

2022

College of Juvenile Justice Faculty Promotion Guidelines

College of Juvenile Justice
Prairie View A&M University
9/1/2022

Prairie View A&M University
College of Juvenile Justice
Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure
Revised: August 15, 2022

Table of Contents:

- I. Introduction and Note on Policy Implementation
- II. Annual Evaluation Review Requirements/Processes
- III. Summary of Mid-Tenure Review Requirements/Processes
- IV. Summary of Tenure and/or Promotion Requirements/Processes
- V. Guidelines for Assessing Tenure and/or Promotion for Faculty
- VI. Summary of Post-Tenure Review Requirements/Processes
- VII. Summary of Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion Requirements/Processes

I. Introduction

This document is intended to outline the following processes with the College of Juvenile Justice relating to: (1) annual evaluation review, (2) mid-tenure evaluation review, (3) tenure and/or promotion requirements and processes, (4) guidelines for departmental and college tenure and/or promotion, (5) post-tenure review requirements and processes, and (6) promotion requirements and processes for non-tenure track faculty.

The criteria and guidelines discussed in this document are supplementary to the Promotion and Tenure Manual published by Prairie View A&M University (henceforth, the University Manual). The provisions of the University Manual shall prevail on any matter not covered herein or on any point wherein the document of the College of Juvenile Justice is inconsistent with those mandatory provisions.

Policy Implementation

It is the responsibility of all parties participating in the tenure and/or promotion process to ensure that the policy stated in this manual is executed in an appropriate manner. The faculty member (candidate for tenure and/or promotion) must provide evidence in their portfolio that, at a minimum, standards for tenure and/or promotion set in this manual are met.

II. Annual Evaluation Review Requirements/Processes

To facilitate and encourage dialogue between the Department Head and faculty members, and to aid in the constructive development of faculty members, an annual review will be conducted for faculty members at any rank.

For lecturers, the annual review will focus on performance and the potential for continued appointment. Reviews for other non-tenure-track faculty (such as research or clinical faculty) will focus on performance in areas aligned with what is stated in the faculty member's appointment or reappointment letter. For tenured or tenure track faculty, the annual review focuses on their progress in a long-term scholarly career (and the review will be conducted differently depending upon the different stages of the faculty member's career). For tenure track

assistant professors, the annual review process must also provide an indication as to their progress toward tenure and promotion.

The annual review is conducted using the University approved instrument. The instrument sets minimum expectations in teaching, research, and service activities that must be fulfilled for a faculty member to qualify for merit pay when available. The weights and measures of the instrument are tailored to the type of position that the faculty member holds. The process for the review is as follows:

1. The faculty member uses the annual evaluation instrument to provide an account (along with any supporting documentation) of their performance on each criterion of evaluation.
2. The Department Head scores the instrument based on available and verifiable documentation.
3. The Department Head holds a private conference with the faculty member to review the scoring of the instrument and discuss any plans for continued development.
4. The faculty member is given a reasonable amount of time (no less than one calendar week) to review the completed instrument and, if necessary, provide a written response before signing it.
5. The completed, signed instrument is submitted in Workday. The faculty member acknowledges the review in Workday, which is then routed to the Department Head.

Annual reviews will also serve as documentation for the determination of merit salary increases. For more information about the annual review process, refer to the University Manual.

III. Mid-Tenure Review Requirements/Processes

Summary

The mid-tenure review is structured to evaluate the cumulative progress toward tenure and promotion for a tenure-track faculty member using the standards set by the College and University. The mid-tenure review generally takes place at the beginning of the fourth year of the probationary period and provides constructive feedback about the faculty member's progress toward tenure. The College of Juvenile Justice uses the same timelines and processes as the University.

It is understood that faculty may not meet each and every criterion at the mid-tenure review. The purpose of the review is to provide the faculty member with a timely account of their strengths and weaknesses as well as any suggested strategies for improvement. The mid-tenure review is also used to identify reasonable resources that may be provided to the faculty member to support their progress toward tenure (e.g., computer or other supportive technology, short-term course load reduction, and adjustment in department responsibilities, etc.).

In some cases, the mid-tenure review can suggest a faculty member might apply for tenure and promotion early. For early consideration of tenure and promotion, individuals must consult first with the Department Head and the Dean for advice by the deadline established by Academic Affairs. If both the Department Head and the Dean encourage the submission of an application for early tenure and promotion, the applicant may submit a portfolio for the review process.

The annual performance evaluation instrument is the basis for measuring faculty fulfillment of the minimum expectations in teaching, research, and service and of making subsequently a positive or negative recommendation relative to the mid-tenure review.

Process

1. The process begins with the COJJ Dean's Office, which informs, by June, via written memorandum, each faculty member who must undergo mid-tenure review in the upcoming academic year (generally the fourth year after the probationary period begins). The process involves compiling an electronic portfolio via PantherFolio that documents the faculty member's record of achievement in teaching, research, and service. Please see the University Manual for specific portfolio requirements.
2. As the College contains few departments, the review begins with the Department Head, who independently evaluates and rates each candidate, including recommendations of improvement as needed. The Department Head then submits a recommendation to the Dean, with a letter justifying the recommended action, including the completed forms necessary for submission by the approved deadline.
3. After the Department Head review, the portfolio is provided to the College Advisory Committee (CAC), which consists of three or five tenured faculty members from the College. The members of the committee are appointed by the Dean, who also appoints a Chair of the committee. If there are fewer than three tenured faculty members, the CAC may include tenured faculty members in disciplines closely related to the applicant's discipline, recruited by the Dean from other colleges at the university. After reviewing the candidate's portfolio, based on the guidelines provided in the College and University Manuals, the CAC submits to the Dean its recommendations (along with justifications), including the completed forms necessary for submission, by the approved deadline.
4. Fourth, the Dean's evaluation is the final phase of the review process. The Dean rates the candidate based on the submitted materials contained in the portfolio and produces an independent written evaluation of the candidate. The Dean ultimately shall communicate this evaluation to the candidate in a formalized way by the prescribed date, with a copy of the same evaluation forwarded to the immediate supervisor concerned. The Dean's final communication can be stated in one of these varieties: a statement of affirmation that the candidate has made adequate progress toward tenure and promotion, or that the candidate has some deficiency requiring improvement, or that the candidate has failed to demonstrate adequate progress so much that he/she will be offered a terminal, nine-month appointment. In case of the third option, the candidate may file an appeal to the Provost, contesting the Dean's decision, at which time the appeals procedures outlined in

the University Manual can be activated.

Please note: All review committee materials and deliberations must be treated as confidential. Violations of confidentiality are regarded as official misconduct.

IV. Summary of Tenure and/or Promotion Requirements/Processes

1. By June, the COJJ Dean's Office will inform, via a written memorandum, each faculty member in the college who must receive a mandatory tenure review during the upcoming academic year.
2. Each faculty member applying for tenure and/or promotion must submit a portfolio via PantherFolio by the date listed in the university review calendar. The portfolio should contain, at the minimum, the items listed in the University Manual. The portfolio should have materials to substantiate achievements in the three areas of teaching, research, and service. Due to the low number of departments in the College, the first level of review is the Department Head. The portfolio should include a letter of submission that indicates the candidate is formally submitting the portfolio to the direct supervisor for evaluation. Unless there are significant extenuating circumstances, failure to submit the portfolio by the prescribed deadline date will preclude the faculty member from applying for tenure and/or promotion.
3. The Department Head reviews the following materials: (i) faculty's portfolio and (ii) relevant material from department personnel files. The Department Head then submits a recommendation to the Dean, with a letter justifying the recommended action, including the completed forms necessary for submission by the approved deadline. The portfolio is then forwarded to the CAC.
4. The portfolio is then reviewed by the CAC. The CAC consists of three or five tenured faculty members from the College, appointed by the Dean. If there are fewer than three tenured faculty members, the CAC may include tenured faculty members in disciplines closely related to the applicant's discipline, recruited by the Dean from other colleges at the university. In case of an application for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor, the CAC must consist of Full Professors. The CAC reviews the applicant's portfolio and submits recommendations, with justification, to the Dean by the approved deadline.
5. The Dean reviews all materials reviewed by the CAC, their recommendation, and that of the Department Head. The Dean prepares an independent assessment of the candidate. The Dean then submits to the Provost the following: (i) faculty's portfolio and (ii) recommendations from the Department Head, CAC, and Dean.
6. The candidate will then have the opportunity to present to the University's Executive Review Committee which includes the Provost, Vice President of Research, and the President. The Dean of the College will offer input after the candidate's presentation. Thereafter, this committee prepares its recommendation regarding whether or not to

submit to the TAMUS Board of Regents a request for the candidate's tenure and promotion.

7. The faculty receiving tenure and/or promotion will typically be notified prior to the commencement of the fall semester.

Please note: All review committee materials and deliberations must be treated as confidential. Violations of confidentiality are regarded as official misconduct.

V. Guidelines for Assessing Tenure and/or Promotion for Faculty

A. Introduction

The weighted scores of the criteria enumerated under each performance evaluation category are derived from the **number value** assigned to each criterion, multiplied by a **ranking scale** of 0 to 5, five being the highest. The same structure is used throughout each of the three performance area rubrics (teaching, research, and service).

Items in Section A of each performance area rubric are **required** rating for all faculty and provide a maximum number of points that can be drawn for that section. Items in Section B of each performance area rubric provide a number of additional points for **optional** items. Each optional section in the rubric has a maximum number of points that can be drawn for that section (i.e., teaching, research, service).

Provided that the faculty member scores enough points in the required section of the rubric (Section A), a lack of points in Section B will not be penalized.

Please note: Portfolio requirements for faculty are the same for the College of Juvenile Justice as the University. Please refer to the University Manual for the portfolio requirements.

B. Instructions for Evaluating Faculty Using Three Areas of Performance Expectations

All faculty will meet the minimum university qualifications for tenure and/or promotion, plus the College requirements. The Committee will rate a faculty member's performance on a scale of 0-5 for each of the items enumerated under each performance category. Thus, the rating of faculty performance for the items in each of the performance areas should reflect these attributes:

Significantly exceeds expectations = 5; Exceeds expectations = 4; Meets expectations = 3; Partially meets expectations = 2; Does not meet expectations = 1; Unable to Evaluate or Not Applicable = 0.

In order to arrive at a weighted score for each item (**Column 4**), one should simply multiply the numbers under **Weight (Column 2)** and **Rating (Column 3)**, to be followed by adding up all the weighted scores under **Column 4** and providing the overall total scores for **Teaching (50%)**, **Research (40%)**, and **Service (10%)**, respectively.

The Committee is expected to evaluate faculty performance systematically, objectively, and judiciously. Given this imperative, we will adopt a rating method based on a point-system covering the three areas of performance. This is duly illustrated below:

Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty

Teaching (50%):

45+ points	= Significantly exceeds expectations
40-44 points	= Exceeds expectations
35-39 points	= Meets expectations
30-34 points	= Partially meets expectations
≤29 points	= Does not meet expectations

Research (40%):

36+ points	= Significantly exceeds expectations
32-35 points	= Exceeds expectations
28-31 points	= Meets expectations
24-27 points	= Partially meets expectations
≤23 points	= Does not meet expectations

Service (10%):

9+ points	= Significantly exceeds expectations
8.0-8.9 points	= Exceeds expectations
7.0-7.9 points	= Meets expectations
6.0-6.9 points	= Partially meets expectations
≤5.9 points	= Does not meet expectations

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

90+ points	= Significantly exceeds expectations
80-89 points	= Exceeds expectations
70-79 points	= Meets expectations
60-69 points	= Partially meets expectations
≤59 points	= Does not meet expectations

C. List of Criteria to be Evaluated under Each Performance Area

Tenure Track and Tenured Faculty

Teaching

A faculty member is to provide evidence of effective instruction during the period of evaluation related to tenure and/or promotion in rank. College-level expectations include university requirements for effective instruction. Items in Section A are **required** rating for all faculty. Items in Section B provide additional points for **optional** teaching items. The total number of points earned in Teaching may not exceed 50. Points from the Teaching section may not be carried over to the Research or Service sections.

Teaching A – All items are required rating for all faculty. In this section, there are 50 points available, and faculty may earn up to 45 points.	Weight	Rating (0 – 5)	Weighted Score
<p>Evidence of teaching excellence via average student feedback score on student evaluations [SOS results]. SOS is, however, only one measure of teaching excellence.</p> <p><3.00 does not meet expectations (rating of 1) 3.00 – 3.49 would partially meet expectations (rating of 2) 3.50 – 3.99 would meet expectations (rating of 3) 4.00 – 4.49 would exceed expectations (rating of 4) >4.50 would significantly exceed expectations (rating of 5)</p>	2.00		
<p>Evidence of teaching excellence from faculty or peer assessments via average score on peer evaluations.</p> <p><3.00 does not meet expectations (rating of 1) 3.00 – 3.49 would partially meet expectations (rating of 2) 3.50 – 3.99 would meet expectations (rating of 3) 4.00 – 4.49 would exceed expectations (rating of 4) >4.50 would significantly exceed expectations (rating of 5)</p>	2.00		
Evidence of mentoring students or teaching assistants or research assistants	1.50		
Evidence of continuing training and professional development	1.50		
Evidence of innovative teaching (new technology and strategies)	1.50		
Evidence of continuous improvement in teaching practice over the years. These efforts are unrelated to SOS results. (Based on the annual performance evaluation scores for the past 3-5 years)	1.50		
Teaching B – This section is optional, and faculty may earn extra point(s) for Teaching. In this section, there are 32.5 points available, and faculty may earn up to 13 points.			
Evidence of coordination and leading independent study activities for students	0.75		
Evidence of coordination and leading travel/study abroad activities for students	0.75		
Evidence of successfully serving on dissertation and/or thesis committees	0.75		
Evidence of chairing dissertation and/or thesis committee(s)	1.50		
Evidence of new course development (including special topics courses) and improvement that meet discipline and university standards (Quality Matters)	0.75		
Evidence of Open Educational Resources development	0.75		
Evidence of development and teaching of discipline-specific workshops for students	0.75		

Other notable accomplishments: Awards and/or recognitions received, regardless of the nomination process. Nominations from others for awards and/or recognitions can also be counted (excludes self-nomination). Awards from professional organizations or the university system should be rated higher than departmental or college awards.	0.50		
Total Score			

Research

A faculty member is to provide evidence of satisfactory contributions in research during the period of evaluation related to tenure and/or promotion in rank. This category includes the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative activities and/or the preservation of knowledge. Consistent progress toward the required number of publications should be made in each year following the first year of service.

These requirements are the same for the award of tenure and the promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, with two exceptions. For the promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, a rating of “Significantly Exceeds Expectations” in research is required. Second, the item rating the impact of research for faculty is only to be used during the scoring of the promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. Items in Section A are **required** rating for all faculty. Items in Section B provide additional points for **optional** research items. The total number of points earned in Research may not exceed 40. Points from the Research section may not be carried over to the Teaching or Service sections.

The graduate degrees offered by the College are taught by faculty with experience and expertise encompassing the broad spectrum of juvenile and criminal justice systems. Interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary work related to juvenile justice within refereed journals in related disciplines like sociology, criminal justice, criminalistics, criminology, psychology, social psychology, economics, administration, methodology, and statistics are appropriate.

The Department of Justice Studies is closely aligned with the Texas Juvenile Crime Prevention Center. It is strongly encouraged that some of the items below relate specifically to juveniles and/or juvenile justice.

Presentations and membership at local, state, national, and international conferences and organizations may also reflect the diversity of interdisciplinary scholarship contained within the College. Notwithstanding specific requirements, higher quality publications based on factors like journal ranking, impact factor, and publisher reputation (among others) will receive higher levels of credit in committee assessment.

Research A – All items in Section A are required rating for all faculty. In this section, there are 40 points available for the promotion to Associate Professor rank, and faculty working toward that	Weight	Rating (0 – 5)	Weighted Score
---	---------------	---------------------------	---------------------------

rank may earn up to 35 points. There are 45 points available for the promotion to Full Professor rank, and faculty working toward that rank may earn up to 32 points.			
<p>Evidence of publication in scholarly, refereed journals (minimum of six are required, with three or more as primary or sole author). Consistent progress toward the required number of publications should be made in each year following the first year of service.</p> <p>Note: Evidence of publication of discipline-related scholarly book(s), which should be peer-reviewed and published with a reputable press may substitute for a maximum of three scholarly, peer-reviewed journal articles, provided the book is a meaningful contribution to the literature rather than an updated edition, short brief, compilation of readings, or textbook. This should be rated along with the evidence of publication in scholarly, refereed journals.</p> <p>Note: Grant proposals, submitted as PI or Co-PI, that lead to successful acquisition of a funded external grant may substitute for one scholarly, peer-reviewed journal article. This should be rated along with the evidence of publication in scholarly, refereed journals.</p>	8.00		
<i>For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor rank only:</i> Evidence of publication of impactful research using commonly cited metrics in the discipline such as, but not limited to h-index, i10-index, or impact factor of selected works.	1.00		
Research B – This section is optional, and faculty may earn extra point(s) for Research. In this section, there are 50 points available, and faculty may earn up to 12 points.			
Evidence of successful acquisition of at least one funded external grant as PI or Co-PI. Evidence of management and administration of grants and funded projects.	2.00		
Evidence of publication of edited books	1.00		
Evidence of research presentations or contributions to conference proceedings at regional, national, or international professional conferences, including presentations with students	1.00		
Evidence of grant proposal submissions	1.00		
Evidence of published encyclopedia entries that are part of a peer-reviewed encyclopedia	0.50		
Evidence of publication of refereed book chapters	1.00		
Evidence of scholarly book reviews	0.50		

Evidence of data or research reports	0.50		
Evidence of policy papers or whitepapers	0.50		
Supervision of research projects; engaging students in research activities, publication of scholarly work with students	0.75		
Publication of three or more scholarly, peer-reviewed journal articles relating in content to juveniles or juvenile justice. This item incentivizes juvenile justice specific research, while acknowledging the wide array of possible scholarly research options among faculty in the college.	0.75		
Other notable accomplishments: Awards and/or recognitions received, regardless of the nomination process. Nominations from others for awards and/or recognitions can also be counted (excludes self-nomination). Awards from professional organizations or the university system should be rated higher than departmental or college awards.	0.50		
Total Score:			

Service

A faculty member is to provide evidence of satisfactory contributions in service to the University (including Department, College, and University levels), profession and community during the period of evaluation related to tenure and/or promotion in rank. College-level expectations include university requirements for excellence in service. Items in Section A are **required** ratings for all faculty. Items in Section B provide additional points for **optional** service items. The total number of points earned in Service may not exceed 10. Points from the Service section may not be carried over to the Teaching or Research sections.

The graduate degrees offered by the College are taught by faculty with experience and expertise encompassing the broad spectrum of juvenile justice systems. Interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary work related to juvenile justice within service in related disciplines like sociology, social psychology, criminal justice, criminalistics, criminology, psychology, economics, administration, methodology, and statistics are appropriate. Service at local, state, national, and international conferences may also reflect the diversity of interdisciplinary scholarship contained within the College.

Service A – All items are required rating for all faculty. In this section, there are 16.25 points available, and faculty may earn up to 9 points.	Weight	Rating (0 – 5)	Weighted Score
Evidence of service on committee assignments at the departmental level	0.50		
Evidence of service on committee assignments at the college level	0.75		

Evidence of service on committee assignments at the university or TAMUS level	1.00		
Evidence of professional organization service (committees, volunteering, panels, conferences or symposiums, etc.)	0.50		
Evidence of reviewing articles, grants, conference submissions, or books in scholarly forums	0.50		
Service B – This section is optional, and faculty may earn extra point(s) for Service. In this section, there are 31.25 points available, and faculty may earn up to 5 points.			
Evidence of leadership on committee assignments at the departmental level	0.75		
Evidence of leadership on committee assignments at the college level	1.00		
Evidence of leadership on committee assignments at the university or TAMUS level	1.25		
Evidence of leadership in professional organization service (committees, volunteering, panels, conferences, or symposiums, etc.)	0.75		
Evidence of appointment to field-related active external board or committee, etc.	0.75		
Pro bono testimony or field-related consultancy	0.25		
Evidence of media engagement, including interviews or features or written submissions in: TV, radio, newsprint, podcasts, professional newsletters, YouTube series, professional magazines, and other related publications	0.25		
Evidence of planning and leading professional or community workshops, training events, presentations, continuing education opportunities, or other discipline-related events	0.25		
Evidence of service on accreditation or evaluation teams	0.25		
Evidence of other demonstration of student support (including but not limited to writing recommendation letters, unpaid recruiting or coordination activities, internship work with students)	0.25		
Other notable accomplishments: Awards and/or recognitions received, regardless of the nomination process. Nominations from others for awards and/or recognitions can also be counted (excludes self-nomination). Awards from professional organizations or the university system should be rated higher than departmental or college awards.	0.50		
Total Score:			

D. Key to Expected Cumulative Faculty Performance for Consideration of Positive Recommendations towards Tenure and/or Promotion

The CAC will use the breakdown and table below to rate the overall performance of the faculty candidate being reviewed under the three critical areas of evaluation. Eventually, the committee on the whole will discuss these ratings thoroughly, after which the recommendation of candidates for or against tenure and/or promotion will be made in a deliberative and transparent manner.

A faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor is expected to demonstrate a minimum cumulative performance rating consisting of these attributes (also reflected in the table below): **Significantly Exceeds Expectations** in Teaching; **Exceeds Expectations** in Research; and **Exceeds Expectations** in Service or **Exceeds Expectations** in Teaching; **Significantly Exceeds Expectations** in Research; and **Exceeds Expectations** in Service. However, for promotion to full professorship, at the minimum these attributes are required: **Significantly Exceeds Expectations** in Teaching; **Significantly Exceeds Expectations** in Research; and **Exceeds Expectations** in Service or **Exceeds Expectations** in Teaching; **Significantly Exceeds Expectations** in Research; and **Significantly Exceeds Expectations** in Service.

<i>Action</i>	<i>Teaching</i>	<i>Research</i>	<i>Service</i>
Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor	Significantly Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
	Exceeds Expectations	Significantly Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Promotion to Professor	Significantly Exceeds expectations	Significantly Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
	Exceeds Expectations	Significantly Exceeds Expectations	Significantly Exceeds Expectations

E. Summary of Findings

Instructions for the College Advisory Committee: Please summarize below the findings of your review, highlighting the areas of strengths or weaknesses of the individual undergoing peer review while justifying the judgment that you have made on the applicant's application for tenure and/or promotion. Please complete this for non-tenure track faculty as well, using "not applicable" for research and service sections.

Name of Faculty Candidate: _____

Teaching:

Research:

Service:

Concluding Remarks:

VI. Post-Tenure Review Requirements/Processes

Summary

Tenured faculty members undergo a post-tenure review every five years to gauge the ongoing productivity of the individual. Post-tenure evaluations are designed to encourage a high level of sustained performance. The portfolio is reviewed by a committee of three or five tenured peers within the same discipline or closely related disciplines. The findings of the committee are reviewed by the Department Head, who combines the findings with those of the committee and submits a summary report that travels from the Dean to the Provost with recommended actions proposed and/or approved at each step along the way. The College uses the same timelines and processes as the University. Post-tenure reviews are not used for purposes of determining merit or promotion, though a faculty member may reference past reviews when applying for a promotion. Unsatisfactory outcomes on a post-tenure review will result in the adoption of an improvement plan for the faculty member approved by the Department/Division Head and Dean. Failure to implement the improvement plan can lead to further interventions and dismissal for cause.

Process

1. By June, the Dean of COJJ will inform, via a written memorandum, each faculty member who must undergo a mandatory post-tenure review by the end of the following academic year. The process involves compiling an electronic portfolio via PantherFolio that documents the faculty member's record of achievement in teaching, research, and service. Please see the University Manual for the portfolio requirements.
2. As the College contains few departments, the Department Head reviews the following materials: faculty's portfolio and relevant material from department personnel file. The Department Head then submits a recommendation to the Dean, with a letter justifying the recommended action, including the completed forms necessary for submission by the approved deadline. The portfolio is then forwarded to the CAC.
3. Second, the portfolio is reviewed by the CAC, which consists of three or five tenured faculty members from the College. In case of receiving a post-tenure portfolio from a Full Professor, the CAC must consist of a majority of Full Professors. The members of the CAC are appointed by the Dean, in accordance with the University Manual. If there are fewer than three tenured faculty members, the CAC may include tenured faculty members in disciplines closely related to the applicant's discipline, recruited by the Dean from other colleges at the university. The CAC reviews the applicant's portfolio following the Post-Tenure Review guidelines offered by the University, along with the necessary forms completed, and submits its report to the Dean.
4. The Dean reviews all materials and the recommendations submitted by CAC and the Department Head. The Dean conducts an independent evaluation of the candidate, and then submits to the Provost the following: faculty's post-tenure portfolio, all the recommendations from CAC, Department Head, and Dean.

5. Faculty members who submit post-tenure portfolios will be notified of the evaluation and recommendations prior to September of the subsequent fall semester. In the case of marginal or unsatisfactory rating in any of the areas of teaching, research, or service, the Dean or the Dean's office will set up a meeting with the faculty applicant to discuss outcomes and develop an improvement plan. In the case of faculty dissatisfaction with the outcome of the review, the faculty member in question can file an appeal at the necessary level. Further appeal may be made by the faculty member to the Provost if the issue is not resolved, in which case the Provost may establish a review panel consisting of members from the Faculty Senate or a panel whose members may be appointed jointly by the Provost and the Speaker of the Faculty Senate.

Please note: All review committee materials and deliberations must be treated as confidential. Violations of confidentiality are regarded as official misconduct.

VII. Summary of Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion Requirements/Processes

Application for promotion in rank for academic professional track (NTT) faculty shall follow the standard department, college, and university criteria and processes with the exception that the dossier shall include required documentation for only those areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and/or service that have been part of the faculty member's job/position responsibility. The review process is generally the same as tenure track promotion and tenure review with some differences as specified in the University Manual. The College Advisory Committee (CAC) for NTT faculty promotion reviews must include NTT faculty, and the appeal process for promotion denial is different for NTT faculty and can be found in the University Manual.

A non-tenure track faculty member is to provide evidence of effective instruction during the period of evaluation. College-level expectations include university requirements for excellence in teaching. **The minimum standard for promotion in rank for non-tenure track faculty is a weighted score of 90 points or higher.**

A. Process

1. Upon deciding to apply for promotion, the NTT faculty member must compile an electronic portfolio via PantherFolio that documents the faculty member's record of achievement in teaching, research, and service. Please see the University Manual for the portfolio requirements for NTT faculty.
2. As the College contains few departments, the Department Head reviews the following materials: faculty's portfolio and relevant material from department personnel file. The Department Head then submits a recommendation to the Dean, with a letter justifying the recommended action, including the completed forms necessary for submission by the approved deadline. The portfolio is then forwarded to the CAC.
3. Second, the portfolio is reviewed by the CAC, which consists of three or five tenured and non-tenure track faculty members. The members of the CAC are appointed by the Dean,

in accordance with the University Manual. The CAC may include tenured or non-tenure track faculty members in disciplines closely related to the applicant's discipline, recruited by the Dean from other colleges at the university. The CAC reviews the applicant's portfolio following the guidelines offered by the University, along with the necessary forms completed, and submits its report to the Dean.

4. The Dean reviews all materials and the recommendations submitted by CAC and the Department Head. The Dean conducts an independent evaluation of the candidate, and then submits to the Provost the following: faculty's promotion portfolio, all the recommendations from CAC, Department Head, and Dean.
5. Faculty members who submit portfolios will be notified of the evaluation and recommendations prior to September of the subsequent fall semester.
6. In the case of faculty dissatisfaction with the outcome of the review, the faculty member in question can file an appeal at the necessary level. Please see the University Manual for more information about NTT faculty promotion appeals.

Please note: All review committee materials and deliberations must be treated as confidential. Violations of confidentiality are regarded as official misconduct.

B. List of Criteria to be Evaluated under Each Performance Area

Items in Section A are **required** rating for all NTT faculty. Items in Section B provide additional points for **optional** research items. Non-tenure track faculty should not be penalized for not earning points in the optional section of the rubric, provided that sufficient points are earned in the required section of the rubric. The total number of points earned may not exceed 100.

Teaching A – All items are required rating for all faculty. In this section, there are 100 points available, and faculty may earn up to 90 points.	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Weighted Score
Evidence of innovative teaching (new technology and strategies)	5.00		
Evidence of continuous improvement in teaching over the years (Based on annual performance evaluations for the past 3-5 years)	5.00		
Evidence of teaching excellence via average student feedback score on student evaluations [SOS results]. SOS is, however, only one measure of teaching excellence. <3.00 does not meet expectations (rating of 1) 3.00 – 3.49 would partially meet expectations (rating of 2) 3.50 – 3.99 would meet expectations (rating of 3) 4.00 – 4.49 would exceed expectations (rating of 4) >4.50 would significantly exceed expectations (rating of 5)	5.00		

Evidence of teaching excellence from faculty or peer assessments via average score on peer evaluations. <3.00 does not meet expectations (rating of 1) 3.00 – 3.49 would partially meet expectations (rating of 2) 3.50 – 3.99 would meet expectations (rating of 3) 4.00 – 4.49 would exceed expectations (rating of 4) >4.50 would significantly exceed expectations (rating of 5)	5.00		
Teaching B – This section is optional, and faculty may earn extra point(s) for Teaching. In this section, there are 90 points available, and faculty may earn up to 20 points.			
Evidence of new course development and improvement (including special topics courses)	1.00		
Evidence of successful acquisition of at least one funded external grant as PI or Co-PI. Evidence of management and administration of grants and funded projects.	2.00		
Providing guest lectures in the area of expertise	1.00		
Evidence of successfully serving on dissertation and/or thesis committees	1.00		
Evidence of development and teaching of discipline-specific workshops for students	1.00		
Evidence of committee service at the department, college, university, or professional level	1.50		
Evidence of scholarly, peer-reviewed publications in refereed journals	1.50		
Evidence of other types of research activities (e.g., publishing academic books or book chapters, presenting papers at conferences, etc.)	1.00		
Evidence of service in student organizations	1.00		
Evidence of mentoring and supporting students, including but not limited to career counseling and letters of recommendation	1.00		
Evidence of recruitment or retention activities	1.00		
Evidence of Open Educational Resources development	1.00		
Evidence of continuing training and self-education, and professional development	1.00		
Evidence of successfully supervising students on presentations and publications	1.00		
Non-contracted or unpaid service as program coordinator/program coordination activities	1.00		
Other notable accomplishments: Awards and/or recognitions received, regardless of the nomination process. Nominations from others for awards and/or recognitions can also be counted (excludes self-nomination). Awards from professional organizations or the university system should be rated higher than departmental or college awards.	1.00		
Total Score			

C. Key to Expected Cumulative Faculty Performance for Consideration of Positive Recommendations towards NTT Promotion

The CAC will use the breakdown and table below to rate the overall performance of the NTT faculty being reviewed under the three critical areas of evaluation. Eventually, the committee on the whole will discuss these ratings thoroughly, after which the recommendation of candidates for or against promotion will be made in a deliberative and transparent manner.

<i>Action</i>	<i>Teaching</i>	<i>Research</i>	<i>Service</i>
Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion	Significantly Exceeds Expectations		

D. Summary of Findings

Instructions for the College Advisory Committee: Please summarize below the findings of your review, highlighting the areas of strengths or weaknesses of the individual undergoing peer review while justifying the judgment that you have made on the applicant's application for tenure and/or promotion. Please complete this for non-tenure track faculty as well, using "not applicable" for research and service sections.

Name of Faculty Candidate: _____

Teaching:

Research:

Service:

Concluding Remarks:
