/or creative activity; and professional development, and (3) service (including service to the profession, department/school/college/university and to the community as these activities relate to the mission of the university).
- C. Every faculty member shall be evaluated in each of the areas specified on a four point scale, with one (1) corresponding to an unsatisfactory rating, two (2) corresponding to a satisfactory rating, three (3) corresponding to a meritorious rating, and four (4) corresponding to a rating of highly meritorious. No faculty member can be rated unsatisfactory overall unless he or she is rated unsatisfactory in one or more areas. Whether a rating of unsatisfactory in one or more areas is a basis for an overall evaluation of unsatisfactory will depend upon the percentage of the faculty member's efforts assigned to those area(s) in the Statement of Expectations and the application of the applicable academic unit criteria to the faculty member's performance.

See Appendix A for a list of performance indicators to be used in the annual evaluation.

Faculty are strongly encouraged to inform the ARC of the significance and importance of their work in their annual report, addressing relevant criteria for the annual review and should be aware that the ARC will only evaluate performance based upon information presented in the Annual Faculty Performance Report.

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to document efforts and accomplishments during the academic year using the professional review file. Evaluation shall be based solely on the written report and supporting materials contained in the faculty member's performance review file. If particular categories are not required in a faculty member's annual SOE, then this category shall be rated as Not Applicable (N/A). However, the faculty member can request that activities that fall into a category not represented on the SOE be used to determine overall merit. This is intended to encourage faculty member's professional growth and development, as well as to recognize the benefits of such accomplishments to the knowledge and reputation of the school, college, university, and community. Failure to provide necessary files may result in an unsatisfactory rating; however, the ARC may request materials from the faculty member. If a document is requested by the ARC, the faculty member will have five working days to provide it; after five days, the ARC will assume the related objective was not met.

Steps in the Annual Review Process

- A. Faculty submit the Annual Faculty Performance Report, curriculum vita, and any supporting materials to the Chair by the date specified in the *Personnel Action Calendar*.
- B. The Chair reviews materials for completeness and when determined to be complete, forwards the materials to the appropriate committee (ARC, FSC or P&T.)
- C. The committee shall review the materials and provide a written recommendation to the Chair and a copy of the recommendation to the faculty member.
- D. Upon receipt of the recommendation of the committee, the faculty member shall have the option to:
 1. Submit a written response to the Chair within seven (7) days of receipt of the written recommendation; or,
 2. Make no response.

- E. The Chair uses the performance of each faculty member to complete the Annual Review for each faculty member. A written copy of this review shall be provided to the faculty member and the Dean.
- F. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the Chair's review, the faculty member may submit an appeal with appropriate documentation to the next level of administration within seven (7) days of receipt of the evaluation.
- G. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the outcome of that appeal, the faculty member may submit an appeal to the Provost within seven (7) days of receipt of the outcome. The decision of the Provost is final.

Merit Policy

The basis for merit raises, including those for first year faculty, shall be the Annual Review. The Dean will provide to the Provost a list of faculty members who are to receive merit raises.

The Provost shall approve the plan for distribution of merit raises with input from the Faculty Senate. Should merit funding not be available annually, evaluation for the subsequent merit increase will be based on the three immediately preceding years, or on the period since the previous merit distributions, whichever is shorter.

If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the merit decision of the Dean, the faculty member may submit an appeal with appropriate documentation to the Provost. The Provost will review the appeal and supporting documentation. The decision of the Provost is final.

Faculty members will be considered for merit pay increases on activities completed in all areas in which they are evaluated. Faculty members must be making significant progress toward the next highest rank in their track in order to be considered for merit pay increases. Faculty who hold the highest rank in their track must be making significant contributions in the areas in which they are evaluated.

1.4.6.2.2 Renewal Review for Non-tenure Eligible Faculty

A faculty member whose appointment is non-tenure eligible shall have no legal right of continued employment or expectation of renewal in that appointment beyond the current contract period. Renewal of appointment will be based on the review and evaluation process described below in consideration of approved ABOR, NAU, and unit/college criteria for non-tenure eligible faculty. In addition, renewals shall consider the needs of the university/college/school/ department and funding availability.

Renewal of Appointment Procedure

Non-tenure eligible faculty members will be reviewed for eligibility for renewal every year unless they have multiple-year appointments. In that case, the renewal review will occur in the final year of the appointment. The purpose of the renewal of appointment review is to assess the faculty member's potential for reappointment in light of the university's needs, availability of funding, performance, and functions served by that individual. The review considers the faculty member's Annual Performance Reports and evaluation outcomes for the year(s) served as well as all other materials from the Professional Review File.

The procedure for review and evaluation of non-tenure eligible faculty shall be as follows:

- A. A review and evaluation of the faculty member shall take place in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar* (available on the provost's website; see Appendix C). Each of the following committees and administrators will be involved in the review process.

1. Department [School] Faculty Status Committee (FSC);
 2. Chair [Director];
 3. Dean of the college;
 4. Provost.
- B. At each review level, the Professional Review File shall be evaluated in accordance with approved criteria for non-tenure eligible faculty. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall make written recommendations to the next level, providing a copy of such recommendations to the faculty member. Upon receipt of each recommendation made, the faculty member shall have the following options:
1. Within seven (7) days of receipt of the written recommendation, submit to the next level of review a written intent to respond, copied to the recommending committee/person. The final written response shall be completed within twelve (12) days of receipt of the initial written recommendation, and shall become a part of the Professional Review File to be reviewed by subsequent reviewing levels.
 2. Withdraw his/her name from consideration for renewal, which shall constitute a resignation effective the end of the current academic year.
 3. Make no response.
- C. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall assess the process followed to date to ensure that it is in accordance with these Conditions of Faculty Service. Upon finding, in the opinion of the reviewing committee/administrator, that the procedure has been followed satisfactorily, the committee/administrator may then proceed with the review and evaluation. If at any level a reviewing committee/administrator believes that appropriate procedure has not been followed, the committee or administrator shall return materials to the previous reviewing level with written instructions for a re-review.
- D. For each non-tenure eligible faculty member, at each level of review the recommending committee/administrator must make available to the next level all materials in the faculty member's Professional Review File. Because a file may contain a large volume of material, the recommending committee/administrator may forward a subset of materials to the next level. This subset must be approved by the faculty member. The remaining contents of the file are available upon request. At a minimum, the faculty member's current curriculum vitae, all Annual Faculty Performance Reports, and all annual faculty evaluation results shall be forwarded, as well as any materials the faculty member designates.
- E. Each level of review shall specifically state either "Recommended as eligible for Renewal" or "Not Recommended as eligible for Renewal." "Recommended as eligible for Renewal" does not imply total satisfaction with all expectations of the faculty member. If there are suggestions for improvement in areas subject to evaluation, the suggestions must accompany the decision for reappointment and should be addressed in subsequent Statements of Expectations. "Not Recommended as eligible for Renewal" need not be construed as due to failure or poor performance by the faculty member, but may be based on other considerations such as changing program needs or lack of funding.
- F. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the outcome of the renewal review, the faculty member may submit an appeal to the Provost within seven (7) days of receipt of the outcome.
- G. The decision of the Provost shall be final as to renewal of appointment or non-renewal of appointment.

1.4.6.2.3 Promotion Review

Advancement in non-tenure eligible faculty rank at NAU shall be determined by evaluation and recommendation using written ABOR, NAU and academic unit criteria for the appropriate faculty classification. These criteria must be approved in writing by the Dean and Provost before implementation. In making promotion decisions, the entire record of the faculty member, including accomplishments at other institutions and other professional activity, shall be considered.

Promotion in rank is based on merit. It is never automatic or routine. In general, promotions in non-tenure eligible ranks are awarded to recognize the level of faculty members' contributions to the missions of the school, the college, and the university in teaching and other student-related activity and in institutional, community, and professional service.

For all faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure, a continuing record of effective and committed teaching is expected. In addition to these primary responsibilities, all faculty members are required to perform appropriate service that contributes to the school, the college, the university, the larger community, and/or discipline-related professional entities.

Case preparation is critical to the promotion process. Promotion decisions are based primarily on evaluation of the faculty member's achievements as described in his or her Application for Promotion. The application must document and contain evaluation of the candidate's performance in teaching and other student-related activities, service, and professional development (which may include scholarly/creative activities) consistent with the candidate's position.

All faculty who are undergoing a review for promotion should therefore produce a professional statement or narrative. This narrative should be a cumulative summary of the faculty member's accomplishments since her/his date of hire or last promotion (although accomplishments prior to date of hire may be relevant and included). This narrative should address the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the criteria for promotion. This statement is not reviewed as part of the annual review process; it is only reviewed as part of the promotion process. Those faculty applying for promotion are therefore required to produce both an annual performance report (for the annual review) and a cumulative narrative (for the promotion review).

The professional narrative and other materials in support of the application for promotion is assembled and maintained in the FAAR system by the faculty member. These documents are used by the Faculty Status Committee, director, SBS Promotion & Tenure Committee, dean, provost, and president each time a faculty member with a continuing contract is reviewed for promotion. The application should include the annual Performance Reports, as well as many of the items found in the annual Professional Review File. While this list is neither exhaustive nor absolute, recommended components include:

- A. All approved Statements of Expectations since date or hire or last promotion.
- B. Current curriculum vitae
- C. Each Annual Faculty Evaluation Report (PER) filed by the faculty member, together with all supporting material evidencing activity and/or recognition in the three areas of teaching and student-related activities, scholarly/creative activity, and service.
 - a. Results, recommendations, and/or decisions relating to the faculty member, including student, peer, and administrator evaluations
 - b. All written notes of faculty, students, committees, and/or administrators that will be considered in the evaluation process. A copy of any such notes placed in the file will be given to the faculty member at the time they are placed in the file.
- D. All evaluations and recommendations from annual reviews (and annual probationary/retention reviews for tenure-eligible faculty) since the date of hire or last promotion, and all letters and recommendations that are added to the file as it moves through the levels of review.
- E. Student-related activities
 - a. A narrative summary that focuses on key areas/items, explains pedagogical issues, and helps the reviewers understand the faculty member's teaching

- procedures and philosophy. This narrative should include a description of course and class preparation and revisions and any other student-related activities of the faculty member (e.g., advising, curriculum development, etc.). Of particular importance can be a narrative description of efforts undertaken to improve student learning over the course of the review period (i.e., since date of hire or last promotion).*
- b. Student opinion survey results for each class taught (along with a summary of the number of students enrolled, and the number of students responding*
 - c. Student opinion surveys, course syllabi, and other relevant documentation will in most cases already be available in the FAAR system; however, faculty applying for promotion should insure such materials are available and are free to include additional documentation of student-related activities (e.g., course assignments, sample student work, and letters from students, colleagues, and other relevant parties).*
- F. Scholarly and/or creative activity*
- G. Narrative summary of scholarly activity that identifies and explains each accomplishment, and clarifies the programmatic nature of the applicant's scholarly and/or creative activity.*
- H. Evidence of scholarly/creative accomplishments, including letters of acceptance, copies of relevant works, and other documents that support the accomplishments described in the narrative.*
- I. Service and professional development*
- a. Narrative summary that explains the nature and scope of the applicants' contributions in the area of service to their academic area, the school, college, university, profession, and/or community, including a self-assessment of the value of contribution to the served entity, the faculty member, and/or the school, college, or university.*
 - b. Narrative summary of professional development activities and an explanation of how these contribute to the teaching role (i.e., remaining current in the field, updating courses, etc.).*
 - c. Evidence of service activities and accomplishments described in the narrative, including letters of appreciation, awards, minutes from meetings, committee membership lists, and the like,*
- J. Any other relevant materials the faculty member may wish to include in the file, such as letters of support or reference, records of outside funding, evidence of awards and professional recognition, and responses to any other material in the file.*

Procedure for Review and Evaluation for Promotion

The procedure for review and evaluation of non-tenure eligible faculty for promotion shall be:

- A. During the fall semester (in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar*), applications for promotion must be filed in the office of the Chair.
- B. A review and evaluation of the faculty member shall take place by each of the following committees/administrators.
 - a. Department Faculty Status Committee (FSC);
 - b. Chair [Director];
 - c. College Promotion and Tenure Review Committee;
 - d. Dean of the college;
 - e. Provost, who makes a recommendation to the President;
 - f. President.
- C. At each review level, the Professional Review File shall be evaluated in accordance with approved ABOR, NAU, and unit criteria for the appropriate non-tenure eligible classification. In addition, any material such as letters of recommendation to which the

faculty member has agreed to waive access shall be made available. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall make written recommendations to the next level, providing a copy of such recommendations to the faculty member. Upon receipt of each recommendation made, the faculty member shall have the following options:

1. Within seven (7) days of receipt of the written recommendation, submit to the next level of review a written intent to respond, copied to the recommending committee/person. The final written response shall be completed within twelve (12) days of receipt of the initial written recommendation, and shall become a part of the Professional Review File to be reviewed by subsequent reviewing levels.
 2. Withdraw his/her name from consideration for promotion.
 3. Make no response.
- D. At each level of review, the committee/administrator shall assess the process followed to date to ensure that it is in accordance with these Conditions of Faculty Service. Upon finding, in the opinion of the reviewing committee/administrator, that the procedure has been followed satisfactorily, the committee/administrator may then proceed with the review and evaluation. If at any level a reviewing committee/administrator believes that appropriate procedure has not been followed, the committee/administrator shall return materials to the previous reviewing level with written instructions for a re-review.
- E. For each faculty member, at each level of review the recommending committee/administrator must make available to the next level all materials in the faculty member's Professional Review File, as well as the confidential file containing letters of recommendation to which the faculty member has waived access. Because a Professional Review File may contain a large volume of material, the recommending committee/administrator may forward a subset of materials to the next level. This subset must be approved by the faculty member. The remaining contents of the file are available upon request. At a minimum, the faculty member's current curriculum vitae, all annual faculty performance reports, and all annual faculty evaluation results shall be forwarded, as well as any materials the faculty member designates.
- F. The recommendation made at each level of review shall specifically state either "Recommended for Promotion" or "Not Recommended for Promotion."

G. Appeal Process

A faculty member must await the President's decision before initiating a formal appeal of a promotion decision. Within fourteen (14) days of receipt by the faculty member of the President's decision, the faculty member may submit a written appeal to the President stating specific reasons for the appeal and providing any supplemental material relevant to the appeal. *Procedures related to this process can be found in COFS 1.4.6.1.3.*

1.4.7 Post-Tenure Review Process

The goals and principles of the Post-Tenure Review Process, as implemented in 1997 by the Arizona Board of Regents, are established at Northern Arizona University to ensure sustained high quality faculty performance, especially in the areas of teaching and other student-related responsibilities, and specifically as faculty move well beyond the point of receiving a tenured appointment. The post-tenure review process emphasizes opportunities for continued faculty development and provides additional accountability to the university community, to the public, and to the Board.

The post-tenure review process is linked to the annual performance review process (see 1.4.6.1.1 above). According to ABOR policies 6-201 and 6-211, an annual performance evaluation of an

individual must be conducted by his/her peers, and by the Chair [Director]. The Dean must also review this evaluation. Specific criteria and standards for performance are to be developed in each unit, and must be approved by the Dean and the Provost before implementation. These standards and criteria must be consistent with the mission of that unit, as well as the mission of the University. These standards and criteria are then used by the Annual Review Committee or the Faculty Status Committee to evaluate the performance of every faculty member in the unit in relation to his/her Statement of Expectations.

If an individual who has already achieved tenure at any rank (assistant, associate, or professor) is judged to be performing at less than a satisfactory level as defined below under 1.4.7.1, then a faculty improvement process is developed as under 1.4.7.2 to assist that individual.

1.4.7.1 Relation of Annual Review Process to Post-Tenure Review Process

- A. "Post-tenure review" refers to the full process of reviewing tenured faculty, including the annual review and any development plans that may result from that review.
- B. The purpose of annual performance evaluations is to provide systematic assessments of faculty accomplishments and to encourage outstanding performance through a system of rewards that are based on the evaluation. At a minimum, the evaluation should determine whether faculty are performing their duties at a satisfactory level, while ideally at the same time identifying a profile of accomplishments that are well above average, and setting the standard for others to emulate. Finally, those who are not performing at a satisfactory level must be identified. Thus, a faculty member may be rated at one of the following four levels: unsatisfactory, satisfactory, meritorious, or highly meritorious.
- C. If a tenured faculty member receives an unsatisfactory performance rating overall, or in a single evaluation category (teaching/advising, research, or service) for a single year, then the Annual Reviews and supporting documentation for the past thirty-six (36) months will be examined carefully by the department chair [Director].
- D. The rating of unsatisfactory means that there is demonstrated substantial failure to perform properly-assigned duties as set forth in the faculty member's Statement of Expectations. The burden of proof for an unsatisfactory rating rests with the evaluating committee and/or administrators, who must agree upon and provide the faculty member with a written statement specifying the basis upon which this rating was determined, and the nature of the remedial action being recommended.
- E. Northern Arizona University recognizes that extenuating circumstances (illness, accident, personal tragedy, etc.) may affect one's performance in such a way that leads to an unsatisfactory evaluation outcome. However, within the spirit of the principle governing this process, it is up to the academic unit peer faculty and administrators (Chair/Director and Dean) to work with the individual to determine an appropriate course of action to address the concern over the individual's performance. If an unsatisfactory rating in an individual area is due to extenuating circumstances which have passed or been overcome, then remedial action may not be necessary.
- F. As a result of an annual performance evaluation, if a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation and the faculty member chooses not to contest the evaluation, or if the unsatisfactory evaluation is upheld through the administrative review process, the following actions apply:
 1. The first rating of unsatisfactory in any single area must be addressed by the Chair. Depending on the specifics and sources of the problem the Chair may work with the faculty member on an individual basis to isolate the sources of difficulty and to develop

- a plan to ameliorate them; or, if the Chair deems it necessary or the faculty member requests it, create a formal Faculty Development Plan described in section 1.4.7.2.1, *Faculty Development Plan*.
2. A faculty member must enter a unit level Performance Improvement Plan as described in section 1.4.7.2.2 *Performance Improvement Plan* whenever:

- a. The faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation for overall performance that is not due to extenuating circumstances that have already been overcome,
- b. The faculty member receives two unsatisfactory evaluations in the same or different areas of assigned responsibility within a thirty-six (36) month review period and is not participating in a Faculty Development Plan, or
- c. The faculty member does not complete a Faculty Development Plan successfully.

1.4.7.2 Faculty Improvement Process

Any faculty member who receives an “unsatisfactory” rating in any element of the annual review may be required to enter a “faculty improvement process.” Additional information about this process can be found in COFS 1.4.7.2.

1.6.2 Evaluation for Appointment to Emeritus Status

Emeritus status may be awarded to faculty upon retirement. Information about the process can be found in COFS 1.6.2.

1.7.1 Sabbatical Leave

Information about the sabbatical leave process can be found in COFS 1.7.1. To be considered for sabbatical leave, an eligible faculty member may submit a sabbatical application no earlier than the sixth (6th) year of full-time service to Northern Arizona University. For sabbatical leave eligibility, time on an unpaid leave of absence may or may not be counted as provided in COFS 1.7.5.

1.7.4 Employment, Services, or Consulting Outside the University (“Outside Employment”)

Information about university requirements related to outside employment and consulting can be found in COFS 1.7.4.

School of Communication APPENDIX A

Performance Indicators for Annual Evaluation

All tenured, tenure eligible, and non-tenure eligible, full-time faculty members shall be evaluated by an Annual Review Committee (ARC) according to their progress toward meeting the criteria established in their statement of expectations. The committee shall recommend to the director the level of achievement (highly meritorious, meritorious, meets expectations, or unsatisfactory) for each of four evaluation categories: (1) teaching, advisement and other student-related responsibilities; (2) research, scholarship and/or creative activities; (3) service to the university, community and the profession; and, (4) overall evaluation of the faculty member's performance.

The Personal Review File, which is not expected to be lengthy, should consist of an annual report (and a cumulative narrative for tenure-track faculty being reviewed for retention and those faculty applying for promotion) and support material for the three areas (student-related, research/creative, and service).

Faculty are strongly encouraged to inform the ARC of the significance and importance of their work in their annual report, addressing relevant criteria for the annual review (see below), and should be aware that the ARC will only evaluate performance based upon information presented in the PRF.

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to document efforts and accomplishments during the academic year using the professional review file. Evaluation shall be based solely on the written report and supporting materials contained in the faculty member's performance review file. If particular categories are not required in a faculty member's annual SOE, then this category shall be rated as Not Applicable (N/A). However, the faculty member can request that activities that fall into a category not represented on the SOE be used to determine overall merit. This is done to encourage faculty member's professional growth and development, as well as to recognize the benefits of such accomplishments to the knowledge and reputation of the school, college, university, and community. Failure to provide necessary files may result in an unsatisfactory rating.

Student opinion survey results are required for inclusion. Student opinion survey results will be used to identify themes regarding an instructor's effectiveness. In no case are student opinion survey results to be used as a baseline for measuring teaching effectiveness. They should be only one of many factors to be considered in evaluating a faculty member's teaching.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to express the qualitative nature of the performance indicator they are using for evaluation. The Annual Review Committee will also evaluate the qualitative nature based on the faculty member's report.

Meets Expectations Performance Indicators

To receive a Meets Expectations rating a faculty member is expected to briefly explain in the report achievement of all of the following:

- Perform expected teaching duties,
- Meet classes regularly,
- Hold a minimum of 2 scheduled and posted office hours/week (but is available by other means to meet with students, such as online, by phone, and so on),
- Conduct courses as described in the syllabus,
- Maintain a clean and safe work environment,
- Maintain an advising load as described in SOE,
- Improve areas that were identified as concerns from prior ARC review.

- Getting a “meets expectations” rating means you have adequately met your responsibilities and obligations under criteria set by the School of Communication. The School values this contribution.

Meritorious and Highly Meritorious Performance Indicators

For a Meritorious rating, a faculty member must completely fulfill the Meets Expectations criteria plus achieve a minimum of 3 of the criteria listed below. For a Highly Meritorious rating a faculty member must completely fulfill the Meets Expectations criteria plus achieve a minimum of 6 of the criteria listed below.

Faculty members in their first year are reviewed after their first semester of teaching. Therefore, the performance indicators used to evaluate first year faculty members will be adjusted to reflect work performed during one semester. Be aware that a criterion may be used more than once. For example, a faculty member may have developed two new courses; in that case, developing a new course may be used twice. Some activities are listed under student-related and service to allow the faculty member flexibility when writing their PRF. Faculty members should use an activity in the one best place. The same activity should not be used in multiple reporting areas (e.g., teaching and service). When writing the report, a faculty member should make an argument as to why they deserve the ranking that they believe they have achieved using the criteria below:

1. Substantial contribution to School teaching load including:
 - a. Number of different course preps,
 - b. Number of contact hours above the minimum of three hours/week for a three-credit course,
 - c. Course enrollment or type of class (e.g., junior level writing, capstone, writing intensive course that is not a “w” course, undergraduate honors thesis preparation, etc.).
2. Course development including:
 - a. Develop a new course (e.g., creating a new course through the curriculum process),
 - b. Substantially update an existing course (e.g., develop enhanced methods to promote creative and critical thinking and writing and oral skills),
 - c. Teach a new preparation,
 - d. Develop a course for alternative delivery (e.g., face-to-face class delivered as an online course or vice versus).
3. Successful submission of a teaching-related grant.
4. Evidence of significant curriculum development or redevelopment of department/school or interdisciplinary program.
5. Commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience including:
 - a. Organize and/or direct a significant field trip (include length of time, degree of supervision, and outcomes),
 - b. Facilitate student participation at a professional meeting,
 - c. Be an advisor of an active, university-related student organization or group,
 - d. Advise a student activity (co-curricular, if release time is available, must explain how efforts are beyond the release time),
 - e. Supervise presentation and/or publication of student scholarly or creative work in a professional and/or academic venue,
 - f. Internship assistance/coordination/supervision (without release time),
 - g. Maintain equipment and laboratories.
6. Chair a Master’s or Doctoral supervisory committee.
7. Successful publication of instructional/teaching related materials (e.g., a workbook that goes through editorial review and is used beyond the instructor’s course).

8. Involvement in professional development activity related to teaching (e.g., acquisition of new skill to be used in teaching).
9. Presentation or written article to a non-School of Communication campus class or student group using subject material or concepts taught in your field.
10. Student/Faculty/University award for excellence in teaching or teaching-related activities (excluding self-nominations, awards that have no set criteria for nomination, and survey results).
11. Additional consideration may be given to evidence of effective classroom teaching and/or advising based on:
 - a. Annual reviews,
 - b. Examples of rigorous student work,
 - c. Creating meaningful relationships with non-university entities, including outside lecturers, internships, and/or job opportunities for students,
 - d. Direct an independent study or student research,
 - e. Serving on a Master's or Doctoral supervisory committee,
 - f. Other forms of documentation.
12. Substantial advising involvement (include a list of advisees).
13. Other teaching, advisement and other student related activities.

Research, Scholarship and/or Creative Activities

Faculty's performance in the area of research, scholarship and/or creative activity is evaluated by taking into account accomplishments in relation to the percentage of their workload allocated to this activity as recorded on their annual statements of expectations document.

Operational Definitions

Research, scholarship and/or creative activities are activities that lead to tangible, original works that expand the knowledge base, extend into new fields of application, and/or improve teaching by the dissemination of pedagogic scholarship. These activities include publications, exhibitions or productions related to a faculty member's academic interests and efforts to increase, synthesize, or disseminate knowledge in subject areas germane to a faculty member's academic interest. It is assumed that the faculty member's output would make an original contribution to the body of knowledge. All scholarship must be externally reviewed – peer, editorial, juried, or other documented forms of external review.

In the case of co-authored/co-produced works, the faculty member should include a statement clarifying the nature of their contribution to the project. If the publication is the result of a complete collaboration, the faculty member should receive full credit. If the faculty member's contribution was limited (e.g., was only involved in data collection, only wrote a small portion of the work) then they should receive partial credit commensurate with their contribution.

Research. Publications in this category have gone through a peer-review process (anonymous blind-review by experts in the field). Publications are completed written documents or other tangible works such as refereed journal articles, books, book chapters, monographs, research/technical reports, or the like. Both print and on-line refereed publications carry the same weight. Supporting documentation should be included in the faculty member's annual review file. Conference papers also fall within this category, with greater weight given to peer-reviewed papers versus abstracts, and less weight given to papers/presentations that do not involve peer review.

Creative Production. Creative works in this category have gone through a juried review process. Supporting documentation should be included in the faculty member's annual review file.

Non-refereed Publications, Creative Works, Works of Professional Practice. Publications and other creative works in this category have been reviewed before publication/exhibition/production by an editor or contracted sponsor or equivalent evaluator. It is

assumed that output would represent a creative and intellectual stretch. It is the obligation of the faculty member to explain the creative and intellectual dimension of the work in their annual review file.

Documentation

Faculty members should include a representative sample of supporting materials as appropriate that provide evidence that the faculty member produced scholarly and/or creative work. Representative samples of materials include photocopies of a small portion of a published or exhibited work, letter of acceptance or contract, conference program listing, and/or letter or certificate of award. Entire documents or exhibits do not need to be presented. Both research and creative work will be given equal weight in evaluations.

Using the evidence presented in the faculty member's professional review file, the ARC members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for research, scholarship and/or creative activities in this document. The faculty member is encouraged to inform the ARC of the importance of their work in the report.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to express the qualitative nature of the performance indicator they are using for evaluation. The Annual Review Committee will also evaluate the qualitative nature of the work based on the faculty member's report. The performance levels outlined below assume a 20% research/creative load (as per the faculty member's statement of expectations). Performance levels should be adjusted for faculty members who have a research/creative load greater or less than 20%. If a faculty member was on sabbatical during all or half of the review period, then her/his SOE will generally indicate 100% or 50-60% devoted to research/creative activity and the performance levels below should be adjusted accordingly.

Meets Expectations Performance Indicators

To receive a "meets expectations" rating a faculty member is expected to briefly explain in the narrative achievement of one (1) of the following activities and provide supporting evidence. When writing the narrative, faculty members should make an argument as to why they deserve the ranking that they desire using the criteria below.

Getting a "Meets Expectations" rating means you have adequately met your responsibilities and obligations under criteria set by the School of Communication. The School values this contribution.

Meritorious and Highly Meritorious Performance Indicators

For a Meritorious rating, a faculty member must completely fulfill the meets expectations criteria plus achieve a minimum of one (1) of the criteria listed below. For a "Highly Meritorious" rating a faculty member must completely fulfill the meets expectations criteria plus achieve a minimum of two (2) of the criteria listed below.

Tenure-eligible faculty members in their first year are reviewed after their first semester of teaching. The Annual Review Committee realizes that research, scholarship and/or creative activities may not be evident for evaluation after one semester. Therefore, if evidence is presented the performance indicators used to evaluate first year faculty members will be adjusted to reflect work performed during one semester. If evidence is not presented, the ARC will not evaluate this component of the workload. However, the ARC will evaluate this component of workload during the second and subsequent year's reviews.

Be aware that some of the listed criteria may be used more than once (e.g., acceptance and presentation of two peer-reviewed conference papers). When writing the report, faculty members should make an argument as to why they deserve the ranking that they believe they have achieved using the criteria below:

Publications

1. Published or produced book, screenplay or equivalent work based on original work, or edited volume with new and original contributions;
2. Revision of an existing work;
3. Refereed journal article;
4. Invited contribution (chapter in a book or other refereed publication such as a review essay, monograph, bibliographic essay, encyclopedia entry, or research note);
5. Newspaper or magazine article related to the discipline (editorially reviewed for a nationally-distributed publication);
6. Disseminated research report, applied research report, or a significant research note in a non-refereed work;

Exhibitions

1. Solo or collective public exhibition of work;
2. Commissioned/collected work;
3. Professional competition/exhibition;
4. Grants and Contracts
5. Contract-in-hand received in the evaluation year; and/or a submitted proposal, and/or other work submitted to a journal/publisher/juried show/creative director/agent;
6. Preparation and submission of a research/creative grant or fellowship from external or internal funding sources;
7. Receipt of a research/creative grant or fellowship;

Presentations/Conference Work

1. Professional conference work (e.g., panel discussant/participant);
2. Presentation (e.g., research or creative invited presentation, keynote address, poster presentation, colloquia or invited lecture outside the department and/or university);
3. Organize symposia or conference related to research/scholarship/creative activity;
4. Paper presented at a conference that has gone through a peer-review process;

Miscellaneous

1. Editing a journal or other publication;
2. Creation and dissemination of computer software for scholarly/creative purposes;
3. Reprint or reproduction or exhibition of published scholarship or creative work in anthology, edited volume or other publication, or online;
4. Award or recognition, or extensive or prominent citation (not self-cited) for research, scholarship or creative activity;
5. Professional development work relating to research/scholarship/creative work;
6. Equivalent work which has been peer-reviewed, editorial reviewed, juried, or equivalent external review. Please explain the "equivalence" to the committee in the accompanying report;
7. Work in progress. In all cases work in progress must have accompanying documentation. Examples include studying relevant literature as documented by an annotated bibliography or a literature review; collecting data or conducting fieldwork as documented by field notes, transcripts, survey data, logs, or images; drafting thumbnails or preliminary images for future creative exhibition as documented by draft images; drafting scripts for future production; seeking out training in preparation for conducting future creative or research activities. Work in this category must be substantial and indicate progress from previous years.

Service to the University, Community and the Profession

Faculty performance in the area of service to the university, community, and the profession is evaluated by taking into account accomplishments in relation to the percentage of their workload

allocated to this activity as recorded on their annual Statement of Expectations document. Service is evaluated by taking into account faculty service to the school, college, university, professional associations and the community.

Using the evidence presented in the faculty member's professional review file, the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for service activities in this document. Faculty are strongly encouraged to inform the ARC of the significance and importance of their work in a report, addressing relevant criteria, and should be aware that the ARC will only evaluate performance based upon information presented in the PRF. It may be helpful for faculty to include the approximate number of hours devoted to the service activity, documented in the report.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to express the qualitative nature of the performance indicator they are using for evaluation. The Annual Review Committee will also evaluate the qualitative nature based on the faculty member's report. The performance levels outlined below assume a 10% service load (as per the faculty member's statement of expectations). Performance levels should be adjusted for faculty members who have a service load greater or less than 10%.

Meets Expectations Performance Indicators

To receive a "Meets Expectations" rating a faculty member is expected to briefly explain in the report achievement of all of the following with support documentation as needed:

1. Is an active member of at least one working committee at the program, department, university and/or discipline-level, or equivalent service;
2. Regular attendance at all faculty meetings and retreats.

Getting a "Meets Expectations" rating means you have adequately met your responsibilities and obligations under criteria set by the School of Communication. The School values this contribution.

Meritorious and Highly Meritorious Performance Indicators

For a "Meritorious" rating, a faculty member must completely fulfill the "Meets Expectations" criteria plus achieve a minimum of two (2) of the criteria listed below. For a "Highly Meritorious" rating a faculty member must completely fulfill the meets expectations criteria plus achieve a minimum of four (4) of the criteria listed below. In some cases a single service activity can justify a highly meritorious ranking due to the quantitative and qualitative nature of the activity.

Faculty members in their first year are reviewed after their first semester of teaching. Therefore, the performance indicators used to evaluate first year faculty members will be adjusted to reflect work performed during one semester.

Be aware that some of the listed criteria may be used more than once (e.g., a faculty member may be a member of several committees). Some activities are listed under student-related and service to allow the faculty member flexibility when writing their PRF. Faculty members should use an activity in the one best place, not using the same activity in multiple reporting areas. When writing the report, a faculty member should make an argument as to why they deserve the ranking that they desire using the criteria below:

1. Work intensive service that involves frequent meetings and/or extensive preparation (e.g., UCC, ARC, FSC, Senate). In addition to being used for the meets expectations criteria, these committee obligation may be considered for higher merit;
2. Additional university service (e.g., school, college, university committees; senate; commissions; task forces; boards; advisor of an active student organization; coordinators; and/or event coordination beyond the activities used to meet expectations in the area of service);

3. State, regional, national, and/or international service (e.g., elected or selected to office in a professional organization, serving as a member of an editorial board, serving as a reviewer, and/or organizing a conference or symposium);
4. Public or community service that uses the expertise of the faculty member, or directly contributes to the mission of the university (e.g., workshops, public forums, consultation; writing and technical assistance);
5. Professional service (e.g., reviewing journal articles and other publications, reviewing or judging creative works, reviewing grant applications, serving on professional committees);
6. Takes leadership role on a committee;
7. Service activities that significantly enhance the visibility and reputation of the school, college, or university (e.g., presentations to a group using subject materials or concepts taught in your field);
8. Service awards;
9. Maintaining equipment and laboratories;
10. Other service activities.

The above annual review criteria remain in effect until they are revised and approved by the School of Communication faculty and approved by the relevant administrators. As of January 2016, changes to the annual review process are being considered and draft recommendations have been circulated, but the above criteria remain in effect.

School of Communication APPENDIX B

Criteria for Determination of “Exemplary” Status

As of January 2016, the exemplary performer program is undergoing review and revision. If the program is re-implemented, exemplary performance awards will be determined by the procedures and criteria distributed by the Provost.

School of Communication APPENDIX C

The following links and/or documents will be helpful to School of Communication faculty in preparing annual review, tenure, and promotion materials (these also can be found on the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences website at <https://nau.edu/sbs/faculty-staff-resources/>).

Calendar of personnel actions

[Faculty Personnel Action Dates](#) (Promotion, Tenure, Probationary, Annual Review, Sabbatical)

Faculty review

[FAAR Manual](#)

[Faculty Review Frequently Asked Questions](#)

[FAAR Instructions](#)

[Non-tenure Eligible Faculty Differences](#)

[Workload Policy Frequently Asked Questions](#)

[Shared Faculty Time Guidelines](#)

Materials checklists for faculty review

[Probationary/Annual Review](#)

[Non-Tenure Eligible Lecturer Renewal/Annual Review](#)

[Sabbatical Review](#)

Promotion and tenure

[SBS P&T Criteria](#)

[Promotion and Tenure/Annual Review](#)

[Promotion to Full Professor/Annual Review](#)

[Promotion to Senior/Principal Lecturer/Annual Review](#)

P&T Committee appointments and procedures

[P&T Committee Election Procedures](#)

[Draft-Joint Appointment Review](#)

[P&T Review Committee Responsibilities](#)

Post-tenure review (tenured faculty not seeking promotion and/or tenure)

[Materials Checklist for Post Tenure Review](#)

[Expedited review policy for post tenure faculty](#)

Statements of Expectations

[Frequently Asked Questions](#)

[SOE Instructions](#)

[SOE Process](#)

Links current as of January 2016.

Sociology

Annual Review

Revised by Department: April, 2014

Approved by the Provost: May 16, 2014

Name Change and subsequent changes (related to Social Work): 2018

This document describes criteria for annual review of faculty performance. The criteria for evaluation are embedded in a model that allows some variation in the distribution of effort in the following areas: 1.) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; 2.) research and scholarship; 3.) service to the university, community, and the profession. The model emphasizes teaching, advisement and other student-related activity as a major component with research/scholarship and service given relatively less weight. The model allows for at least five configurations with different weights for each area of effort. The model configuration used for the evaluation of a particular faculty member in a given year should reflect the distribution of effort described in the statement of expectation for the evaluation period, which is formulated by the faculty member with the department Chair and approved by the Dean. The five models presented herein represent the distributions of effort that reflect typical faculty workloads within the Department of Sociology. Any distribution of effort could be accommodated within the general model. Part-time instructors direct all effort to teaching and will be evaluated in this area outside of the annual review process.

For all full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty, lecturers, and instructors, performance in each area of effort will be evaluated annually as specified in the Conditions of Faculty Service. Comprehensive post-tenure review evaluations will be conducted on a rotating basis every five years. Expedited reviews of tenured faculty will affirm the prior year's overall rating. Evaluations rendered by the Annual Review Committee and the Department Chair will be based on thresholds of accomplishment for satisfactory, meritorious and highly meritorious performance in each area of effort. In this sense, the evaluation is based upon individual accomplishment. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to document efforts and accomplishments during the academic year on the accomplishment form. Faculty will be evaluated in each of the areas 1.) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; 2.) research and scholarship; and 3.) service to the university, community, and the profession. Ratings for each area are weighted and combined to determine the overall performance evaluation. The criteria for each of the evaluation areas were formulated with the intent to encompass the diversity of faculty activities and contributions during a normal year. The Annual Review Committee and the Department Chair should also consider forms of accomplishment or effort documented by the faculty member that may not be specifically addressed in this document.

The Model of Distribution of Effort

The model is a method for accommodating variation in workload distribution for the areas of effort in the process of rendering an overall performance evaluation. The areas of effort are 1.) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; 2.) research and scholarship; 3.) service to the university, community, and the profession. The total workload for all full-time faculty is based upon 30 units/credit hours per year. The models presented below are based upon patterns of workload effort within the department. For instance, most faculty teach three courses per semester (9 credit hours per semester/18 credit hours per academic year) with the other time spent divided in scholarship/research (3 credit hours per semester/6 credit hours per academic year) and service activity (3 credit hours per semester/6 credit hours per academic year). In the models below all weights sum to 100% (30 credit hours) and percentages represent weighted effort in each category. Each year the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair will evaluate faculty performance within the context of the model with appropriate weights. Weights

are determined by the distribution of effort specified in the statement of expectation for the particular faculty member. Some weights may be zero reflecting no activity in that area for a given year. The models below are illustrative and other configurations are possible.

Model #1: Typical Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty Workload

Teaching/advising/SRR	8 hrs. (3/3 course load)	60%
Scholarship/research	6 or 9 hrs.	20% or 30%
Service	<u>3 or 6 hrs.</u>	<u>10% or 20%</u>
	30 hrs.	100%

This model reflects the typical faculty workload distribution in our department. Teaching consists of three courses per semester and is weighted at 60% of the overall work distribution effort. Scholarship/research and service add to 40%.

Model #2: Increased Advising/Other Student Related Responsibilities

Teaching/advising/SRR	18 hrs. (3/2 course load + 3 hrs. advising/SRR)	60%
Scholarship/research	6 or 9 hrs.	20% or 30%
Service	<u>3 or 6 hrs.</u>	<u>10% or 20%</u>
	30 hrs.	100%

This model reflects an increased advising/other student related responsibilities workload which is the equivalent to a 3-credit course. To qualify for this model, faculty would need to have a substantially higher student related supervision responsibilities. The faculty research activities are assumed to remain the same as in model 1 above. Scholarship/research and service add to 40%.

Model #3: Program Coordinators

Teaching/advising/SRR	12 hrs (2/2 course load)	40%
Scholarship/research	6 hrs.	20%
Service/Administration	<u>12 hrs.</u>	<u>40%</u>
	30 hrs.	100%

Model three reflects the workload of program coordinators. Here the faculty person is released 20% from teaching to administer the program.

Model #4: Faculty without Research Expectations

Teaching/advising/SSR	24 hrs. (4/4 course load)	80%
Scholarship/research	0 hrs.	0%
Service	<u>6 hrs.</u>	<u>20%</u>
	30 hrs.	100%

Model four reflects faculty who teach at 80% which is four classes per semester and do not devote time to scholarship. In this case, scholarship is weighted at zero. Teaching is the major component of this person's overall evaluation model with service at 20%.

Model #5: Increased Scholarship/Research

Teaching/advising/SRR	15 hrs. (3/2 course load)	50%
Scholarship/research	12 hrs.	40%
Service	3 hrs.	10%
	30 hrs.	100%

Model five reflects a distribution of effort that is appropriate when the teaching load is reduced to allow for a more intensive scholarly effort. Extraordinary reassigned time to scholarship/research must be justified by a buyout from an external grant or its equivalent. Such intensive scholarly activity is also measured in highly productive publication of books and refereed journal articles.

The college promotion and tenure document reflects the minimum standard regarding performance in teaching, scholarship, and service for tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and has established a standard as a minimum to be promoted from Associate to Professor. Thus, model #4 may not be appropriate for anyone who wishes to be considered for promotion or tenure to the rank of Associate Professor or promotion to the rank of Professor.

Lastly, the above models do not preclude some other configuration.

Sabbatical Leave

The distribution of effort for a faculty member on sabbatical leave is determined by the nature of the approved sabbatical proposal. For instance, if the sabbatical plans are exclusively scholarly in nature, scholarship would be weighted at 100% for the period of the leave. Fulfillment of proposed sabbatical activities will normally result in a rating of Meritorious. Partial fulfillment will result in a rating of Satisfactory. Only exceptional productivity warrants a rating of Highly Meritorious.

Evaluation Categories

The evaluation categories are those specified by the Conditions of Faculty Service. The numerical weights are presented below:

Highly Meritorious	=	4
Meritorious	=	3
Satisfactory	=	2
Unsatisfactory	=	1

An evaluation for each of the non-zero-weighted areas in the above models will be performed in light of the above categories and their assigned numerical representations. The numeric value for the evaluation category for each area of effort is incorporated into the equation for the appropriate model in order to generate an overall evaluative score with one constraint: a minimum evaluation of satisfactory is required in all areas of effort in order to receive an overall evaluation of meritorious or highly meritorious. With at least satisfactory performance in all areas, the evaluative score places the faculty member into one of the four performance categories. Numerical thresholds for placing faculty into the four categories in general terms are:

Highly Meritorious	=	3.5 or greater
Meritorious	=	2.5 to 3.4
Satisfactory	=	1.5 to 2.4
Unsatisfactory	=	1.4 or less

In addition, it is important to note that the students' qualitative comments and other supportive data related to teaching activities play a significant role in determining the evaluation. Similarly,

quality of scholarly activity such as publications and the like are also evaluated to augment the quantitative assessment of scholarship based on the number of published or presented works.

Criteria for Evaluation in Each Area of Effort

Criteria for evaluation in each area of effort are specified below. The areas of effort are: 1.) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; 2.) research and scholarship; 3.) service to the university, community, and the profession, and 4.) administration. Each area contains thresholds for satisfactory, meritorious and highly meritorious.

TEACHING/MENTORING/OTHER STUDENT-RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES CRITERIA

The department recognizes the diversity of faculty contributions in teaching, mentoring, and other student-related responsibilities and embraces the principle of multidimensional assessment of performance in this area. The Annual Review Committee is expected to consider the range of evidence provided by each faculty member documenting teaching, mentoring, and other student-related activity and effectiveness. At minimum the committee will review results of student course surveys and course syllabi. Faculty are also encouraged to provide additional documentation of their teaching and mentoring efforts and performance, such as summaries of student comments on courses, descriptions or examples of course assignments/activities, statement of teaching objectives and strategies, examples of student work, documentation of mentoring activities, supervised independent studies and research and the results of such independent study or research by the students, etc. It is incumbent upon each faculty member to provide evidence of teaching effectiveness to the committee, with sensitivity to the burden imposed on Annual Review Committee members by excessive documentation.

The Annual Review Committee is encouraged to consider student survey results in light of a faculty member's teaching assignments and practices. The nature of the course, assignments, number of students in relation to pedagogical and assessment practices, and teaching efforts beyond the classroom should all be considered by the ARC in the determination of the overall rating for teaching. Additionally, all faculty are expected to be engaged in department/program governance.

To obtain **satisfactory** the minimum requirement for the academic year is:

1. Completion of agreed upon course teaching load.
2. Minimum student survey grand unweighted mean above 2.4 for the academic year OR other documentation the committee judges to be evidence of satisfactory teaching effectiveness. Also, examination of qualitative comments from student surveys should be incorporated to contextualize the responses.
3. Course syllabi, instructional materials, and other input (such as requested peer- reviews) submitted by faculty member are judged to be effective and appropriate by the Annual Review Committee and Chair.
4. Participation in mentoring undergraduates and other student related activities such as graduate committee memberships, thesis and internship supervision, graduate committee chair, and club advisor (student, faculty, or alumni).

Criteria for evaluating effectiveness and appropriateness of course syllabi and instructional materials:

1. Content is appropriate for the course and curriculum.
2. Course content is appropriate for the level of the class.
3. Material/information used in course is current or otherwise appropriate.
4. Instructional methods are effective for achieving course objectives.
5. Methods of assessment/evaluation are fitting for the objectives of the course.

If faculty receive student survey evaluations indicating an overall grand unweighted mean lower than 2.4 for the academic year and there is no other evidence of minimal teaching effectiveness

OR the Annual Review Committee judges one or more course syllabi for the year to be ineffective or inappropriate, they will be unsatisfactory during that calendar year in teaching/advisement/other student-related responsibilities. Student comments also provide important qualitative evaluations that should be used in conjunction with the numerical averages. Consistency between all input used must be considered in rendering the teaching evaluation.

Beyond the satisfactory level, faculty will be evaluated on the basis of a variety of teaching-related efforts and accomplishments during the period under review. The thresholds for the evaluation categories are as follows.

To obtain **meritorious** the minimum requirement for the academic year is:

1. Completion of agreed upon course teaching load.
2. Minimum student survey grand unweighted mean at or above 3.2 for the academic year.
3. Course syllabi and instructional materials submitted by faculty member are judged to be effective and appropriate by the Annual Review Committee.
4. Supportive evidence of auxiliary effort to enhance or further teaching as exemplified in the list presented below.
5. Qualitative survey comments by students that reflect positively on the survey responses.
6. An undergraduate advising load and documentation of other advising activity such as graduate committee memberships, thesis and internship supervision (graduate committee chair), or club advisor (student, faculty, or alumni).

Or

1. A minimum of two course preparations per semester.
2. Minimum student survey grand unweighted mean at or above 3.0 for the academic year OR other documentation the committee judges to be evidence of meritorious teaching effectiveness.
3. Course syllabi and instructional materials submitted by faculty member are judged to be effective and appropriate by the Annual Review Committee.
4. Supportive evidence of excellence in teaching performance or auxiliary effort to enhance teaching from list below.
5. Qualitative survey comments by students that contextualize the student survey responses.
6. An undergraduate advising load and documentation of other advising activity such as graduate committee memberships, thesis and internship supervision (graduate committee chair), or club advisor (student, faculty, or alumni).

To obtain **highly meritorious** the minimum requirement for the academic year is:

1. A minimum of two course preparations per semester.
2. Minimum student survey grand unweighted mean at or above 3.4 for the academic year.
3. Course syllabi and instructional materials submitted by faculty member are judged to be effective and appropriate by the Annual Review Committee, and additional supportive evidence for effective teaching such as teaching workshop attendance or presentations on teaching effectiveness methods.
4. Qualitative student survey comments that complement the survey responses.
5. An undergraduate advising load and documentation of other advising activity such as graduate committee memberships, thesis and internship supervision (graduate committee chair), and club advisor (student, faculty, or alumni).

Or

1. A minimum of two course preparations per semester.
2. Minimum student survey grand unweighted mean at or above 3.2 OR other documentation the committee judges to be evidence of exceptional teaching effectiveness.
3. Course syllabi and instructional materials submitted by faculty member are judged to be effective and appropriate by the Annual Review Committee.
4. Qualitative survey comments from student surveys that contextualize and support the assessment.

5. At least two forms of supportive evidence of excellence in teaching performance or auxiliary effort to enhance teaching from list below.
6. An undergraduate advising load and documentation of other advising activity such as graduate committee memberships, thesis and internship supervision (graduate committee chair), and or club advisor (student, faculty, or alumni).

Auxiliary Teaching-Related Efforts and Accomplishments

- Course syllabi and instructional materials submitted by faculty member are judged to be exceptional (based on criteria for effectiveness and appropriateness) by the Annual Review Committee.
- Preparation of a course never before taught or not taught for three years.
- Major modifications (substantial changes in materials and assignments) of an existing course.
- Creation of new course resource material (handouts, study guides, visuals, models).
- Teaching workshops attended with a minimum of 8 hours of work.
- Courses taken related to teaching effort.
- Scholarship written on teaching. For faculty with scholarship/research expectations, this activity should be reported under "scholarship/research."
- Panel participation in teaching forums.
- Independent study supervisions at three hours minimum.
- Three or more course preparations per semester.
- First time teaching preparation and delivery of Extended Campuses' web courses.
- The development of a new course proposal.
- Peer review reports based on classroom visits or student interviews.
- Refereed articles in teaching journal.
- Publishing conference papers related to teaching.
- Teaching Junior Level Writing or Capstone Courses.
- Mentoring of Teaching Assistants that extends beyond assignment of responsibilities/tasks and provision of directions.
- Mentoring/assisting students in preparation of professional papers.
- Extensive writing or research assignments in courses not designated as capstone or junior level writing.
- Comparison of the faculty member's performance in relation to other faculty of the same rank in the department for the period under review.

SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH CRITERIA

Scholarship/research is an arena in which accomplishments should be commensurate with the proportion of the faculty member's time that is devoted to this area (weight in the model). The Annual Review Committee and Department Chair should evaluate accomplishments on the basis of quality as well as quantity. In terms of quantity, the thresholds described below are based on the model in which 20% of a faculty member's time is directed to scholarship/research efforts (as per the statement of expectation). In cases where the amount of effort in research is greater or less than 20%, the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair are responsible for adjusting the thresholds accordingly. For instance, if someone is devoting 40% of their time to scholarship, the criteria for thresholds should be doubled (which is unlikely to happen unless the faculty member has a buyout from an externally funded grant or its equivalent). The Annual Review Committee and Department Chair should evaluate quality of scholarly efforts by faculty on the basis of materials submitted. The quantitative thresholds presented below are based on the presumption of **at least satisfactory quality**. Scholarship that is judged to be of high or exceptional quality should be given greater weight by the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair, in the context of the thresholds. The qualitative dimension of the evaluation of scholarship is necessarily at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee and Chair. Committee members and the Chair should utilize appropriate professional/disciplinary standards to evaluate scholarship and explain in the memo reporting the evaluation how and on what basis qualitative factors affected the rating. Faculty must submit copies of papers presented, published or accepted for publication/presentation, and reports along with appropriate correspondence documenting the status of manuscripts in order for the Annual Review Committee and Chair to evaluate the quality of scholarly work and the accomplishment of the thresholds described below.¹

Below are the activities in the area of scholarship/research that are required to achieve an evaluation as **satisfactory**. The items identified below may not be accumulated toward a higher evaluation category. Any two satisfy the minimum for this category.

- Article in popular press.
- Article in newsletter.
- Panel participant at professional meetings.
- Speaking engagement.
- Professional research training.
- Public lecture.
- Session discussant.
- Internal grant application.
- Work in progress.²

Below are the activities in the area of scholarship/research that are required for **meritorious** in scholarship. Any one plus one from the satisfactory list (above) is the minimum for this category. The items below may also be accumulated toward the **highly meritorious** evaluation category.³

¹ Alternatively, generic standards for assessing scholarship, such as those proposed by Glassick, Huber M Maeroff (1997) may be utilized: a) clear goals; b) adequate preparation; c) appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.

² Substantial work in progress may be counted toward meritorious (for instance, completion of book chapters). The review committee should make a judgment with regard to the merit of work in progress. Faculty should provide evidence of such work.

³ The Annual Review Committee and Chair will judge whether the cumulative effort within the meritorious list should be recognized as highly meritorious.

- Internal grant award.
- Publication in non-refereed conference proceedings.
- Subsequent editions of edited volumes.
- Paper submitted for refereed publication review.
- Professional meeting paper presentation.
- Non-refereed journal article.
- Published book review essay.
- Published refereed conference proceedings.
- Needs assessment, planning or technical report.
- Unremunerated contract for research or professional service.
- Submission of external grant proposal.

Below are the activities in the area of scholarship/research that are required to evaluate faculty as **highly meritorious** in scholarship. Any one accomplishment from the list below qualify faculty for highly meritorious. Alternatively, the Annual Review Committee and Chair will consider combinations of accomplishments from the meritorious list for evaluation as highly meritorious.

- Refereed journal article (accepted/forthcoming or published).⁴
- Book chapters (two or more book chapters are to be considered equal to a refereed journal article).
- Authored book.
- Major external grant award or administration (NSF, NIH, or similar major awards).
- First edition of edited book.

SERVICE (TO THE UNIT, COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY, PROFESSION, AND COMMUNITY) CRITERIA

Service activities and thresholds for evaluation categories are listed below. Credit for service efforts is based on active participation in department, college, university, and community efforts (committees, task forces, boards, pro bono consultations, etc.).

Faculty should provide a list of all memberships as well as a brief description of activities or tasks performed in relation to each service role identified.

Service, similar to scholarship, is an arena in which the quantity of effort should be commensurate with the proportion of the faculty member's time that is devoted to this area (weight in the model). The thresholds described below are based on the model in which 10% or 20% of a faculty member's time is directed to service efforts (as per the statement of expectation). In cases where the amount of effort in service is greater or less than 10% or 20%, the Annual Review Committee is responsible for adjusting the thresholds accordingly. For instance, if someone is devoting 40% (or 12 hours of the total 30 hours per academic year) of their time to service, the criteria for thresholds should be doubled.

To be considered **satisfactory** in service faculty should document any two from the following list in addition to on-going participation in program/department governance and undergraduate advising:

- Committee membership (department, college, or university).
- Professional organization participation.

⁴ If accepted/forthcoming, publication during subsequent evaluation period will not be credited.

- Grant proposal reviewer.
- Presentation of workshops, seminars, training for public service or the profession.
- Serving on professional public service boards, task forces, or committees.

To be considered ***meritorious*** in service faculty should document any two of the following or any two from the satisfactory list (above) plus one from below.

- Committee, chair (department, college or university).
- Curriculum or program development efforts not encompassed by committee memberships or administrative release.
- Professional organization, hold an office in subsection of an organization.
- Professional organization, panel/session organizer at conference.
- Technical reports or manuals (professional or public service).
- New preparations of workshops, seminars, training, etc. for public service or profession.
- Chairing professional public service boards, task forces, or committees.
- Journal referee, reviewing papers for a journal.
- Reviewer of scholarly book or textbook manuscript.

To be considered ***highly meritorious*** in service faculty should document any of the following or three from the meritorious list or a combination judged by the committee as equivalent to these.

- Professional organization officer.
- Conference organizer.
- Unusual effort as chair or member of a university body with significant charge.
- Faculty should provide evidence in their annual review materials if they wish to have a service activity treated differently than described above. Unusual committee effort should be rewarded but this needs to be documented by the faculty member. It is assumed that items listed as service are unremunerated.

Faculty Documentation

Faculty are responsible for documenting their annual departmental contributions in the areas of teaching/advancement/other student related responsibilities, scholarship/research and service for the Chair and the Annual Review Committee through the FAAR system. The current Conditions of Faculty Service require annual reviews within all departments. It also requires that an elected faculty committee be part of the annual review recommendation process. It is important for the committee that each faculty person clearly documents their accomplishments in FAAR in order to facilitate the review process. The statement of expectation for the relevant year, current curriculum vitae, and all student evaluations and course syllabi are the minimum needed to accomplish the review task. Copies of scholarly articles, papers presented, and other publications or works in progress should also be uploaded into FAAR if they are listed as faculty activity. In addition to the minimum, if faculty members believe there is other documentation that would support their annual review, they may submit it for review. The efforts and accomplishments listed in the foregoing criteria are not necessarily exhaustive. Faculty should provide documentation of and the Faculty Status Committee should consider efforts/accomplishments that are not listed explicitly in this document.

Exemplary Designation

Faculty members at any level rank (tenured, tenure-track, non-tenure track) who have demonstrated exceptional performance in any area of faculty service (teaching and student-related activities, scholarship, service) may be considered for exemplary status for their accomplishments during the academic year under review. The general conceptualization of what is considered "exemplary" includes activities that are deemed to be of excellent quality outside what might be considered the expectations derived from the Statement of Expectations (SOE) and relevant departmental annual review criteria.

Given that NAU places restrictions on how many faculty members may be rewarded with exemplary status, the departmental COFS/ARC committee will identify those individuals who meet the exemplary criteria and subsequently vote for the number of individuals allotted to the department from among the identified individuals. The number of individuals (in line with the number allotted) with the highest number of votes will be awarded the exemplary designation and will receive a permanent merit-based salary adjustment. The amount of this adjustment for any given annual evaluation is determined by the upper administration at NAU.

¹ Revision effective July 1, 2018 reflects the name change from Department of Sociology and Social Work to Department of Sociology.

² All references to Social Work are indicated with a strikethrough for purposes of future deletion.

Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria

Revised by Department: April, 2014

Approved by the Provost: May 16, 2014

Name Change and subsequent changes (related to Social Work): 2018

The Sociology Faculty Status Committee makes departmental recommendations for tenure and/or promotion based upon the criteria specified in this document. The committee ensures that each candidate meets acceptable minimum standards for the University (see ABOR Policy 6-201 and the NAU “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Sections 1.2 and 1.4.1) and the College in teaching, advisement and other student-related responsibilities; scholarship and research; and service to the university, community, and the profession. This document defines the Department’s indicators of faculty performance to be used in evaluating a candidate, and the standards required by the Department in each area for promotion and/or tenure in accordance with the COFS (Section 1.4.6.1.3).

Evaluation Criteria and Indicators of Faculty Performance

General

To be considered for promotion and/or tenure, a candidate must achieve the minimum department standards in the areas of teaching, advisement and other student-related responsibilities; scholarship, research; and service to the university, community, and the profession. In addition, for promotion to the rank of Professor, a candidate must demonstrate outstanding performance in either teaching, advisement and other student-related responsibilities or scholarship and research.

To be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer, non-tenure eligible faculty must meet the University’s Conditions of Faculty Service requirements as set forth in the NAU COFS, Section 1.2.2.

Evaluation of a candidate by the Department of Sociology Faculty Status Committee shall be confined to materials included in a Professional Review File that adhere to the requirements set forth by the University’s “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.4.5.2. Evaluations of a candidate’s performance by reviewers from outside the University are not required by the Department of Sociology Faculty Status Committee.

A candidate for promotion and/or tenure must submit a carefully organized and complete set of materials (the Professional Review File) by the deadlines specified in the University’s Personnel Action Calendar. The Professional Review file must demonstrate:

- Performance in teaching, including classroom instruction, advisement, and related teaching activities;
- Performance in research, including scholarly activities, publications, and/or other submissions of exhibitions or productions in areas germane to his or her subject matter; and
- Service contributions, including service to the Department, the College, the University, the candidate’s profession, and the community.

INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE IN THE AREA OF TEACHING, ADVISEMENT, AND OTHER STUDENT-RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES

To evaluate the quality of a candidate's teaching, advisement and other student-related responsibilities, the committee shall examine evidence of teaching performance documented by materials offered by the candidate in the Professional Review File.

Indicators of teaching, advisement and other student-related performance may include a combination of:

- Classroom and/or online instruction;
- Quality and extent of advisement;
- Types of courses taught;
- Efforts at course preparation;
- Number of courses taught and enrollment numbers for individual courses;
- Teaching-related publications;
- Supervision of students' scholarly activities and independent studies, including graduate thesis and dissertation work;
- Curriculum development including creation and updating of course materials;
- Teaching innovations;
- Organization of or participation in professional development activities related to teaching;
- Mentoring of peers in the area of teaching (appropriate for promotion to the rank of Professor);
- Evaluations by peers;
- Evaluations by the Department Chair;
- Student opinion surveys;
- Other student-related activities such as mentoring student research; and
- Other evidence relevant to demonstrating the quality of teaching.

Examples of performance indicators in the area of teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities, in order of importance for promotion and tenure are:

1. Sustained pattern of positive evaluations by the chair and peers.
2. Sustained pattern of positive evaluations from student opinion surveys and any other documentation believed by the Department to be relevant.
3. Evidence of effective classroom teaching and/or advising based on annual review narratives, letters from students, exit interviews, examples of student work, and other forms of documentation.
4. Student/Faculty/University award nominations for excellence in teaching or teaching-related activities.
5. Development of new or updated courses on a regular basis.
6. Award of a grant for pedagogical innovation.
7. Acquisition of new skills to be used in teaching on a regular basis.
8. Development and delivery of online courses.
9. Evidence of being instrumental in the development or redevelopment of Department programs.
10. Successful publication of instructional/teaching related materials.
11. Supervising Master's and/or Ph.D. students.
12. Commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience, including: directing independent studies and student research; organizing and/or directing field trips; facilitating student participation at professional meetings; supervising presentation and/or publication of student scholarly work in professional venues.

13. Sustained pattern of commitment to student professional growth through supervision of internships and practicums.
14. Service as an internship coordinator.
15. Career and professional advising of students including letters of recommendation, informal meetings, and organized work sessions.

INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE IN THE AREA OF RESEARCH /SCHOLARSHIP

A candidate's research and scholarship shall incorporate evidence of scholarly activities, publications, and exhibitions or productions related to a candidate's discipline and academic interests. The term "scholarly activities" means efforts to increase, synthesize, or disseminate knowledge in subject areas germane to a candidate's discipline. "Publication" refers to completed written documents or other tangible works such as refereed journal articles, books, chapter contributions to books, monographs, reports, or the like, as defined by the Department. Exhibitions and productions refer to works in a variety of media that survive a competitive review process, which might include external peer, editorial, and/or blind review in venues appropriate to a candidate's discipline.

Examples of performance indicators in the area of research, scholarship, and related activities:

- Successful publication of journal articles, book chapters, research/technical reports, applied project reports, and other peer-reviewed works.
- Presentation of research and activities at peer-reviewed professional meetings.
- Publication relevant to scholarly expertise in non-peer reviewed outlets.
- Invited talks and/or poster sessions at referred conferences and meetings.
- Organizing symposia at refereed conferences and meetings.
- Editing (or co-editing) a scholarly book or conference proceedings.
- Creation of a database for shared scholarly works.
- Creation and dissemination of computer software for scholarly purposes.
- Research talks given in non-refereed formats, e.g., an invited speaker series.
- Preparation, submission and/or administration of grants for scholarly and/or creative activities.
- Awards from professional associations for scholarship activity.
- Public presentations of scholarly work to community groups.
- Citation of scholarly work in refereed papers, essays, and books.
- Reprints of published scholarship in anthologies and edited volumes.

More specifically, indicators of research and scholarship performance in order of importance for promotion and tenure include:

1. Professional publications, papers;
2. Research projects that can be documented in the form of laboratory reports, research logs, diaries, field notes, interim progress reports, or the like, as defined by the Department;
3. Scholarly work accepted for publication (either forthcoming or published);
4. Grant and contract work, including applied projects, as defined by the Department;
5. Applied research reports, and other professional contributions;
6. Papers, presented at professional meetings, such as at state, regional, national and international venues; and
7. Other tangible works related to the research or scholarly process germane to a candidate's discipline.

INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE IN THE AREA OF SERVICE

To evaluate the quality of service, the committee shall examine a candidate's contributions within the Department, College, University, professional associations, community, and society. Extraordinary service refers to activities that substantially enhance the Department, College, or University's functioning or image beyond levels normally expected of faculty.

Indicators of service in order of importance for promotion and tenure include:

1. Department, College, and University service such as participation on boards, panels, committees, task forces, or the like;
2. Leadership at various levels within the University;
3. Public or community service, such as workshops; public forums; unremunerated consultations; and technical assistance to the public using the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues; and
4. Professional service, such as reviewing journal articles and other publications, reviewing or judging creative works, reviewing grant applications, editing journals, serving on professional committees, holding office within an organization of a candidate's discipline, or the like, as defined by the Department.

Examples of Performance Indicators in the Area of Service

- Officer, committee chair or other significant leadership role in an academic or professional association.
- Chair and/or membership on University or College committee or sub-committee.
- Receipt of an award for service.
- Professional service to the campus and/or the larger community that is relevant to the faculty's scholarly expertise (may include public issue oriented consulting, volunteer coordination, and technical assistance).
- Volunteer service in elementary and/or secondary schools that is relevant to the faculty's scholarly expertise.
- Volunteer service relevant to scholarly or creative expertise on community boards and commissions.
- Development and presentation of public lectures and workshops.

Standards for Promotion to Specific Ranks

Associate Professor (with tenure)

To be promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, a candidate must possess a doctorate or other terminal degree in his or her discipline and achieve the minimum Department standards in teaching, research and service, as noted in the “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.2.1. and this document.

Teaching, Advisement and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

Minimum Requirements: At a minimum, for a faculty member to attain the rank of the Associate Professor, the candidate must have a record of substantial effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.

An overall pattern of positive teaching performance as an Assistant Professor is required for promotion to Associate Professor. A candidate must have promoted his or her Department's teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities goals and demonstrated concern for the improvement of course content through his or her conscientious evaluation of textbooks, lecture notes, course requirements, etc.

Research, Scholarship, and Related Activities

Minimum Requirements: At a minimum, for a faculty member to attain the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate must have a record that shows a sustained pattern of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to her or his discipline.

A candidate should have completed professional works such as books, book chapters, monographs, refereed journal publications, research reports, exhibitions, or the like, as defined by the Department. These expectations are communicated verbally to incoming faculty members by the Department Chair and through these written criteria.

Service

Minimum Requirements: At a minimum, for a candidate to attain the rank of Associate Professor, the faculty member must have a record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the university community with the potential to assume leadership roles among the faculty as she/he moves toward the rank of professor.

A candidate should demonstrate active participation in Department activities, which includes contributions in program development and administration, as well as effective Department representation on key College and University committees, and the larger community.

Professor

As stated in the NAU “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.2.1, a faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, or otherwise indicated as Professor without tenure at the time of hire.

Professors are scholars who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member in the 6th year of full-time service as an Associate Professor may be eligible to apply for the rank of Professor (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as an Associate Professor). In addition, the candidate must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in either teaching or research.

Teaching, Advisement and Other Student-Related Activities

Minimum Requirements: An overall pattern of positive teaching performance as an Associate Professor is required for promotion to Professor. A candidate must have promoted his or her Department's teaching goals and demonstrated concern for the improvement of course content through conscientious reevaluation of textbooks, lecture notes, course requirements, etc. A candidate must also have shown leadership in curriculum development and course innovation.

Outstanding performance in teaching and related student activities requires a sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other teaching-related responsibilities for promotion to the rank of professor. In addition, a faculty member must have engaged in activities designed to enhance professional development of teaching skills and demonstrated commitment to student success since promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate should have a substantial portfolio of teaching and related student activities of high professional quality and congruent with the missions of the Department, College, and University.

Research, Scholarship, and Other Related Activities

Minimum Requirements: A candidate should have completed professional works such as books, book chapters, monographs, refereed journal publications, research reports, as defined by the Department, since appointment to the rank of Associate Professor. A sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly and related endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline is required to be promoted to the rank of Professor.

Outstanding performance in research, scholarship, and related activity is defined as contributing significant scholarly works to a candidate's discipline. Significant contributions include a reputation for scholarly achievements, or a sustained scholarly record such as books, monographs, refereed journal publications, and research reports. A candidate must demonstrate leadership in his or her academic discipline. A candidate should have a substantial record of refereed publications, as defined by the Department, since promotion to Associate Professor. These accomplishments should be of high professional quality and congruent with the missions of the Department, College, and University.

Service

Minimum Requirements: At a minimum, a candidate should demonstrate active participation in departmental, college, and university affairs and demonstrate highly engaged levels of leadership. Public or community service that provides technical assistance to community entities also meets this requirement. Additionally, the service record should be substantial and reflect important leadership positions in service rendered to the university, the discipline and the broader community.

Outstanding service performance is demonstrated by a record that shows a combination of sustained service to the discipline and the university community and exemplifies leadership through assumption of elected or appointed leadership roles.

Finally, in addition to providing a record of effectiveness in teaching and scholarship, the faculty who apply for the rank of Professor must demonstrate at least the minimum of accomplishments in service as defined by the college and academic unit criteria.

Senior Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. Record of a sustained pattern of positive evaluations by peers and chair.
2. Sustained pattern of positive evaluation from student opinion surveys or other documentation accepted by the department as relevant.
3. Evidence of effective classroom teaching and/or advising based on annual review narratives and other documentation.
4. Acquisition of new skills to be used in teaching on regular basis.

Principal Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU “Conditions of Faculty Service,” Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Principal Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of Senior Lecturer or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. Record of a sustained pattern of excellence in teaching evaluations by peers and chair at the Senior Lecturer rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.
2. A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role as evidenced by student opinion survey results while having served at the rank of Senior Lecturer.
3. Evidence of sustained effective classroom teaching and advising based on annual reviews as demonstrated for the years served at the rank of Senior Lecturer.
4. Evidence of effective development and delivery of online courses.
5. Evidence of commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience such as directing independent studies and student research as noted during the period served at the rank of Senior Lecturer.

Social Work

Annual Review

Approved by Department: May 2, 2019

This document describes criteria for annual review of faculty performance. The criteria for evaluation are embedded in a model that allows some variation in the distribution of effort in the following areas: 1) teaching and other student-related responsibilities; 2) research and scholarship; 3) service to the program, college, university, community, and the profession, including SW program coordination (i.e., in-person, on-line, field). The model emphasizes teaching and other student-related activity as a major component with, in most cases, research/scholarship and service given relatively less weight. The model allows for at least three configurations with different weights for each area of effort. The model configuration used for the evaluation of a particular faculty member in a given year should reflect the distribution of effort described in the Statement of Expectation (SOE) for the evaluation period, which is formulated by the faculty member with the Department Chair and approved by the Dean. The three models presented herein represent the distributions of effort that reflect typical faculty workloads within the Department of Social Work. Any distribution of effort could be accommodated within the general model. Part-time faculty direct all effort to teaching and will be evaluated in this area outside of the annual review process.

For all full-time faculty, performance in each area of effort will be evaluated annually as specified in the Conditions of Faculty Service. Comprehensive post-tenure review evaluations will be conducted on a rotating basis every five years. Expedited reviews of tenured faculty will affirm the prior year's overall rating. Evaluations rendered by the Annual Review Committee and the Department Chair will be based on thresholds of accomplishment for satisfactory, meritorious, and highly meritorious performance in each area of effort. In this sense, the evaluation is based upon individual accomplishment. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to document efforts and accomplishments during the academic year within the Faculty Activity and Achievement Reporting (FAAR) system. Faculty will be evaluated in each of these areas: 1) teaching and other student-related responsibilities; 2) research and scholarship; and 3) service to the program, college, university, community, and the profession, including SW program coordination (i.e., in-person, on-line, field). Ratings for each area are weighted and combined to determine the overall performance evaluation. The criteria for each of the evaluation areas were formulated with the intent to encompass the diversity of faculty activities and contributions during a normal year. The Annual Review Committee and the Department Chair should also consider forms of accomplishment or effort documented by the faculty member that may not be specifically addressed in this document.

The Model of Distribution of Effort

The model is a method for accommodating variation in workload distribution for the areas of effort in the process of rendering an overall performance evaluation. The areas of effort are: 1) teaching and other student-related responsibilities; 2) research and scholarship; 3) service to the program, college, university, community, and the profession, including SW program coordination (i.e., in-person, on-line, field). The total workload for all full-time faculty is based upon 30 units/credit hours per year. The models presented below are based upon patterns of workload effort within the Department. For instance, most full-time faculty with research expectations teach five courses per year (15 credit hours per academic year, or 50%) with the other time spent divided in research/scholarship (12 credit hours per academic year, or 40%), and service activity (3 credit hours per academic year, or 10%). In the models below, all weights sum to 100% (30 credit hours) and percentages represent weighted effort in each category. Each year the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair will evaluate faculty performance within the context of the model with appropriate weights. Weights are determined by the distribution of effort specified in

the SOE for the particular faculty member. Some weights may be zero, reflecting no activity in that area for a given year. The models below are illustrative and other configurations are possible.

Model #1: Clinical & Lecturer Faculty (4/4 course load)

Teaching and other student-related responsibilities	80%
Research/scholarship	0%
Service	<u>20%</u>
	100%

Model #1 reflects the typical faculty workload distribution for Clinical Faculty in our Department. Teaching is the major component of this person's overall evaluation model and consists of four courses per semester (80% of the overall work distribution). There are no formal research/scholarship expectations and so in this case, research/scholarship is weighted at zero. Service accounts for 20% of effort.

Model #2: Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty (3/2 course load)

Teaching and other student-related responsibilities	50%
Research/scholarship	40%
Service	<u>10%</u>
	100%

Model #2 reflects a distribution of effort that is appropriate when the teaching load is reduced to allow for a more intensive scholarly effort, as in the case of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty. Extraordinary reassigned time to research/scholarship must be justified by a buyout from an external grant or its equivalent. Such intensive scholarly activity is also measured in highly productive publication of books and refereed journal articles.

Model #3: Program Coordinators (3/3 or 2/2 course load)

Teaching and other student-related responsibilities	variable
Research/scholarship	variable
Service/Program Coordination	<u>variable</u>
	100%

Model #3 reflects the workload of Program Coordinators including in-person and on-line BSW, MSW, and field. In this model, the faculty person may be released from teaching (10%) and research/scholarship (20%) to coordinate a program component. Effective coordination of the Social Work Programs is congruent with the guidelines of the external accreditation body: The Council for Social Work Education.

The college promotion and tenure document reflects the minimum standard regarding performance in teaching, research/scholarship, and service for promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, including soliciting external letters of support. That document also has established a standard as a minimum to be promoted from Associate to Professor. The above models do not preclude some other configuration. Distribution of effort for all faculty will be individualized based upon the annual SOE.

Sabbatical Leave

Faculty should consult the current NAU Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS) document to determine if they be eligible for sabbatical leave. The distribution of effort for any faculty member on sabbatical leave is determined by the nature of the approved sabbatical proposal. For instance, if the sabbatical plans are exclusively scholarly in nature, research/scholarship would be weighted at 100% for the period of the leave. Fulfillment of proposed sabbatical activities will normally result in a rating of Meritorious. Partial fulfillment will result in a rating of Satisfactory. Only exceptional productivity warrants a rating of Highly Meritorious.

Evaluation Categories

The evaluation categories are those specified by the Conditions of Faculty Service. The numerical weights are presented below:

Highly Meritorious	=	4
Meritorious	=	3
Satisfactory	=	2
Unsatisfactory	=	1

An evaluation for each of the non-zero-weighted areas in the above models will be performed in light of the above categories and their assigned numerical representations. The numeric value for the evaluation category for each area of effort is incorporated into the equation for the appropriate model in order to generate an overall evaluative score with one constraint: a minimum evaluation of satisfactory is required in all areas of effort in order to receive an overall evaluation of meritorious or highly meritorious. With at least satisfactory performance in all areas, the evaluative score places the faculty member into one of the four performance categories.

Numerical thresholds for placing faculty into the four categories in general terms are:

Highly Meritorious	=	3.5 or greater
Meritorious	=	2.5 to 3.4
Satisfactory	=	1.5 to 2.4
Unsatisfactory	=	1.4 or less

For example, a Clinical Faculty member's SOE may specify a distribution effort as follows: Teaching = 80 %, Research/scholarship = 0%, and Service = 20%. Based upon the materials the faculty members submits through FAAR and comparing and evaluating those materials in relation to the criteria listed in this Criteria for Annual Review of Faculty document, the faculty member's numeric score in each of the areas may be Teaching (3) and Service (2), for a combined numeric score of 2.8 (.8 X (3)) + (.2 X (2)).

In addition, it is important to note that student qualitative comments and other supportive data related to teaching activities play a significant role in determining the evaluation. Similarly, quality of scholarly activity is also evaluated to augment the quantitative assessment of research/scholarship based on the number of published or presented works.

Criteria for Evaluation in Each Area of Effort

Criteria for evaluation in each area of effort are specified below. The areas of effort are: 1) teaching and other student-related responsibilities; 2) research and scholarship; and 3) service to the program, college, university, community, and the profession, including SW program coordination (i.e., in-person, on-line, field). Each area contains thresholds for satisfactory, meritorious and highly meritorious.

TEACHING AND OTHER STUDENT-RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES CRITERIA

The Department recognizes the diversity of faculty contributions in teaching, mentoring, and other student-related responsibilities and embraces the principle of multidimensional assessment of performance in this area. The Annual Review Committee is expected to consider the range of evidence provided by each faculty member documenting teaching, mentoring, and other student-related activity and effectiveness. At minimum, the committee will review results of student course surveys and course syllabi. Faculty are also encouraged to provide additional documentation of their teaching and mentoring efforts and performance, such as summaries of student comments on courses; descriptions or examples of course assignments/activities; evidence of the development or preparation of a new course; statement of teaching objectives and strategies; evidence of teaching across the curriculum or teaching an overload; documentation of innovative teaching methods or strategies; examples of student work; documentation of mentoring activities such as letters of reference for BSW or graduate school applications, field and/or TA supervision, or serving on a graduate committee; supervised independent study and research and the results of such independent study or research by the students; etc.

The Annual Review Committee is encouraged to consider student survey results in light of a faculty member's teaching assignments and practices. The nature of the course, assignments, number of students in relation to pedagogical and assessment practices, and teaching efforts beyond the classroom should all be considered by the Annual Review Committee in the determination of the overall rating for teaching. Additionally, all faculty are expected to be engaged in department/program governance.

To obtain **satisfactory** the minimum requirement for the academic year is:

1. Completion of agreed upon course teaching load.
2. Minimum student survey grand unweighted mean above 2.4 for the academic year OR other documentation the committee judges to be evidence of satisfactory teaching effectiveness. Also, examination of qualitative comments from student surveys should be incorporated to contextualize the responses.
3. Course syllabi, instructional materials, and other input (such as requested peer-reviews) submitted by faculty member are judged to be effective and appropriate by the Annual Review Committee and Chair.
4. Participation in mentoring students and other student-related activities such as providing letters of reference for BSW or graduate school applications, field and/or TA supervision, graduate committee memberships, Social Work Graduate Faculty Advisor, or Social Work Club Advisor.

Criteria for evaluating effectiveness and appropriateness of course syllabi and instructional materials:

1. Content is appropriate for the course and curriculum.
2. Course content is appropriate for the level of the class.
3. Material/information used in the course is current or otherwise appropriate.
4. Instructional methods are effective for achieving course objectives.
5. Methods of assessment/evaluation are fitting for the objectives of the course.

If faculty receive student survey evaluations indicating an overall grand unweighted mean lower than 2.4 for the academic year and there is no other evidence of minimal teaching effectiveness OR the Annual Review Committee judges one or more course syllabi for the year to be ineffective or inappropriate, the faculty member will be unsatisfactory during that calendar year in teaching and other student-related responsibilities. Student comments also provide important qualitative evaluations that should be used in conjunction with the numerical averages. Consistency between all input used must be considered in rendering the teaching evaluation.

Beyond the satisfactory level, faculty will be evaluated on the basis of a variety of teaching-related efforts and accomplishments during the period under review. The thresholds for the evaluation categories are as follows.

To obtain **meritorious** the minimum requirement for the academic year is:

1. Completion of agreed upon course teaching load.
2. Minimum student survey grand unweighted mean at or above 3.2 for the academic year.
3. Course syllabi and instructional materials submitted by faculty member are judged to be effective and appropriate by the Annual Review Committee.
4. Supportive evidence of auxiliary effort to enhance or further teaching, including collaboration with colleagues on course development or execution, as exemplified in the list presented below.
5. Qualitative survey comments by students that reflect positively on the survey responses.
6. Participation in mentoring students and other student-related activities such as providing letters of reference for BSW or graduate school applications, field and/or TA supervision, graduate committee memberships, SW Graduate Faculty Advisor, or SW Club Advisor.

Or

1. A minimum of two course preparations per semester.
2. Minimum student survey grand unweighted mean at or above 3.0 for the academic year OR other documentation the committee judges to be evidence of meritorious teaching effectiveness.
3. Course syllabi and instructional materials submitted by faculty member are judged to be effective and appropriate by the Annual Review Committee.
4. Supportive evidence of excellence in teaching performance, including collaboration with colleagues on course development or execution, or auxiliary effort to enhance teaching (e.g., innovative methods) from list below.
5. Qualitative survey comments by students that contextualize the student survey responses.
6. Participation in mentoring students and other student-related activities such as providing letters of reference for BSW or graduate school applications, field and/or TA supervision, graduate committee memberships, SW Graduate Faculty Advisor, or SW Club Advisor.

To obtain ***highly meritorious*** the minimum requirement for the academic year is:

1. A minimum of two course preparations per semester.
2. Minimum student survey grand unweighted mean at or above 3.4 for the academic year.
3. Course syllabi and instructional materials submitted by faculty member are judged to be effective and appropriate by the Annual Review Committee, and additional supportive evidence for effective teaching such as teaching workshop attendance or presentations on teaching effectiveness methods.
4. Qualitative student survey comments that complement the survey responses.
5. Participation in mentoring students and other student-related activities such as providing letters of reference for BSW or graduate school applications, field and/or TA supervision, graduate committee memberships, SW Graduate Faculty Advisor, or SW Club Advisor.

Or

1. A minimum of two course preparations per semester.
2. Minimum student survey grand unweighted mean at or above 3.2 OR other documentation the committee judges to be evidence of exceptional teaching effectiveness.
3. Course syllabi and instructional materials submitted by faculty member are judged to be effective and appropriate by the Annual Review Committee.
4. Qualitative survey comments from student surveys that contextualize and support the assessment.
5. At least two forms of supportive evidence of excellence in teaching performance or auxiliary effort to enhance teaching from list below.
6. Participation in mentoring students and other student-related activities such as providing letters of reference for BSW or graduate school applications, field and/or TA supervision, graduate committee memberships, SW Graduate Faculty Advisor, or SW Club Advisor.

Auxiliary Teaching-Related Efforts and Accomplishments

- Course syllabi and instructional materials submitted by faculty member are judged to be exceptional (based on criteria for effectiveness and appropriateness) by the Annual Review Committee.
- Preparation of a course never before taught or not taught for three years.
- Guest Speaker in another course.
- Major modifications (substantial changes in materials and assignments) of an existing course.
- Creation of new course resource material (handouts, study guides, visuals, models).
- Teaching workshops attended with a minimum of 8 hours of work.
- Courses taken related to teaching effort.
- Scholarship written on teaching and learning (SOTL). For faculty with scholarship/research expectations, this activity should be reported under "scholarship/research."
- Panel participation in teaching forums.

- Independent study supervisions at three hours minimum.
- Three or more course preparations per semester.
- First time teaching preparation and delivery of Extended Campuses' on-line courses.
- The development of a new course proposal.
- Peer review reports based on classroom visits or student interviews.
- Publishing conference papers related to teaching.
- Teaching Junior Level Writing or Capstone Courses.
- Participation in Association of College and University Educators teaching workshops
- Actively collaborating with colleagues on the development or execution of a course.
- Developing and/or implementing new teaching technologies or methods.
- Acceptance into the Persistent Scholars Program.
- Mentoring of Teaching Assistants that extends beyond assignment of responsibilities/tasks and provision of directions.
- Mentoring/assisting students in preparation of professional papers.
- Extensive writing or research assignments in courses not designated as capstone or junior level writing.

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP CRITERIA

Research and scholarship is an area in which accomplishments should be commensurate with the proportion of the faculty member's time that is devoted to this area (i.e., weight in the model). The Annual Review Committee and Department Chair should evaluate accomplishments on the basis of quality as well as quantity. In terms of quantity, the thresholds described below are based on the model in which 40% of a faculty member's time is directed to research and scholarship efforts (as per the SOE). In cases where the amount of effort in research and scholarship is greater or less than 40%, the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair are responsible for adjusting the thresholds accordingly. For instance, if someone is devoting 80% of their time to research and scholarship, the criteria for thresholds should be doubled (which is unlikely to happen unless the faculty member has a buyout from an externally funded grant or its equivalent). The Annual Review Committee and Department Chair should evaluate quality of scholarly efforts by faculty on the basis of materials submitted. The quantitative thresholds presented below are based on the presumption of at least satisfactory quality. Research and scholarship that is judged to be of high or exceptional quality should be given greater weight by the Annual Review Committee and Department Chair, in the context of the thresholds. The qualitative dimension of the evaluation of research and scholarship is necessarily at the discretion of the Annual Review Committee and Chair. Committee members and the Chair should utilize appropriate professional/disciplinary standards to evaluate research and scholarship and explain in the memo reporting the evaluation how and on what basis qualitative factors affected the rating. Faculty must submit copies of manuscripts or posters, under review, revised and resubmitted, accepted, or in print, along with appropriate correspondence documenting the status of submissions in order for the Annual Review Committee and Chair to evaluate the quality of scholarly work and the accomplishment of the thresholds described below.¹

Below are the activities in the area of research and scholarship that are required to achieve an evaluation as **satisfactory**. The items identified below may not be accumulated toward a higher evaluation category. Any two satisfy the minimum for this category.

- Article in popular press.
- Article in newsletter.
- Panel participant at professional meetings.
- Invited speaker.
- Delivery of professional research training.
- Delivery of public lecture or other training.

¹ Alternatively, generic standards for assessing scholarship, such as those proposed by Glassick, Huber M Maeroff (1997) may be utilized: a) clear goals; b) adequate preparation; c) appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.

- Participation as a session discussant.
- Submission of an internal grant application.
- Demonstrated progress on a work in progress.²

Below are the activities in the area of research and scholarship that are required for a rating of ***meritorious***. Any one plus one from the satisfactory list (above) is the minimum for this category. The items below may also be accumulated toward the highly meritorious evaluation category.³

- Receiving an internal grant award.
- Publication in non-refereed conference proceedings.
- Submission of IRB protocols with supporting documents.
- Significant progress in participant recruitment and/or data collection or analysis.
- Publication in refereed conference proceedings.
- Subsequent editions of edited volumes.
- Manuscript submitted for refereed publication review.
- Professional meeting paper presentation.
- Non-refereed journal article.
- Published book review essay.
- Contract for community needs assessment, planning or technical report.
- Unremunerated contract for research or professional service.
- Submission of an external grant application.

Below are the activities in the area of research and scholarship that are required for a rating of ***highly meritorious***. Any one accomplishment from the list below qualify faculty for highly meritorious. Alternatively, the Annual Review Committee and Chair will consider combinations of accomplishments from the meritorious list for evaluation as highly meritorious.

- Refereed journal article (accepted or in print).⁴
- Book chapters (two or more book chapters are to be considered equal to a refereed journal article).
- Authored book.
- Receiving a major external grant award or contract (NSF, NIH, SAMSHA, HRSA, or similar major awards).
- First edition of edited book.

SERVICE TO THE PROGRAM, COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY, COMMUNITY, AND PROFESSION CRITERIA

Service activities and thresholds for evaluation categories are listed below. Credit for service effort is based on active participation in department, college, university, and community efforts (committees, task forces, boards, pro-bono consultations, etc.). Faculty should provide a list of all memberships as well as a brief description of activities or tasks performed in relation to each service role identified.

Service, similar to research and scholarship, is an area in which the quantity of effort should be commensurate with the proportion of the faculty member's time that is devoted to this area (weight in the model). The thresholds described below are based on the model in which 20% of a faculty member's time is directed to service efforts (as per the SOE). In cases where the amount of effort in service is greater or less than 20%, the Annual Review Committee is responsible for adjusting the thresholds accordingly. For instance, if someone is devoting 40% (or 12 hours of the total 30 hours per academic year) of their time to service, the criteria for thresholds should be doubled.

² Substantial work in progress may be counted toward meritorious (for instance, completion of book chapters). The review committee should make a judgment with regard to the merit of work in progress. Faculty should provide evidence of such work.

³ The Annual Review Committee and Chair will judge whether the cumulative effort within the meritorious list should be recognized as highly meritorious.

⁴ If accepted, publication during subsequent evaluation period will not be credited.

To be considered **satisfactory** in service faculty should document any two from the following list in addition to on-going participation in department/program governance:

- Committee membership (department, college, or university).
- Participation in NAU faculty candidate site visits.
- Professional organization participation.
- Grant proposal reviewer.
- Presentation of workshops, seminars, training for public service or the profession.
- Serving on professional public service boards, task forces, or committees.

To be considered **meritorious** in service faculty should document any two of the following or any two from the satisfactory list (above) plus one from below.

- Committee, chair (department, college or university).
- Faculty advisor for Social Work Club, Phi Alpha Social Work Honors Society, or similar organization.
- Volunteer work in the community.
- Curriculum or program development efforts not encompassed by committee memberships or administrative release.
- Professional organization, hold an office in subsection of an organization.
- Professional organization, panel/session organizer at conference.
- Grant proposal reviewer.
- Author of technical reports or manuals (professional or public service).
- New preparations of workshops, seminars, training, etc. for public service or profession.
- Mentorship to other behavioral health professionals seeking licensure.
- Participation in research presentations at the NAU Student Research Symposium.
- Representation at program/university outreach events (e.g., Discover NAU, Career Fairs, NASW Statewide Conference)
- Assistance with program accreditation and/or affirmation process.
- Chairing professional public service boards, task forces, or committees.
- Participation in the Supervisor's Academy or similar leadership development program
- Journal referee, reviewing papers for a journal.
- Reviewer of scholarly book or textbook manuscript.
- Recipient of a local or regional award for service.

To be considered **highly meritorious** in service faculty should document any of the following or three from the meritorious list or a combination judged by the committee as equivalent to these.

- Professional organization officer.
- Journal editor.
- Conference organizer.
- Organizer of a student study abroad experience.
- Unusual effort as chair or member of a university body with significant charge.
- Recipient of a statewide or national award for service.

Faculty should provide evidence in their annual review materials if they wish to have a service activity treated differently than described above. Unusual committee effort should be rewarded but this needs to be documented by the faculty member. It is assumed that items listed as service are unremunerated.

Faculty Documentation

Faculty are responsible for documenting their annual departmental contributions in the areas of teaching and other student-related responsibilities, research and scholarship, and service for the Chair and the Annual Review Committee through the FAAR system. The current Conditions of Faculty Service require annual reviews within all departments. It also requires that an elected faculty committee be part of the annual review recommendation process. It is important for the

committee that each faculty member clearly documents his or her accomplishments in FAAR in order to facilitate the review process. The SOE for the relevant year, current curriculum vitae, and all student evaluations and course syllabi are the minimum needed to accomplish the review task. Copies of scholarly articles, papers presented, and other publications or works in progress should also be uploaded into FAAR if they are listed as faculty activity. In addition to the minimum, if faculty members believe there is other documentation that would support their annual review, they may submit it for review. Faculty have seven days to appeal decisions made by the Chair, Annual Review Committee, and subsequent levels of reviewer. The efforts and accomplishments listed in the foregoing criteria are not necessarily exhaustive. Faculty should provide documentation of and the Annual Review Committee should consider efforts/accomplishments that are not listed explicitly in this document.

Exemplary Designation

Faculty members at any status or rank (Clinical, Tenure-track, Tenured; Assistant, Associate, Full) who have demonstrated exceptional performance in any area (teaching and student-related activities, research and scholarship, or service) may be considered for exemplary status for their accomplishments during the academic year under review, depending upon university policy at the time of review. The general conceptualization of what is considered "exemplary" includes activities that are deemed to be of excellent quality outside what might be considered the expectations derived from the SOE and relevant departmental annual review criteria. Given that NAU places restrictions on how many faculty members may be rewarded with exemplary status, the Annual Review Committee will identify those individuals who meet the exemplary criteria and subsequently vote for the number of individuals allotted to the Department from among the identified individuals. The individuals with the highest number of votes will be awarded the exemplary designation and may receive a permanent merit-based salary adjustment. The amount of this adjustment for any given annual evaluation is determined by the upper administration at NAU and depends upon available resources at the time of review.

It should be noted that at the time of this writing, the present document (i.e., Criteria for Annual Review of Faculty Including Workload Assignments within the Department of Social Work) aligns with other documents governing NAU faculty review and promotion. These documents include the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) Faculty Performance Evaluation Framework, the SBS Faculty Promotion and Tenure Criteria, and NAU Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS) document, and the NAU Faculty Handbook. It is the faculty member's responsibility to review all relevant documents and to seek clarity from the Chair as needed.

Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria

Coming Soon in 2021

Sustainable Communities

Annual Review

Submitted to SBS Dean May 2015

This document clarifies the procedures and criteria for annual performance evaluations in the Masters of Sustainable Communities (SUS). The document is in accordance with section 1.4 "Faculty Evaluation" of the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS). Annual Performance evaluators are encouraged to refer to Section 1.4.6 of the NAU COFS prior to engaging in the annual performance evaluation. Section 1.4 of COFS includes the scope of evaluations, the criteria and calendar for evaluation procedures, personnel involved in faculty evaluations, necessary materials to complete the annual review, and evaluation policies for non-tenure eligible faculty, tenure eligible faculty, and tenured faculty.

The Statement of Expectations (SOE) provides the context for the Annual Review. Annual workload assignments as stated in the SOE must be considered during the annual review process and during the promotion and tenure (P & T) review process. Workload assignments need to take into account the criteria for annual review and P & T and these assignments follow the guidelines found in the SUS Work Load Policy. During the annual review period outlined in the member's SOE, the faculty member will receive a written review by the Program's Annual Review Committee and, following that, from the Program Director, that assesses their performance in the areas of teaching, advising, and student-related activities, research and scholarship and service to the university community, to the profession, and to the Masters of Sustainable Communities. Faculty members will be given an opportunity to appeal these recommendations if they so desire by following the instructions laid out in the Conditions of Faculty Service.

Teaching, Advising and Student Related Activities

Several means of evaluation can be used to enhance judgments about teaching effectiveness in the Masters of Sustainable Communities. At a minimum, a pattern of high-quality teaching and student related responsibilities involve three different, though related, components: instructional methodology, course content and organization, and leadership/professional development in teaching.

Teaching Effectiveness and Instructional Methodology refers to the idea that good teaching requires pedagogical methods that promote student learning. Well-recognized elements of teaching effectiveness include the following: good communication, knowledge of the subject matter, the creation of a supportive classroom environment for all students, promoting engaged and multi-contextual learning, and fairness in examinations and grading. Teaching Effectiveness is evidenced by: a narrative description of pedagogy and instructional methods; faculty interpretations in the performance report on student opinion surveys; and a pattern of strong written and numerical student opinion surveys (required). Optional materials include: assessment of student learning outcomes; peer and Director/Chair evaluations; unsolicited letters from students; examples of student work; awards or recognition for outstanding teaching; evidence of the incorporation of innovative technology and efforts to increase multi-contextual learning and reduce 'D' and 'F' grades; and other documentation that indicates the impact of teaching effectiveness.

Course Content and Organization refers to the idea that quality teaching depends upon good organization of up-to-date subject matter in a cohesive course. Course objectives and student learning outcomes should be clearly stated in syllabi. Assessment strategies and methods of instruction should clearly lead to these objectives. Other aspects of good organization include the currency of the material used and the appropriateness of the material for the level of the course.

Course Content and Organization is evidenced by: course syllabi (required); descriptions of projects, papers, and exercises used in class; descriptions of innovative teaching strategies employed; evidence that courses are revised regularly to remain current; and additional course materials related to content and organization.

Leadership and Professional Development in Teaching refers to the idea that student related responsibilities within a university setting involve both classroom teaching and a variety of other important tasks that contribute to the learning environment of the university. Accurate and fair evaluation of faculty instructional efforts needs to include the variety of teaching and student related responsibilities that comprise the entire faculty teaching workload. Faculty may participate in professional development and leadership activities related to teaching, and these should be considered important contributions. A narrative description should be included to best evidence this work.

General Faculty Expectations: All faculty members have to meet the general faculty expectations: to meet classes, to prepare syllabi and complete one item from Category B. It is also expected that faculty would provide advising to students. Names of advisees will be provided each year and will be cumulatively available.

Faculty Rating Criteria:

- To receive a "*Highly Meritorious*" rating, a faculty member must meet the General Faculty Expectations and have 2 items from Category A below and 3 items from Category B.
- To receive a "*Meritorious*" rating, a faculty member must meet the General Faculty Expectations and have 1 item from Category A and 2 items from Category B below.
- To receive a "*Satisfactory*" rating, a faculty member must meet the General Faculty Expectations and have 3 items from Category B below.
- To receive an "*Unsatisfactory*" rating, a faculty member does not meet the criteria of any of the above.

Faculty Rating Categories:

Category A:

- A Teaching Award
- Funded grant for improving teaching or curriculum
- Multiple course preps that include significant work on a new course and that exhibit pedagogical soundness
- Major revisions to existing courses that exhibit pedagogical soundness in the revisions
- Effectiveness in Teaching as demonstrated by the use of innovative technological methods reflected in the syllabi and course materials that include pedagogical soundness and course handouts (e.g. innovation, student evaluations)
- Serving as chair of at least one thesis committee.
- Other items may be included if faculty explain their equivalency to the items above.

Category B:

- Nomination for a teaching award
- Submission of a grant application for improving teaching or curriculum
- Documentation of significant advising that provides mentoring to students
- Documentation of mentoring new faculty concerning teaching, advising and/or student-related activities
- Serving as a member of thesis committees
- Creative use of pedagogical techniques and/or technology in the classroom
- Participation in teaching workshops and clinics
- Directing Independent Studies
- Consistent efforts to update course content

- Positive student opinion scores and comments.
- Other items negotiated in the SOE, with and explanation of the equivalency to the items above.

Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

This area includes evidence of research, scholarly and creative activities which contribute to the field, knowledge or expertise of the faculty member's discipline. SUS also recognizes applied research that engages community work and is subject to formal peer review. A faculty's base research, scholarly and creative activities load may be adjusted for the individual and for the Program within the parameters set by the workload policy. In other words, not all faculty have the same expected work assignment and the evaluating committee will take this into account.

The Statement of Expectations document, which is developed with input from the faculty member and the Program Director (or Directors/Chairs if the faculty has a split position), is the formalized tool for stating the expectations of the faculty member's research, scholarship and creative activities.

Faculty Rating Information:

The criteria below serve as a guide for the ARC as it evaluates each faculty. The evaluation will depend on the individual's statement of expectation as outlined in the SUS Work Load Policy document. The guidelines below are set for a faculty member working at 20% scholarship.

- To receive a "*Highly Meritorious*" rating, a faculty member must have 1 item from Category A below or 2 items from B plus one item from C.
- To receive a "*Meritorious*" rating, a faculty member must have 1 item from Category B or 3 from C
- To receive a "*Satisfactory*" rating, a faculty member must have 2 items from Category C.
- To receive an "*Unsatisfactory*" rating, a faculty member does not meet the criteria of any of the above.

And the guidelines below are set for a faculty member working at 10% scholarship (e.g., senior lecture and lecturers).

- To receive a "*Highly Meritorious*" rating, a faculty member must have 1 item from Category A below or 1 items from B and 1 item from C.
- To receive a "*Meritorious*" rating, a faculty member must have 2 from any column.
- To receive a "*Satisfactory*" rating, a faculty member must have 1 items from any column.
- To receive an "*Unsatisfactory*" rating, a faculty member does not meet the criteria of any of the above.

Faculty Rating Categories:

Category A:

- Funded external grant, as PI or co-PI, for research or creative work
- Peer reviewed journal article, book chapter in academic press, or exhibition equivalent to a full length journal article
- Published book authorship. Single author or co-author for a maximum of 2 years of credit as follows:
 - 1 year for contract
 - 1 year for the published book
- An edited book (as editor or co-editor). A maximum of 2 years of credit as follows:
 - 1 year for contract
 - 1 year for published book
- Other items may be included if faculty explain their equivalency to the items above.

Category B:

- Submission of a grant application for research or creative work
- Leadership in multi-investigator proposals
- Published conference proceedings
- Development/Maintenance of a scholarly or creative research website
- Non-peer reviewed published research or book review in scholarly journal
- Research or creative presentations at professional academic conferences
- Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in research
- Other Items may be included if faculty explain their equivalency to the items above.

Category C:

- Non-peer reviewed publication or creative work
- Discussant at international, national or regional meeting
- Prepared proposal for and/or worked on internal or external grant
- Two conference presentations (local or invited)

Other items may be included if faculty explain their equivalence to the items above.

Service to the University, Program, and Profession

Service activities typically include participation in unit and University committee work and other administrative tasks. In addition, faculty may perform service activities for schools, industry, local, state, and national agencies, and for the public at large as long as these activities are related to the faculty's academic expertise. Leadership of professional organizations and participation in other professional activities such as reviewing works submitted to professional journals or conferences or serving on professional editorial boards are also important to the mission of the University, as well as to the advancement of one's profession or discipline.

The University recognizes the importance of faculty service activities that promote and support cultural diversity within the University. Faculty members are also expected to participate in the life of the University by attending various activities on campus or in the community, and University-wide functions such as commencement, school/College convocations, and program/College/University colloquia. Many faculty are also directly involved in activities that promote the recruitment and retention of students.

Faculty Rating Criteria:

The workload parameters for service to the university, program, profession and community in the Master's Program in Sustainable Communities is found in the workload policy. A faculty's service load may be adjusted for the individual and for the Program within the parameters of the policy. The basic expectation for all faculty members is that they attend all unit meetings and be engaged in discussions on unit issues.

The Statement of Expectations document, which is developed with input from the faculty member and the Program Director, is the formalized tool for stating the expectations of the faculty member's service activities.

Highly Meritorious (two or more of the following with a narrative that explains the extent of the service performed)

- Membership in at least 2 program or department committees or Chair of one of the committees within the Master's Program in Sustainable Communities or other departments where the faculty member may hold a joint-appointment (if applicable).
- Membership in one of the following or its equivalent: Faculty Senate, University Curriculum Committee, Liberal Studies Committee, Commission on Ethnic Diversity, Commission on the Status of Women, Commission on Disability Access and Design, LGBTQ Commission, Native American Commission, or other committees recognized in this category.

- Chair of a task force or board that is related to the faculty's academic expertise for city, county, or state government.
- Editorial board member of a journal
- Main organizer of a national/regional/local conference or exhibition
- Other items may be included if faculty explain their equivalence to the items above.

Meritorious (two or more of the following, with a narrative that explains the extent of the service performed)

- Membership in one committee in the Master's Program in Sustainable Communities.
- Member of a task force or board on the city, county, or state level that is related to the faculty's academic expertise.
- Chair of a program or departmental committee
- Reviewer of a journal related to the field of expertise
- Other items may be included if faculty explain their equivalence to the items above.

Satisfactory

- Attendance at Unit meetings and participation in 1 unit committee

Unsatisfactory

- To receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating, a faculty member does not meet the criteria of any of the above

Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria

Approved by Department: December 2016

The Faculty Status Committee of the Master's Program in Sustainable Communities reviews program recommendations for tenure and/or promotion and makes recommendations to the SBS Promotion and Tenure Committee based upon the criteria specified in this document. The committee ensures that each candidate meets acceptable minimum standards for the University (see ABOR Policy 6-201 and the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service" [CoFS] document, Sections 1.2 and 1.4) and the College (see SBS P&T Document) in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; research, scholarship, or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline; and service to the university community and the profession. As stated in the CoFS (Section 1.4.6.1.3), "in making promotion decisions, the entire record of the faculty member, including accomplishments at other institutions and other professional activity, shall be considered." This document defines the Program's indicators of faculty performance to be used in evaluating a candidate, and the standards required by the Program in each area for promotion and/or tenure.

Each fall semester, the Master's Program in Sustainable Communities will elect faculty members from the Steering Committee to serve on the Annual Review committee (ARC) and/or the Faculty Status Committee (FSC) as needed. The ARC will consist of a minimum of three full-time faculty members, based on the requirements outlined in CoFS. Typical membership includes 3 faculty members. The membership of the FSC is limited to tenured faculty members and must have at least one full-time faculty from the associate and full professor rank. Membership of the two committees can overlap, with the exception that FSC membership is limited to tenured faculty.

I. Evaluation Indicators of Faculty Performance

A. General

To be considered for promotion and/or tenure as a tenure-eligible faculty, a candidate must achieve at least the minimum Sustainable Communities Masters' Program, SBS, and University criteria for each rank in the three areas under review: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; (2) research and scholarship (3-4 refereed articles for faculty with a 10% research allocation, 5-6 for 20% allocations, 6-8 for 30%, and more publications for individuals with a higher level of research in their SOE); and (3) service to the university community and the profession. In addition to meeting all the minimum requirements in the three areas under review, for promotion to the rank of Professor, a candidate must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in either (1) or (2) above as defined by College and Program criteria. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements.

For non-tenure eligible faculty holding the rank of Lecturer to be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer, a candidate must achieve the minimum Sustainable Communities Masters' Program, SBS, and university criteria for each rank in the following areas: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; and (2) a record of service and professional development related to the teaching role. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements. For promotion of non-tenure eligible faculty positions, see the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2.

Evaluation of a candidate by the Sustainable Communities Master's Program Faculty Status Committee shall be confined to the materials included in a faculty member's Professional Review File that adhere to the requirements set forth by the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.4.5.2. By the deadlines specified in the University's Personnel Action Calendar, a candidate for promotion and/or tenure must submit a carefully organized and complete set of

materials (the Professional Review File) that demonstrates the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of his/her performance in the areas relevant to the rank to which promotion is sought.

The Master's Program in Sustainable Communities promotes excellence in teaching, scholarly activities, and service. In supporting this goal, the Program recognizes that an innovative and dynamic faculty should develop performance standards that foster both individual and programmatic success. The Master's Program in Sustainable Communities at Northern Arizona University has as its major goal to provide a challenging and enriching program through the efforts of talented faculty who are dedicated to university teaching and academic research. Faculty able to contribute to this teaching goal will by definition bring a multitude of backgrounds, strengths, and visions of the future. An evaluation process of their contributions in teaching, advising, research or scholarship, creativity, and service must acknowledge each person's strengths and contributions. It is imperative that the ARC/FSC committee and program chairperson evaluate the candidate's accomplishments in relation to the candidate's workload allocations for the period under consideration.

B. Indicators of Performance in the Area of Teaching, Advisement, and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

The candidate, at a minimum, must demonstrate a record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities. The evidence that is provided must demonstrate both the quality and quantity of the candidate's performance in this area in the context of the responsibilities found in his/her statement of expectations. The quantity of the evidence provided for each indicator should reflect its importance in affecting overall effectiveness in this area. The candidate is responsible for explaining this importance. In addition, the candidate is responsible for explaining why his/her performance on the indicators is offered as evidence of a quality performance.

Teaching, advisement, and student-related responsibilities may include:

- Classroom and community-based instruction;
- Creation and updating of course materials to reflect current knowledge, research, and trends in the discipline;
- Teaching innovations;
- Receipt of an award for teaching;
- Teaching-related presentations and publications;
- Supervision of students' scholarly activities including undergraduate research, graduate thesis, and dissertation work;
- Supervision of students' independent studies;
- Curriculum development;
- Advising activities include guiding progress toward graduation and post-graduation planning;
- Other student related activities (student mentoring, supplemental instruction sections, etc.);
- Organization of or participation in professional development activities related to teaching.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File, committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities in this document.

Faculty being considered for promotion should include the following materials in their dossier*:

- Syllabi, sample examinations, handouts, etc., for all courses for period under consideration (graduate and undergraduate) that have been taught;
- Class supplementary materials;
- Development of new course materials;

- Grants from NAU (e.g., e-learning, Office of the Provost, Office of the President) for development of new didactic methods of materials;
- Innovative classroom projects;
- Documentation of workshops attended that address issues of teaching;
- Membership in professional teaching-related organizations;
- Documentation of participation in activities that foster the development of new and better teaching methods and activities;
- The number and names of students of theses, dissertations, and independent study projects that they have been involved in during the period of time under consideration for promotion and tenure decisions;
- Evidence of student learning and/or achievements;
- The number of student advisees per year that a person counsels and advises;
- Faculty may also request that the Faculty Status Committee observe a lecture as evidence of teaching expertise, but this form of peer evaluation is optional.

**This list is not exhaustive and others items and materials that faculty members feel should be evaluated as related to their accomplishments and contributions should be included in their dossier, along with supportive comments as to their importance.*

C. Indicators of Performance in the Area of Research and Scholarship or Creative Activity

Evidence of a candidate's scholarship and research must demonstrate both the quality and quantity of the candidate's performance in this area, as appropriate according to the designated effort assigned to research, scholarship, and/or creative activity in the Statement of Expectations (SOE). That is, given that each faculty member has a specific research and scholarship requirement, then each member will be evaluated in the context of the stated expectation. The quantity of the evidence provided for each indicator should reflect its importance in affecting overall effectiveness in this area. The candidate is responsible for explaining this importance. In addition, the candidate is responsible for explaining why his/her performance on the indicators is offered as evidence of a quality performance. Research and scholarship are activities that lead to tangible, original works that expand the knowledge base of Sustainable Communities or related fields, extend the discipline into new fields of application, and/or improve teaching in Sustainable Communities and the college by the dissemination of pedagogic scholarship. Creative activity related to Sustainable Communities includes original productions (e.g., fiction, poetry, film) that enhance the appreciation and understanding of sustainable communities-related issues. Peer review of scholarly and creative work is expected and will be factored into the evaluation of the evidence presented.

Research and scholarship may include:

- Professional publications, creative exhibitions, papers, presentations, books, chapter contributions to books, monographs, technical reports;
- Refereed scholarly work accepted for publication or exhibitions;
- Presentation, submission, and/or administration of grants, including applied projects and/or research;
- Edited (or co-edited) scholarly book or conference proceedings;
- Applied research reports and other professional contributions;
- Papers and research findings presented at professional meetings;
- Invited talks and/or poster sessions at refereed conference meetings;
- Other tangible works related to the scholarly process germane to the general field of sustainable communities;
- Community-based research engaging the needs of the community;
- Research talks given in non-refereed formats, e.g., an invited speaker series;
- Citation of scholarly work in refereed papers, essays and books;
- Reprints of published scholarship in anthologies and edited volumes.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File, the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for research and scholarship in this document, within the context of the faculty's SOE. Please note: Scholarship and creative work refers to work within the discipline of Sustainable Communities or a related field within the candidate's areas of academic study.

Faculty being considered for promotional decisions should include the following items in their professional dossiers**:

- Publications in all journals, both within and external to the discipline;
- Documentation of creative exhibitions;
- Books, chapters in books, monographs, etc.;
- All presentations (panel discussions, symposia, lectures, slides, posters, etc.) at professional meetings;
- Reports and professional projects that involve sustainable communities-related activities, including any types of interdisciplinary projects;
- Grants that have been submitted, that are pending, or that have been funded should be identified (both intramural and extramural);
- Workshops, symposia, other developmental activities (related to scholarly work) that have been attended;
- Independent research projects in which the faculty member has taken an active role in working closely with a student (undergraduate or graduate).

***This list is not exhaustive, and others items and materials that the faculty member feels should be evaluated as related to their accomplishments and contributions, should be included in their dossier, along with supportive comments as to their importance.*

D. Indicators of Performance in the Area of Service

The evidence that is provided must demonstrate both the quality and quantity of the candidate's performance in this area in the context of the responsibilities found in his/her statement of expectations. The quantity of the evidence provided for each indicator should reflect its importance in affecting overall effectiveness in this area. The candidate is responsible for explaining this importance. In addition, the candidate is responsible for explaining why his/her performance on the indicators is offered as evidence of a quality performance.

Service activities may include:

- Program, College, and University service such as participation on boards, panels, committees, task forces, or the like, as a member of the committee and/or chair;
- Leadership at various levels within the University;
- Officer, committee chair or other leadership role in an academic or professional organization;
- Public or community service, such as workshops, public forum, and consultations that uses the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues;
- Professional service, such as reviewing journal articles and other publications, reviewing grant applications, editing journals, serving on professional committees, and book manuscripts;
- Receipt of an award for service;
- Volunteer service relevant to scholarly expertise on community boards and commissions;
- Articles and/or invited opinion essays in community publications based on one's academic expertise;
- Review of book manuscripts for university presses and other scholarly publishers;
- Community engaged work.

Using the evidence presented in the candidate's Professional Review File, the committee members assess the degree to which the faculty member's performance has or has not met the criteria set for service activities in this document.

Faculty being considered for promotional decisions should include the following items in their professional dossiers***:

- List of committees served on within the program since appointment. Describe briefly contributions and identify those committees on which one has served as chair.
- List of all college and university committees (e.g., Graduate Council, Institutional Research, Faculty Senate, SBS Promotion & Tenure, University Planning, etc.). Describe briefly contributions and identify those committees on which one has served as chair.
- Description of community involvement related to the discipline, workshops, lectures, that have been presented to a community agency or any types of contribution to the community at large.

****This list is not exhaustive and other items and materials that the faculty member feels should be evaluated as related to their accomplishments and contributions should be included in their dossier, along with supportive comments as to their importance.*

II. Standards for Promotion to Specific Ranks

A. Associate Professor (a tenure eligible or tenured position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.1, to hold the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must possess a doctorate or other terminal degree in the discipline area. A faculty member may not be promoted to this rank unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured Associate Professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor at NAU; the faculty member, however, may have prior service credit that was agreed to in writing at the time of hire.

To hold the rank of Associate Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record that shows substantial evidence of a sustained pattern of high quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities since appointment at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors listed in IB (p. 2) of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate's courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Evidence that the candidate's courses contribute to the mission of the academic unit is also important. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer valid evidence when used in conjunction with other material.
2. A record that shows a sustained pattern of research and scholarly activity related to the faculty member's discipline since appointment at NAU. A sustained pattern of scholarly activity is defined as having an active research agenda (for example, equivalent of three refereed journal articles since appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor) in the discipline prior to the application for promotion and the production of the types of scholarship described below. The demonstrated scholarly activity is determined by such factors listed in IC (pp. 4-5) of this document.
 - a. Primary evidence of scholarship includes published work in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters or scholarly books published by respected academic publishers, and grants. Presentations at regional and national meetings and manuscripts accepted for publication supplement a record of published work.

Minor work, such as book reviews, or incomplete work, such as working papers, are considered evidence of professional activity, but are not alone sufficient for promotion. For evaluation of a candidate's published work, the program relies on the judgment of its own members, the faculty member, and discipline specific ratings.

3. A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the University community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of Professor.
 - a. Contribution to a variety of program, college, and university committees is expected. Assistant Professors are expected to primarily focus their service contributions to program committees. However, it is expected that Assistant Professors will also serve, to a lesser extent, on college, and/or university committees. The candidate must demonstrate a sustained pattern of service prior to the year of application. Satisfactory service is to be determined by such factors as listed in ID (pp. 5-6) of this document.

The work of faculty applying for promotion to Associate Professor must also be supported through at least three external letters of recommendation solicited according to guidelines outlined in the SBS criteria for promotion and tenure. The letters, to which the faculty member has agreed to waive access, shall be made available to reviewers for tenure and promotion review. The Sustainable Communities Program requires that outside letters (letters written by individuals who do not work or study at NAU) speak to a faculty's research, publications, and accomplishments for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure file. In the spring semester before a promotion review, the Director and the candidate will meet and identify six individuals who are qualified to write letters assessing the performance of the candidate. After this meeting, the Director will obtain at least three letters from these in the semester prior to promotion for inclusion in the promotion and tenure file. All procedures for pursuing external letters as put forth by the SBS policy will be followed, including confidentiality. The SUS Faculty Status Committee will consult external letters of recommendation in their evaluation of a candidate for promotion and tenure.

B. Professor (a tenured position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.1, a faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the written notice of appointment indicated the hire was at the rank of Professor without tenure. Professors are faculty members who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as an Associate).

To hold the rank of Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must have the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities since submission of materials for last promotion or appointment at NAU. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors as listed in IB (p. 2) of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate's courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Evidence that the candidate's courses contribute to the mission of the academic unit is also important. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer one indicant when used in conjunction with other material.

- b. The Associate Professor must have maintained a record of pedagogical excellence, continued to develop as a teacher, developed innovative course materials, participated in graduate education through service on thesis committees and successfully chaired completed theses. Awards or recognition for teaching or mentoring, and other indicators of outstanding instructional contributions enhance a candidate's record.
- 2. A sustained pattern of high-quality research and scholarship related to the faculty member's discipline since submission of materials for last promotion or appointment at NAU (for example, equivalent of three refereed journal articles since appointment to the rank of Associate Professor). Performance in this area is determined by such factors listed in IC (pp. 4-5) of this document.
 - a. Primary evidence of scholarship includes published work in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters or scholarly books published by respected academic publishers, and grants. Presentations at regional and national meetings and manuscripts accepted for publication supplement a record of published work. Minor work, such as book reviews, or incomplete work, such as working papers, are considered evidence of professional activity, but are not alone sufficient for promotion. For evaluation of a candidate's published work, the program relies on the judgment of its own members, the faculty member, and discipline specific ratings.
 - b. The Associate Professor must have maintained a record of high quality, and scholarly contributions. Evidence of outstanding scholarship, including evidence supporting the significance of a candidate's contributions to the literature, typically include articles in respected peer reviewed journals, books, book chapters in scholarly edited works, grant proposals receiving external funding, invited scholarly presentations, and special honors or awards. In assessing the quality of the work under consideration, the committee will make a judgment following their own close readings, and then weigh these reactions against other evidence—contemporary reviews and citations in other scholarly work. Scholarship may include significant conceptual and theoretical works as well as quantitative and qualitative research. Evidence of scholarship may also be visible in other professional activities, for example, instruction and service activities that are informed by the relevant professional and scholarly literature.
- 3. A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's Program (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the Program, College, and/or the University, and to mentor junior faculty since appointment to Associate Professor).
 - a. Membership on a variety of program, college, and university committees is expected, including leadership responsibilities. Associate Professors are expected to take on increasing responsibilities in committees, such as chairing program committees, chairing and/or serving on college, and/or university committees or making contributions to the administration of programs. Ongoing service is expected from candidates for promotion to Full Professor. Examples of service to the profession include participation in professional organizations (serving on a committee, organizing a conference, etc.) and serving as a reviewer for refereed journals. Evidence of outstanding service contributions for example, service awards, appointment to journal editorships, or election as an officer of a professional organization, further attest to the quality of university, community, and professional service. Other recognized forms of professional activity include presenting papers at professional meetings; serving on editorial boards of scholarly journals; holding offices in professional organizations; and participating in workshops and seminars.
- 4. In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of Professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (1) or (2) above as defined by the criteria and indicators in this document.

- a. The faculty performance in research/scholarship must exceed the performance level required as a minimum. The faculty member must demonstrate outstanding, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in research/scholarship. The faculty member's reputation in research should reach to a national or international level. Primary evidence of scholarship includes several published works in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters or scholarly books published by respected academic publishers, and grants. Presentations at national or international meetings and manuscripts accepted for publication supplement a record of published work. Minor work, such as book reviews, or incomplete work, such as working papers, are considered evidence of professional activity, but are not alone sufficient for promotion. For evaluation of a candidate's published work, the program relies on the judgment of its own members, the faculty member, and number of academic citations and other discipline specific recognition.
- b. The faculty performance in teaching/advising/student-related responsibilities must exceed the performance level required as a minimum. Outstanding accomplishments include demonstration of superior ability and interest in stimulating in students a genuine desire for learning. Evidence of outstanding teaching may include indications of the success of students, student evaluations, publication of textbooks or teaching materials, active participation in organizations devoted to teaching, and so forth.

The work of faculty applying for promotion to Professor must also be supported through at least three external letters of recommendation solicited according to guidelines outlined in the SBS criteria for promotion and tenure. The letters, to which the faculty member has agreed to waive access, shall be made available to reviewers for tenure and promotion review. The Sustainable Communities Program requires that outside letters (letters written by individuals who do not work or study at NAU) speak to a faculty's research, publications, and accomplishments for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure file. In the spring semester before a promotion review, the Director and the candidate will meet and identify six individuals who are qualified to write letters assessing the performance of the candidate. After this meeting, the Director will obtain at least three letters from these in the semester prior to promotion for inclusion in the promotion and tenure file. All procedures for pursuing external letters as put forth by the SBS policy will be followed, including confidentiality. The SUS Faculty Status Committee will consult external letters of recommendation in their evaluation of a candidate for promotion and tenure.

C. Senior Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record of substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities. Effectiveness is to be determined by factors listed in previous sections of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate's courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization, and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer valid evidence when used in conjunction with other material.
2. A record of service and professional development related to the teaching role.

- a. Primary evidence of professional development and service includes participation at teaching seminars, teaching conferences, mentoring students, and student-related activities.
3. If appropriate, a candidate may have some of their SOE assigned to research. If so, then they must demonstrate a sustained pattern of high-quality research and scholarship related to the faculty member's discipline since submission of materials for the last promotion or appointment at NAU.
 - a. Evidence of research and scholarship may include published articles in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters, books, funded research, and other scholarly related work.

D. Principal Lecturer (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Principal Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of Senior Lecturer. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document):

1. A record of sustained excellence at the Senior Lecturer rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities. Effectiveness is to be determined by such factors listed in previous sections of this document.
 - a. A sustained pattern is one that is consistent, reliable, and predictable across time and the candidate's courses and interactions with students. Assessment of high-quality performance will rely on indicators, such as respectable student opinion quantitative and qualitative ratings; comprehensive, appropriately challenging, and stimulating course materials; pedagogically sound course design, organization, and management; and the maintenance of high academic standards. Student evaluations should not be the sole evidence employed, but they do offer valid evidence when used in conjunction with other material.
2. A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role.
 - a. Primary evidence of professional development and service includes participation at teaching seminars, teaching conferences, mentoring students, and student-related activities.
3. If appropriate, a candidate may have some of their SOE assigned to research. If so, then they must demonstrate a sustained pattern of high-quality research and scholarship related to the faculty member's discipline since submission of materials for the last promotion or appointment at NAU.
 - a. Evidence of research and scholarship may include published articles in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters, books, funded research, and other scholarly related work.

Women's and Gender Studies

Annual Review

Approved by Department: May, 2011

The following document is a supplement to the NAU Faculty Handbook for annual performance evaluations in the Women's and Gender Studies Program. The document is in accordance with section 1.4 "Faculty Evaluation" of the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS). Annual Performance evaluators are encouraged to refer to Section of [the NAU Faculty Handbook](#) prior to engaging in the annual performance evaluation. Section 1.4 of the Handbook includes the scope of evaluations, the criteria and calendar for evaluation procedures, personnel involved in faculty evaluations, necessary materials to complete the annual review, and evaluation policies for non-tenure eligible faculty, tenure eligible faculty, and tenured faculty.

Teaching/Advising/Other Student-Related Responsibilities:

- Tenure eligible faculty – 50% to 70% of total workload (15 to 21 units of a 30-unit academic year)
- Non-tenure eligible faculty – 80% to 100% of total workload (24 to 30 units of a 30-unit academic year)

Research:

- Tenure eligible faculty – at least 20% of total workload (6 units of a 30-unit academic year)

Service:

- Tenure eligible faculty – 10% to 20% of total workload (3 to 6 units of a 30-unit academic year)
- Non-tenure eligible faculty – 0% to 20 % of total workload (0 to 6 units of a 30-unit academic year).

Teaching/Advising/Other Student-Related Responsibilities

Faculty Workload Information:

- The typical teaching load in the Women's and Gender Studies Program is 60%, which equates to 6 courses per academic year.
 - A faculty's teaching load may be adjusted for the individual and for the Program. Work outside of the classroom (advising, mentoring, and other student-related responsibilities) is recognized when it is the equivalent of a 3- credit course. This work must be written into faculty Statement of Expectations (SOEs). The following types of activities are examples of work outside of the classroom: (1) supervising student learning and research in individualized study courses; (2) supervising student learning and research as the chair of graduate student theses or dissertations; (3) carrying a very heavy advising load of undergraduate or graduate students; (4) other work with students that involves teaching outside of the classroom (e.g. supervision of internships)
- Individual faculty teaching loads may also be negotiated based on the Women's and Gender Studies Program needs for a particular year or semester.
- The Statement of Expectations document, which is developed with input from the faculty member and the Program director, is the formalized tool for documentation of faculty member's teaching load.

Faculty Rating Criteria:

- To receive a "Highly Meritorious" rating, a faculty member must have 2 items from Category A below and 1 item from Category A and/or B.
- To receive a "Meritorious" rating, a faculty member must have 1 item from Category A and 2 from Category B below.

- To receive a "Satisfactory" rating, a faculty member must have 3 items from Category B below.
- To receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating, a faculty member must have fewer than 3 items from Category B below.

Faculty Rating Categories:

Category A

- New Course Development
- A Teaching Award
- Active Participation in Program/Curriculum Development
- Three or more Course Preps
- Strong qualitative and quantitative evaluations through student opinion surveys.
- Teach collaborative, cross- or tri-listed WGS class
- Creativity in Teaching (e.g. in terms of innovation, use of technology, quality implementation of curriculum, student and/or peer evaluations)
- Thesis Director/Dissertation Director
- Directing Independent Study Opportunities
- Other Items based on Faculty Member Justification that enable unique contributions to pedagogy

Category B

- Nomination for a Teaching Award
- Documentation of Excellent Advising
- Documentation of Mentoring Faculty and Graduate Students
- Thesis Committee Member
- Attend Teaching Workshops and/or Clinics
- Providing Guest Lectures
- Other Items based on Faculty Member Justification that enable unique contributions to pedagogy

Research, Scholarly & Creative Activities

Faculty Workload Information:

- The typical load for Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities is 30% in the Women's and Gender Studies Program. This area includes evidence of research, scholarly and creative activities which contribute to the field, knowledge, or expertise of the faculty member's discipline or Women's and Gender Studies.
 - A faculty's Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities load may be adjusted for the individual. At times, faculty may have heavy research expectations in their Statement of Expectations (SOEs), and these expectations may result in reassigned time from the areas of teaching/advising/other student-related responsibilities and/or service to the area of research/creative activities. One example is a time buyout of 10% of a salary for a 3-credit course, depending on the scope of an externally funded grant.
- Individual faculty Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities loads may also be negotiated based on the Women's and Gender Studies Program's needs for a particular year or semester.
- The SOEs document, which is developed with input from the faculty member and the Program director, is the formalized tool for documentation of faculty member's Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities load.

Faculty Rating Criteria:

- To receive a "Highly Meritorious" rating, a faculty member must 1 item from Category A below and 1 item from Category A or B.
- To receive a "Meritorious" rating, a faculty member must have 2 items from Category B.
- To receive a "Satisfactory" rating, a faculty member must have 1 item from Category B.
- To receive an "Unsatisfactory" rating, a faculty member must have less than 2 items from Category B and or/ Category C below:

Faculty Rating Categories:**Category A**

- Peer reviewed journal article
- Book Authorship: Single Author, Co-Author (Maximum 3 years)
- Book Editor or Co-Editor (Maximum 3 years of credit)
- Book Chapter
- Funded Grant
- Applied Research Report
- Comparative book review/literary survey
- Journal Editor of a Mainstream Journal
- Other Items based on Faculty Member Justification

Category B

- Book pre-publication (Maximum 2 years of credit)
- Applied Research Project - In Progress (Maximum 1 year of credit)
- Editor of a journal edition
- Book Reviews
- Grant Applications
- Submitted Article
- Research presentation at professional meeting
- Published conference proceeding contribution
- Invited national/international grant/award reviewer
- Development/Maintenance of a Scholarly Website
- Journal Reviewer
- Other Items based on Faculty Member Justification

Service to the University, Program, and Profession**Faculty Workload Information:**

- The typical load for Service to the University, Program, Profession, and Community is 10% in the Women's and Gender and Gender Studies Program.
- A faculty's service load may be adjusted for the individual and for the Program. At times, faculty may have heavy service expectations in their SOEs, and these expectations may result in reassigned time from the areas of teaching/advising/other student-related responsibilities and/or research/creative activities to the area of service. One example is serving as chair or co-chair of a university commission or committee.
- Individual faculty service loads may also be negotiated based on the Women's and Gender Studies Program needs for a particular year or semester.
- The Statement of Expectations document, which is developed with input from the faculty member and the Program director, is the formalized tool for documentation of faculty member's service load.

Faculty Rating Criteria:

Highly Meritorious (one of the following bullets)

- 3 Committees or one of the following:
 - Main Organizer of a National Level Conference
 - Main Organizer of a Regional or Local Conference
 - Main Organizer of a Regional or Local Film Series
 - Editorial Board Member of a Journal
- Attendance at all WGS unit meetings.
- Service to the University, the Program, the Profession, College or Community that exceeds expectations. An example is when a faculty member spearheads an initiative where students and others assist organizations or agencies that improve the community. Another example is when a faculty member organizes a campus community event that involves cross-campus participation and contributes to scholarship, policy or program development. Documentation to be provided by the faculty members to justify highly meritorious service.

Meritorious (one of the following bullets)

- 2 Committees (or equivalent)
- Attendance at the majority of unit meetings.
- Meets expectations for Service to the University, the Program, the Profession, College, or Community, participating on committees, helping with events or other activities outlined in one's statement of expectations. Documentation to be provided by the faculty members to justify meritorious service.

Satisfactory

- 1 Committee
- Attendance at all unit meetings

Unsatisfactory

- 0 Committees
- Minimal attendance at unit meetings

Promotion & Tenure – Standards and Criteria

Approved and Revised by Department: May 23, 2011

The Northern Arizona University Conditions of Faculty Service stipulates that all candidates for promotion and/or tenure must be evaluated by the following personnel in the following order: Women's and Gender Studies Program's Faculty Status Committee (FSC), Director of WGS, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean of the College, and the Provost and the President of Northern Arizona University. The FSC ensures that each candidate meets acceptable minimum standards for the university in teaching, research, and service.

A central document that annually defines performance standards in all the areas of teaching, research, and service is the "statement of expectations." Additional required documentation outlined by the College (SBS) includes: the annual performance report linking accomplishments with previously defined expectations; a professional statement or narrative; letters of recommendation and evaluation written by committees over the 7 years (Annual Review Committee, Faculty Status Committee) as well as those written by administrators (the Director, Dean, and Provost); formal evaluations of teaching; supporting materials in teaching and other student-related responsibilities; supporting materials in scholarship, research or creative activity; supporting materials in professional/community service. The Director will work with WGS line faculty to ensure that a faculty member's file includes appropriate and well-organized documentation of activities and accomplishments in teaching, research, and service as outlined by Conditions of Faculty Service and in the Women's and Gender Studies Program.

The WGS program values traditional and non-traditional achievement in all areas of professional performance (teaching, research, and service). It is committed to nurturing faculty in the early years of their career, and to assisting more advanced faculty with ongoing development of their professional skills, achievements, and networks. We recognize and value the local, regional, national, and international communities within which Women's and Gender Studies faculty participate; we understand that membership in multiple professional communities may involve research, teaching, and service activities, and that a faculty member's interests and commitments will determine the extent and nature of engagement with their professional communities.

Tenure eligible faculty shall have a maximum probationary period no longer than six (6) years in full-time service at tenure eligible rank, except in cases of a waiver by the President for a particular tenure-eligible faculty member. All tenure eligible positions require an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the appropriate discipline. Any exception to this degree requirement must be recommended by the faculty and Director of WGS, and approved by the Provost. Achievement of a faculty rank at NAU shall be determined by evaluation and recommendation using written academic unit criteria, which must be approved by the Dean and Provost before implementation.

Evaluation of a candidate by the WGS Promotion and Tenure Review Committee shall be confined to the materials included in a faculty member's Professional Review File that adhere to the requirements set forth by the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.4.5.2. In addition, materials received, such as external letters of recommendation, to which the faculty member has agreed to waive access, shall be made available to reviewers for tenure and promotion review. The Women's and Gender Studies Program requires that outside letters (letters written by individuals who do not work or study at NAU) speak to a faculty's research, publications, and accomplishments for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure file. In the spring semester before a promotion review, the Director and the candidate will meet and identify six individuals who are qualified to write letters assessing the performance of the candidate. After

this meeting, the Director will obtain three letters from these in the semester prior to promotion for inclusion in the promotion and tenure file. All procedures for pursuing external letters as put forth by the SBS policy will be followed, including confidentiality. The WGS Promotion and Tenure Review Committee will consult external letters of recommendation in their evaluation of a candidate for promotion and tenure.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

General: To be considered for promotion and/or tenure as a tenure eligible faculty, a candidate must achieve at least the minimum WGS, SBS and NAU university criteria for each rank in the three areas under review: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student- related responsibilities; (2) research, scholarship and/or creative activities; and (3) service to the university community and the profession. In addition to meeting all the minimum requirements in the three areas under review, for promotion to the rank of Professor, a candidate must demonstrate **outstanding** accomplishments in either (1) or (2) above as defined by College and Department/School criteria. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements.

For non-tenure eligible faculty holding the rank of Lecturer to be considered for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer, a candidate must achieve the minimum WGS, SBS and NAU university criteria for each rank in the following areas: (1) teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; and (2) a record of service and professional development related to the teaching role. See the standards for promotion to specific ranks at the end of this document for the full requirements. For promotion to other non-tenure eligible faculty positions, see the University's "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2.

Indicators of Performance in the Area of Teaching, Advisement, and Other Student-Related Responsibilities

Indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate's performance in the area of teaching, advisement, and other student-related activities are the following:

- Sustained pattern of positive evaluations by the chair and peers.
- Sustained pattern of positive evaluations from student opinion surveys and any other documentation the Department/School deems relevant.
- Evidence of effective classroom teaching and/or advising based on annual review narratives, letters from students, exit interviews, examples of student work, and other forms of documentation.
- Student/Faculty/University award nominations for excellence in teaching or teaching related activities.
- Development of new or updated courses on a regular basis.
- Award of a grant for pedagogical innovation.
- Acquisition of new skills to be used in teaching on a regular basis.
- Development and delivery of online courses.
- Evidence of the development or redevelopment of Department/School programs.
- Commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience including: directing independent studies and student research; organizing and/or directing fieldtrips; facilitating student participation at professional meetings; supervising presentation and/or publication of student scholarly work in professional venues.
- Sustained pattern of commitment to student professional growth through supervision of internships and independent studies.
- Service as internship or graduate coordinator.
- Supervising Master's and/or Ph.D. students.

- Career and professional advising of students including letters of recommendation, informal meetings, and organized work sessions.
- Publication of instructional/teaching related materials.
- Sustained involvement in professional development activities related to teaching.
- Other teaching or pedagogical contributions that the candidate can document.

WGS considers the entire package of a professional review file that is submitted for promotion and tenure. Quality and quantity are evaluated among the package of elements that represent positive accomplishments in teaching.

Indicators of Performance in the Area of Research, Scholarship and/or Creative Activity

To make judgments about the quality of faculty research, the committee shall examine scholarly activities and publications related to the discipline and interests of the faculty member. Scholarly activity refers to efforts completed in the subject areas germane to the faculty member's discipline. Indicators of scholarly activity include professional papers (or research projects) published or forthcoming, articles submitted to professional journals, grant and contract work, papers presented at professional meetings, and other work related to the research process.

Specific indicators of scholarly activity and research include the following:

- Publication of books, journal articles, book chapters, edited collections, research/technical reports, applied project reports, and other peer-reviewed works.
- Presentation of research and creative activities at peer-reviewed professional meetings.
- Invited talks and/or poster sessions at refereed conferences and meetings.
- Creation and presentation of film, video and media projects related to scholarly and/or creative activities.
- Organizing symposia at refereed local, regional or national conferences and meetings.
- Organizing a conference at local, regional, national or international meetings.
- Editing (or co-editing) a scholarly book or conference proceedings.
- Creation of a database for shared scholarly and/or creative works.
- Creation and dissemination of computer software for scholarly purposes.
- Research talks given in non-refereed formats, e.g., an invited speaker series.
- Exhibition of creative works in non-juried venues.
- Publication relevant to scholarly or creative expertise in non-peer reviewed outlets.
- Preparation, submission and/or administration of grants for scholarly and/or creative activities.
- Awards from professional associations for scholarship and creative activity.
- Public presentations of scholarly/creative work to community groups.
- Citation of scholarly work in refereed papers, essays and books.
- Reprints of published scholarship in anthologies and edited volumes.
- Other scholarly activity that the candidate can document.

WGS considers the entire package of a professional review file submitted for promotion and tenure. In the case of research, reviewers must variously assess the high quality of a grant award compared to cited articles from peer-reviewed journals, as both of these are potentially highly valued accomplishments. Quality as well as quantity must be assessed among the elements, which represent very strong or outstanding work in scholarship.

Indicators of Performance in the Area of Service

To make judgments concerning service, the committee shall examine the faculty member's contributions to the program, university, community, and professional associations, including service to activities that substantially enhance the program or the university's functioning beyond levels normally expected of faculty. Indicators of university service include participation on boards, panels, committees, task forces, and the like. It includes leadership at various levels within the university. Public or community service involves technical assistance to the public using the expertise of the faculty member to examine or solve public issues.

Indicators of the sustained nature, effectiveness, and quality of the candidate's performance in the area of service are the following:

- Officer, committee chair or other significant leadership role in an academic or professional association.
- Chair and/or membership on University committee or sub-committee.
- Chair and/or membership on a Department/School or College committee or sub-committee
- Receipt of an award for service.
- Professional service to the campus and/or the larger community (may include public issue oriented consulting, volunteer coordination, and technical assistance).
- Volunteer service/activism in the community that is related to the faculty member's academic expertise.
- Volunteer service relevant to scholarly or creative expertise on community boards and commissions.
- Contributions through the development and presentation of public lectures and workshops relevant to the faculty member's academic expertise.
- Judge and/or reviewer for University or community events, such as literary or artistic productions.
- Articles and/or invited opinion essays in community publications based on the faculty member's academic expertise.
- Working with community colleges in curriculum development and transfer policies.
- Other service that the candidate can document.

STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION TO SPECIFIED RANKS

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.1, to hold the rank of Associate Professor, a candidate must possess a doctorate or other terminal degree in the discipline area and demonstrate the relationship to Women's and Gender Studies. A faculty member may not be promoted to this rank unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured Associate Professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor at NAU; the faculty member, however, may have prior service credit that was agreed to in writing at the time of appointment to a tenure-track position at the rank of Assistant Professor. To hold the rank of Associate Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must demonstrate an overall pattern of positive teaching performance. This would include indicators like the following:

1. A record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.
 - a. At a minimum, the faculty seeking promotion and tenure should show teaching effectiveness, response to evaluations and an effort to continually improve instruction. Beyond the minimum to excellence, substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching would include teaching awards or nominations, sustained

- qualitative and quantitative (if the class is typical of the faculty member's assignment and is statistically valid), evaluations by student opinion surveys, by faculty and by chairs/directors; documentation of quality syllabi; instructing students to be an assistant in research or the classroom; curriculum and course development that advances the unit. Effective advising is recognized by both the quantity of students and appointments and quality of advice provided by the faculty member. Quality is demonstrated by: guiding students through requirements in line with student needs, independent studies, and assisting students to garner the knowledge and skills they need for future plans. Finally, other student-related possibilities would include arranging for students to participate in events, conferences and other activist scholarship in the community at large.
2. A record that shows a sustained pattern of research, scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.
 - a. To operationalize scholarly activity is complex due to the interdisciplinary nature of WGS. At a minimum, the candidate will have completed professional work such as books, refereed journal articles, research reports, book chapters, monographs, creative productions, and the like. Sustained quality activity would include a range of efforts from books to statistical research studies and from poetry to performance. As noted above, many of the following activities represent excellence and eligibility for tenure, though the faculty need not have all of them: published books, edited collections, peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters, invited articles, reprints of articles, exhibitions of creative works, presentations at professional meetings, book reviews, editing a journal edition, funded grants, applied research reports, comparative book reviews or literary surveys, research talks at a refereed conference, journal editor of a mainstream journal or other items based on faculty member justification.
 3. A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the University community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one subsequently moves from the rank of Associate Professor to Professor.
 - a. At a minimum, the faculty would have served on various university committees or other professional organizations. Indicators of sustained service would include a mix of service contributions at all levels of the university and in the community. In the community, this could be service in schools, non-profit-organizations, or on boards; in the university this could be as committee members, professional development contributors, or workshops; in the college and department this could include committees and organizing events and projects. Finally, evidence of leadership or potential for leadership should be present.

PROFESSOR

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.1, a faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the written notice of appointment indicated the hire was at the rank of Professor without tenure. Professors are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for this rank in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of Associate Professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as an Associate). To hold the rank of Professor, the performance of the candidate, at a minimum, must have the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document). In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of Professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (1) or (2) above as defined by the criteria and indicators in this document.

1. A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.

While all indicators listed in this document are not mentioned here (see pages 2-3), potential differentiating achievements follow.

At **minimum**, the teaching, advisement and other student related responsibilities should show a general pattern of positive performance. The candidate must promote the Program's teaching and curricular goals. Indicators of strong performance might include teaching award nominations, excellent advising, member of a thesis or dissertation committee(s), professional development workshops, guest lectures or other faculty justified contributions to pedagogy.

To award **outstanding** for teaching, the committee shall especially recognize factors such as: superb evaluations of teaching by the director, peers, and students; teaching awards; innovative programmatic curriculum development; documented quality and extent of advisement to minors, majors and graduate certificate students; chairing thesis and dissertation committees; creative courses and innovations; heavy course loads, commitment to student professional growth through supervision of internships and independent studies; teaching-related publications or grants or other faculty justified contributions to pedagogy.

1. A sustained pattern of high-quality research, scholarship or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.

While all indicators as listed on are not mentioned here (see p. 3-4), some examples of potential differentiating achievements follow.

Very strong research, scholarship or creative activity would be recognized by such indicators as: published conference proceeding, contributions to edited collections, submitted articles, reprints of previously published articles, exhibitions of creative works, presentations at professional meetings, book reviews, journal editor or guest editor of a special edition of a journal, invited reviewer of grants and awards, journal reviewer, maintenance of a scholarly website, or other items based upon a faculty member justification.

To make judgments in relation to awarding **outstanding** in research, scholarship or creative activity the committee shall especially recognize single-authored or co-authored books, peer-reviewed journal articles; book editing or co-editing, book chapters, funded grants and their administration, awards for professional research endeavors, applied research reports, comparative book reviews or literary surveys, research talks at a refereed conference, journal editor of a mainstream journal or other items based on faculty member justification.

2. A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's Department/School. (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the Department/School, College, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty).

At a minimum, a candidate should demonstrate active participation in departmental, college, and university affairs and demonstrate engaged leadership. Public or community service that contributes or provides assistance to the community also meets this requirement. The service record should be substantial and reflect important leadership positions in service rendered to the university, the discipline and the broader community. In sum, the package as a whole should document both leadership and expertise in a mix of faculty contributions to department/program, college or school, university, profession, and community.

SENIOR LECTURER (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document above, page 2):

Faculty seeking a Senior Lecturer position should show teaching effectiveness. In addition to response to evaluations and an effort to continually improve instruction, evidence of effectiveness in teaching would include indicators like: teaching awards or nominations, sustained pattern of positive evaluations by student opinion surveys, by faculty and by chairs/directors; documentation of quality syllabi; innovative pedagogy; instructing students to be an assistant in research or the classroom; curriculum and course development contributing to the advance of the unit. Effective advising is recognized by both the quantity of students and appointments and quality of advice provided by the faculty member. Quality is demonstrated by: guiding students through requirements in line with student needs, independent studies, and assisting students to garner the knowledge and skills they need for future plans. Finally, other student-related possibilities would include taking students to events, conferences and other activist scholarship in the community at large.

In sum, the key areas for consideration are:

1. A record of sustained pattern of positive evaluations by peers and chair.
2. Sustained pattern of positive evaluation from student opinion surveys or other documentation accepted by department as relevant.
3. Evidence of effective classroom teaching and/or advising based on annual review narratives and other documentation.
4. Acquisition of new skills to be used in teaching on a regular basis.

WGS considers the entire package of a professional review file that is submitted for promotion. This allows for qualitative flexibility in evaluation of the package of elements that can represent positive accomplishments in teaching.

PRINCIPAL LECTURER (a non-tenure eligible position)

As stated in the NAU "Conditions of Faculty Service," Section 1.2.2, to be eligible for the rank of Principal Lecturer, a candidate must have the equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of Senior Lecturer or other relevant professional experience. In addition, the performance of the candidate must demonstrate the following (as measured by the criteria and indicators in this document above):

Teaching, advisement and other student related responsibilities should show a general pattern of excellent performance. The candidate must promote the Program's teaching and curricular goals. Indicators of excellence in teaching might include: superb evaluations of teaching by the director, peers, and students; teaching awards; innovative program curriculum development; documented quality and extent of advisement to minors, majors and graduate certificate students; chairing thesis and dissertation committees; creative courses and innovations; heavy course loads; commitment to student professional growth through supervision of internships and independent studies; professional development workshops; guest lectures; teaching related publications or grants or other faculty-justified contributions to pedagogy.

In sum, the key areas for review consideration are:

1. A record of sustained pattern of excellence in teaching evaluations by peers and chair at the Senior Lecturer rank in teaching, advising, and other student-related responsibilities.
2. A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role as evidenced by student opinion survey results while having served at the rank of Senior Lecturer.
3. Evidence of sustained effective classroom teaching and advising based on annual reviews as demonstrated for the years served at the rank of Senior Lecturer.
4. Evidence of commitment to student academic growth outside the formal classroom experience such as directing independent studies and student research as noted during the period served at the rank of Senior Lecturer.

WGS considers the entire package of a professional review file that is submitted for promotion. This allows for qualitative flexibility in evaluation of the package of elements that can represent positive accomplishments in teaching.