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Section 3.0 Purpose

The purpose of this Chapter is to delineate a process and guiding principles for evaluating faculty members. UNI’s Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System is designed to recognize and reward faculty excellence throughout the evolution of one’s career, while protecting academic freedom, due process, tenure, and shared governance, according to the foundational 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.¹ Faculty evaluation also creates a process and standards for supporting ongoing faculty development and improvement. Department heads, in consultation with Professional Assessment Committees (PACs), have primary responsibility for evaluating faculty performance in terms of teaching or librarianship, research, scholarship, creative activity, and service. This chapter establishes university level guiding principles and standards, as well as processes to evaluate faculty members across their career. Specific departmental standards and criteria (Subdivision 3.1f, Departmental Standards and Criteria Document) and procedures for reviewing faculty (Subdivision 3.1g, Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document) must be compatible with those provisions in this chapter.

Section 3.1 General Guiding Principles for Evaluation

Subdivision 3.1a Dimensions of Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated along three dimensions: teaching or librarianship, scholarship, and service. Specific definitions of teaching or librarianship, scholarship, and service are included in Chapter 4 (Faculty Portfolios). Scholarship includes research and creative activities. Evaluators should acknowledge that faculty work may be relevant to more than one area (e.g., it could be evaluated as multiple areas of teaching, scholarship, and service).

Subdivision 3.1b Teaching or Librarianship

Faculty members’ primary role is to provide high quality instruction to students. Excellence in teaching is evaluated first and foremost. Faculty members whose primary role is librarianship are principally involved in the creation and provision of information, resources, and services that advance critical thinking, scholarly research, and learning in an evolving information landscape. Only after an affirmative judgment as to documented teaching or librarianship effectiveness has been made can serious consideration be given to an evaluation of scholarship and service.

² Hereafter, “teaching” includes “teaching or librarianship” as appropriate.
UNI expects faculty to foster critical thinking and knowledge in the content area of study, as well as to tailor course content or librarianship to the course level, curricular needs, and program learning goals and outcomes for the disciplines pursued by UNI’s student body. Faculty teaching should evolve over time as faculty members continue to refine and develop their teaching skills or librarianship across their careers and to update and refine their curriculum. UNI encourages faculty to consider new pedagogical or librarianship approaches when appropriate for their discipline. Teaching should be informed by the scholarship of teaching and learning or discipline-based pedagogy.

**Subdivision 3.1c Scholarship**

UNI faculty engage in the collective endeavor of creating knowledge or art, enhancing civic life, and influencing communities through research, creative activities, and other forms of scholarship, as assigned in their Portfolio (see Chapter 4 for Faculty Portfolio definitions). Scholarship is a valuable and meaningful part of faculty life. Scholarship is assessed through peer-review, which attests to the quality and meaningful impact, significance and relevance of the work. UNI recognizes the Scholarship of Discovery, the Scholarship of Integration, and the Scholarship of Application (see Chapter 4 for definitions) as legitimate and important forms of scholarship. UNI recognizes all forms of peer review for tenured faculty (see Section 3.8). In addition to traditional peer review (subdivision 3.8a), departments may include other forms of peer review for probationary faculty in their Departmental Standards and Criteria Document.

**Subdivision 3.1d Service**

Service is recognized as an essential component of UNI’s overall Portfolio for all faculty members. Service obligations are to be shared and fulfilled equitably by faculty members according to their assigned Portfolios (see Chapter 4 for Faculty Portfolio definitions). Faculty members contribute to shared governance and civic life through service to their department, college, university, profession, and community. Faculty are expected to actively participate in service, substantially and constructively contribute, and have a productive impact through service. Service to the community should make use of faculty member’s professional or disciplinary expertise.

**Subdivision 3.1e Weighting of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service**

The specific weighting of teaching, scholarship, and service shall be according to the faculty member’s most recently assigned Portfolio (see Chapter 4 for faculty portfolio definitions). It is recognized that faculty may have varied degrees of accomplishment in the three areas.

---

3 Hereafter “Scholarship” refers to research, creative activity, and other forms of academic scholarly activity.
Subdivision 3.1f Departmental Standards and Criteria Document
All probationary and tenured faculty, PACs, and department heads are expected to collaborate together to create clear, consistent departmental standards and criteria for the purposes of evaluation, promotion, and tenure. Departments should consult with adjuncts, term, and renewable term faculty regarding standards for their performance. Meetings shall be co-chaired by the department head and PAC chair. All criteria are to be reviewed annually in the spring semester by all departmental faculty members and department heads and submitted to the dean for approval. This document will be titled Departmental Standards and Criteria Document and must be approved by the dean [in consultation with the College Review Committee (CRC)] and designee from the Provost’s office and then distributed to the faculty of each department.

Paragraph 3.1f.1 Document Components
The document includes the specific operationalization of criteria for evaluating faculty performance. Departments shall specify criteria for: (a) meets expectations, (b) exceeds expectations, and (c) needs improvement for annual review and continuation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews by rank and portfolio. All criteria must be consistent with the University Guiding Standards (Section 3.10). The document shall also specify any materials to demonstrate teaching effectiveness in addition to the required components in scholarship and service. Finally, the document must specify discovery scholarship expectations for probationary faculty, and which if any integration or application scholarship is to be recognized for promotion and tenure. (Tenured faculty may pursue all three forms of scholarship. See Chapter 4.)

Paragraph 3.1f.2 Template
A template for departments to use in developing their own Departmental Standards and Criteria Document is located in Appendix A.

Paragraph 3.1f.3 Facilitating Departmental Collaboration
Departments, including department heads and all full-time faculty members, that need assistance in facilitating departmental collaboration to develop departmental standards and criteria for evaluation should seek assistance from their dean, the Associate Provost for Faculty, CRC, or Faculty Handbook Committee.

Paragraph 3.1f.4 Failure to Approve Departmental Standards and Criteria
If the dean or Provost or designee from the Provost’s office rejects the department’s document, they shall provide clear direction and feedback for
revising the document to meet the University Guiding Standards (Section 3.10) and other general university policies and procedures.

**Paragraph 3.1f.5 Failure to Develop Departmental Standards and Criteria Document**

When departments fail to create an approved Departmental Standards and Criteria Document, the dean shall call a meeting of the CRC to assist in resolving the issue.

If resolution cannot be achieved, representatives of the department, CRC, and the dean shall meet with the Faculty Handbook Committee to develop an action plan to assist the department in finalizing an acceptable Standards and Criteria Document. In the meantime, the University Guiding Standards Document shall serve as the Department’s standards and criteria.

**Subdivision 3.1g Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document**

PACs must create a PAC procedures document titled, Professional Assessment Committee Procedures, that specifies additional procedures to those documented in this Handbook. These procedures define how the PACs organize, function, schedule and complete their work. PACs utilize their individual department’s Department Standards and Criteria Document as their guiding resource for faculty evaluation (see Subdivision 3.1f). Any such procedures must be consistent with this Handbook and be reviewed annually by the department head, dean (in consultation with the College Review Committee (CRC)), and the Provost or designee. The procedures are then distributed to the faculty of each department. The Professional Assessment Committee Procedures must adhere to the timeline specified below.

**Paragraph 3.1g.1 Template**

A template for PACs to utilize in developing their own Professional Assessment Committee Procedures is located in Appendix B.

**Paragraph 3.1g.2 Failure to Develop Professional Assessment Committee Procedures**

PAC procedures which contradict this Handbook, university policy or procedure, or law shall follow the same process outline in Paragraph 3.1f.5.
### Table 3.2 Evaluation and Process Schedule by Faculty Rank: Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>BY STUDENTS</th>
<th>BY DEPARTMENT HEAD</th>
<th>BY PAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Instructor</td>
<td>Every class, every semester</td>
<td>During 1st year, 6th semester, 12th semester, or sooner if adjunct requests it&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes, if applying after a minimum of 12 cumulative semesters (50% or more appt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Adjunct Instructor (12 accumulated semesters of 50% or more appt.)</td>
<td>Every class, every semester</td>
<td>18th semester, 24th semester, or sooner if adjunct requests it</td>
<td>Yes, if applying after a minimum of 24 cumulative semesters (50% or more appt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Adjunct Instructor (12 accumulated semesters of 50% or more (appt.)</td>
<td>Every class, every semester</td>
<td>Every 6 semester s, or sooner if adjunct requests it</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term (1-4 years &amp; appt. ends)</td>
<td>Every class, every semester</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor (2-year)</td>
<td>Every class, every semester</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>4</sup> Includes merit designations

<sup>5</sup> Teaching portfolio evaluation materials compiled according to evaluation schedule
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Tenure Level</th>
<th>Review Frequency</th>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewable term</strong></td>
<td>Every semester</td>
<td></td>
<td>in year 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Instructor (2-year renewable term)</strong></td>
<td>Every class in the fall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>If the PAC chooses to conduct an annual review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Instructor (2-year renewable term)</strong></td>
<td>Every class in the fall</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>If the PAC chooses to conduct an annual review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probationary TT Faculty of Any Rank</strong></td>
<td>Every class, every semester</td>
<td>Yes, extensive in year 3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes; extensive in year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenured Faculty of Any Rank</strong></td>
<td>Every class in the fall 6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Summative evaluation in year 6; Full review if 3 “needs improvement” decisions during annual review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subdivision 3.2a Faculty Member Being Evaluated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faculty member being assessed shall adhere to the procedures, guidelines, and timetable contained in this handbook, and any pertinent Professional

---

6 Student assessments may be administered more frequently if a faculty member “needs improvement” in the area of teaching. Faculty may also request informational student assessments or additional assessments for their evaluation file. See Subdivision 3.6
Assessment Committee Procedures. When seeking promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member shall notify the department head and PAC chair by April 30, prior to the fall evaluation when teaching, scholarship and service contributions or portfolios will be reviewed. The faculty member is responsible for submitting evidence and supporting materials to document excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service (see Sections 3.6 - 3.9). These materials should reflect the assigned Portfolio (see Section XX Evaluation File Contents).

**Paragraph 3.2a1 Assembling Evaluation File Materials to Forward for Review**

In preparing for promotion, tenure, or full review for post-tenure review, faculty members collaborate with the department head and secretary to assemble their evaluation file into a box/binders to be sent to the dean’s office. The university will provide the box. Faculty boxes should be well organized.

**Subdivision 3.2b Professional Assessment Committee (PAC)**

Each academic department shall have a Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) for the assessment and evaluation of renewable term, probationary, and tenured faculty. The PAC is charged with conducting an independent review of faculty performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service using established standards and criteria. The PAC review serves as a recommendation to the Department Head.

**Paragraph 3.2b.1 PAC Membership**

The PAC shall consist of all tenured members of the department. All tenured faculty members are expected to serve on the PAC, unless released by the department head in consultation with the PAC Chair (including Conflicts of Interest see Section 3.3). The department head or designated administrators (such as director) shall not be a member of the PAC. Any faculty member who is a candidate for promotion/post-tenure review shall be excluded from committee deliberation of their candidacy. A PAC must include a minimum of three committee members. If membership drops below three department faculty members, the PAC shall seek outside membership from tenured faculty members from another academic department. They may consult with the department head or dean and must inform them of the final membership. PACs may choose to invite faculty members from another department to serve on the PAC to review a specific case when additional expertise is necessary or if the PAC lacks the necessary membership to make an informed decision. Faculty on phased retirement may choose to serve on the department PAC and continue to fulfill PAC membership and/or chair responsibilities.
SubParagraph 3.2b.1a Adjunct Instructors/Instructors (renewable term),
Associate Adjunct Instructors/Associate Instructors (renewable term), and Senior Adjunct Instructors/Senior Instructors (renewable term)
Adjunct instructors/Instructors (renewable term) at 50% or more workloads may be promoted to Associate Adjunct Instructors/Associate Instructors (renewable term), and then Senior Adjunct Instructors/Senior Instructors (renewable term). Renewable Term faculty who have been promoted to Associate Instructors or Senior Instructors, may serve on the PAC for the purposes of reviewing faculty of a lower rank in their faculty employment classification (see Paragraph 3.17d.2 Other).

Paragraph 3.2b.2 PAC Chair
The position of the PAC chair is a rotating term position of one or two years among members of the PAC committee. The PAC chair position may be renewed once consecutively. Some departments may choose to use a system of co-chairs who are elected and serve on alternating terms. The department’s PAC procedures must detail the leadership requirements of PAC chairs and associated duties. The PAC chair/co-chairs ensure that the department has developed the “Departmental Standards and Criteria Document” and “Professional Assessment Committee Procedures” that are compatible with University Guiding Standards, the Faculty Handbook, and university policies and procedures. The PAC chair/co-chair shall not be a faculty member who is being assessed for promotion by PAC in that year.

Paragraph 3.2b.3 PAC Chair Responsibilities
The duties of the chairperson/s shall be to preside at PAC meetings and to be the official spokesperson for PAC in performing its designated responsibilities in an orderly and timely fashion to meet deadlines as described in Section 3.11. PAC chairs also serve as members of the College Review Committee (see Subdivision 3.2d). PAC chairs provide a copy of PAC procedures to the department head and dean for review.

Paragraph 3.2b.4 PAC Responsibilities
PACs shall review renewable term instructors and probationary faculty each year. They also review faculty for recommendations of retention, termination, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews. PACs review associate and senior renewable term instructors every 12 semesters (50% appointments or more). PACs may choose to review adjuncts at the time of twelve accumulated (50% or more) semesters or more frequently if they choose. Adjuncts may also request to be reviewed by the PAC more frequently in preparation for promotion. PACs review associate and senior adjuncts at 12 accumulated (50% or more) semesters. The PAC will provide a recommendation to the department head. (See Section 3.13d.2 Evaluation and Process Schedule by Faculty Rank: Summary and 3.14 PAC Review.)

Subdivision 3.2c Department Head
In collaboration with the PAC chair, the department head ensures that the department has developed the “Departmental Standards and Criteria Document” that are compatible with University Guiding Standards, the Faculty Handbook, and university policies and procedures. The department head conducts an annual review of all faculty, including probationary, tenured, term, and renewable term faculty. Heads review adjunct faculty during their first year, every sixth semester, and when seeking promotion. The department head provides a recommendation to the dean. Department heads will provide specific written rationale when an evaluative decision is contrary to the PACs’ recommendations.

See Section 3.13 for a timeline of activities related to the department head’s annual review of faculty.

Paragraph 3.2c.1 Responsibilities
The department head ensures that an electronic copy of all official documents utilized in the evaluation process is accessible to all faculty members. These documents include the “Faculty Handbook,” “Departmental Standards and Criteria Document” and “Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document.” In the spring semester, the department head will distribute a communication requesting nominations or self-nominations for promotion and/or tenure to be received by April 15 for the next academic year. The department head is responsible for assuring that the material in the evaluation file be made available to the PAC during regular business hours and that all materials remain in the office or alternative assigned location.
**Subdivision 3.2d College Review Committee (CRC)**

The department head and one PAC chair from each department shall serve on a College Review Committee (CRC), chaired by the dean. The CRC is responsible for facilitating collaboration across faculty and administration regarding evaluation processes and standards around the college. The CRC ensures quality, consistency, equity, and compatibility of department standards and criteria and PAC procedures with University Guiding Standards, the Faculty Handbook, university policies and procedures, and applicable accreditation requirements. The CRC does not review individual faculty materials for the purposes of tenure and promotion. The CRC is to meet a minimum of one time per year, preferably in spring, to review all official documents utilized in the evaluation process, including any changes proposed by department faculty members, PACs or administrators.

**Subdivision 3.2e Deans**

Each dean will conduct an independent review of probationary faculty, renewable term faculty, faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure, and faculty undergoing the post-tenure review by examining the Faculty Evaluation File (Subdivision 3.4b). Each dean provides a recommendation to the provost. Deans will provide specific written rationale when an evaluative decision is contrary to either the department head or the PACs’ recommendations.

**Paragraph 3.2e.1 Reporting**

Deans shall report in writing by September 15 to the faculty leadership every fall a summary of how many, including a list, of faculty who received each evaluation rating (i.e., meets, exceeds or does not meet expectations) and merit allocation by department. The report should be blinded so that individual faculty are not identifiable.

**Subdivision 3.2f Provost**

The provost, in consultation with the deans and associate provosts, conducts an independent review of probationary faculty, renewable term faculty, faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure, and faculty undergoing post-tenure review by examining the Faculty Evaluation File. The Provost shall provide in the spring prior a written list of selected materials from the Evaluation File that they wish to review. The Provost may request additional materials as needed within the full Faculty Evaluation File. The provost will provide specific written rationale when an evaluative decision is contrary to the dean’s recommendation.
Subdivision 3.2g Board of Regents
The Board of Regents/State of Iowa is responsible for the final approval for tenure and/or promotion decisions.

Section 3.3 Conflicts of Interest
Faculty members shall be treated and evaluated on individual merit, and such evaluation shall be free of conflicts of interest that compromise these principles by the real or perceived possibility of preferential treatment based on family or personal relationships. While it is not possible to define all potential conflicts of interests, examples include individuals connected to the evaluatee by blood or adoption, by a current or former marriage or domestic partnership, by a romantic, sexual or other consensual relationship that may give the appearance of favoritism, or where the faculty members were adverse parties in an internal complaint, grievance, or legal action. Where a potential conflict of interest may exist, the evaluating faculty member must notify their dean of the potential conflict and may choose to recuse themself from the PAC review. If the faculty member chooses not to recuse themself from the evaluation, their dean, in consultation with the Associate Provost for Faculty, will determine whether a conflict of interest exists. If it is determined that a conflict of interest exists, the evaluating faculty member will not be permitted to evaluate the other faculty member.

Section 3.4 Evaluation Files
An evaluation file (including boxes or binders for action cases) shall be maintained for each tenured, probationary, term, renewable term and adjunct (temporary) faculty member. The evaluation file serves to annually and cumulatively document a faculty member’s productivity in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service as applicable and according to an individual’s portfolio. The departmental Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) will use the evaluation file to carry out its assessment of faculty. No separate or duplicated evaluation (or “PAC”) file will be created or maintained for the purposes of evaluation.

Subdivision 3.4a Evaluation File Access
The Evaluation File shall be located and secured in the assigned departmental office or in a protected electronic faculty portal with controlled access. Faculty may add materials to their own files with the approval of the department head. Bulky materials, which are still considered part of the Evaluation File, may be located physically outside the file proper, provided a record of the material is

7 There are no separate “PAC Files.”
included within the file. Department or University offices have the option of maintaining select documentation by providing protected and proper storage or data bases for approved access for reviews in electronic format. PAC members may have access to the evaluation files during evaluation time periods.

**Subdivision 3.4b Evaluation File (including portfolios) Contents**

The following materials shall be included in all departmental Evaluation Files (additional categories of materials may be created as needed in specific departments upon agreement of the PAC and department head, and documented in the PAC Procedures)

**Paragraph 3.4b.1 Formal Letters and Documents**

A. Probationary Summary Cover Sheet  
B. Letter of Offer  
C. Position Description (or job requisition)  
D. Updated annual Curriculum Vitae (FAR)  
E. Faculty Narrative Letter (see Section 3.10)–(FAR)  
F. Annual Faculty Activity Reports (FAR)  
G. MOUs Related to Course Reassignments and Differentiated Portfolios  
H. Approval notification(s) documented on Cover Sheet that the Faculty Request to Suspend the Probationary Tenure/Promotion Clock or Faculty Request to Extend the Probationary Period for a Seventh Year. These files shall not include confidential information.  
I. Department Head Evaluation Letters  
J. PAC Evaluation Letters, including PAC Minority Reports  
K. External Letters (if available or required)  
L. Faculty Promotion and Tenure Letters  
M. Professional Development Assignment Letters

**Paragraph 3.4b.2 Evidence of Teaching or Librarianship**

A. Statement of Teaching or Librarianship Philosophy (FAR)  
B. Syllabi (see 3.5f for detailed requirements)  
C. Teaching or Librarianship Artifacts  
D. Student Assessment Results  
E. Teaching or Librarianship Awards or Nominations received  
F. Other evidence of teaching or librarianship effectiveness

**Paragraph 3.4b.3 Evidence of Scholarship**

---

8 Departments are free to create their own organizational system for the contents within the evaluation file.
A. Research Agenda (may be optional or required as per Departmental Standards and Criteria Document)
B. Peer-Reviewed Publications/Products
C. Documentation related to Peer Review
D. Papers/Products Under Review
E. Papers/Products in Progress
F. Creative Activities, including but not limited to performances, compositions, exhibits, and installations
G. Scholarly Awards or Nominations received
H. Other Evidence of Scholarship

**Paragraph 3.4b.4 Evidence of Service**

A. Documentation of Service Activity: departmental, college, university
B. Documentation of Service to the Profession
C. Documentation of Community Service
D. Service Awards or Nominations received
E. Other Evidence of Service Activity

**Paragraph 3.4b.5 Supplemental and Other Materials**

A. Supplemental Files
B. Miscellaneous
C. Outdated Files (e.g. old CVs, old drafts, etc.)

**Subdivision 3.4c Preparing Boxes/Binders in the Evaluation File**

Faculty will assemble materials for deans, according to Paragraph 3.2a1 Assembling Evaluation File Materials to Forward for Review.

**Subdivision 3.4d Evaluation File Material Removal**

A faculty member may request in writing removal of any item in the file. The written request shall also contain a rationale for the requested removal. If the dean and the provost or designee agree, the item shall be removed from the evaluation file. If the dean and the provost deny the request for removal, they will notify the faculty member in writing within thirty (30) days from the date of the written request including reasons for the denial. For purposes of this section, days shall mean class days during the regular academic year.

**Subdivision 3.4e Response to File Material**

Faculty members may write responses to materials in the evaluation file, which shall be attached to related materials and become part of the file.
Subdivision 3.4f Faculty Member Review

Each faculty member shall have the right to review the contents of her/his evaluation file (including boxes/binders) during regular business hours, or at such other time as mutually agreed upon with the department head. The faculty member may scan (at no charge) or copy (at their expense) their file upon request.

Subdivision 3.4g Professional Assessment Committee Review

When a faculty member is assessed by a departmental Professional Assessment Committee (PAC), members of the committee or subcommittee shall have the right to review the contents of the faculty member’s evaluation file on request to the department head. Reviews shall occur during regular business hours in the departmental office or in a location specified, or at such other time as mutually agreed upon with the department head. The PAC chairperson is permitted to take the file to a regularly scheduled PAC meeting. Files removed from the departmental office shall be signed out and back in and returned by the end of the normal business day.

Subdivision 3.4h Materials Removal Upon the End of Employment at UNI

Faculty may request the return of their original materials, such as books, upon the end of their employment by making a written request to the department head within 30 days of the conclusion of their employment. Removal of original materials from the evaluation file must be documented by the department and summarized in writing to the faculty member and memorialized in the file.

Subdivision 3.4i Maintaining Copies

Faculty are encouraged to maintain copies of their evaluation file materials for their own records.

Section 3.5 Materials and Methods for Measuring Faculty Performance in Teaching

Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated and documented through multiple methods in order to provide a comprehensive representation of a faculty member’s teaching performance. Faculty shall document their teaching performance in a teaching portfolio, consisting of departmental required and optional artifacts. Teaching portfolios shall be succinct and well organized with each component clearly identified or labeled. Faculty may document teaching performance through a variety of teaching artifacts, including, but not limited to, syllabi, sample assignments, sample lectures, in-class activities, sample exams, or sample projects.
Subdivision 3.5a Required versus Optional Teaching Components

The Departmental Standards and Criteria Document must include all of the required components, as delineated below, for the evaluation of teaching. Optional components may also be included. Departments shall consider any additional optional components that a faculty member chooses to include in the teaching portfolio, that is part of the evaluation file, as evidence of teaching performance.

Subdivision 3.5b Required Component: Annual Goals (see Sections 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8)

All faculty shall develop annual goals for teaching, scholarship, and service. Annual goals should be succinct and substantive, and documented in the FAR. The annual goals are discussed between the faculty member and the department head each fall for the purposes of discussing the faculty member’s portfolio and professional development, as well as allocation of resources. The faculty member may request the PAC chair to participate in the meeting. Faculty should reflect annually on achieving these goals, faculty development efforts (if pursued), feedback from teaching observations (see Subdivision 3.5c) and student assessments (see Subdivision 3.5d), scholarly accomplishments, and service contributions.

Subdivision 3.5c Required Component: Observations for Probationary Faculty, Renewable Term Faculty and Action Cases

Department heads and PACs (according to their PAC Procedures) shall conduct teaching observations of probationary faculty, renewable term faculty, and other action cases (e.g., when faculty members are applying for tenure and/or promotion or undergoing comprehensive post-tenure review). Results must be summarized in annual and PAC reviews.

PACs may opt to conduct some peer teaching observations in the spring semester in advance of their reviews of faculty for the following fall semester, in order to reduce PAC workload and for cases in which certain courses are only taught by faculty in the spring semester. Department heads may observe at this time, as well as other times during the academic year.

Paragraph 3.5c.1 Observation Training

Individuals engaging in peer observation are recommended to be trained in conducting and reporting effective peer observation by PAC members or through the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) before doing so.
Paragraph 3.5c.2 Observations by Pedagogy Experts

Additional trained observers with expertise in a variety of pedagogies are available through Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) to assess pedagogy and facilitate faculty development in teaching. Faculty members may solicit observation by an expert in pedagogy for inclusion in their evaluation file or for informational purposes. Pedagogy observers cannot review disciplinary content or knowledge. Observations by pedagogy experts shall not be used in place of observations by faculty with disciplinary expertise.

Paragraph 3.5c.3 Observations of Online, Hybrid, or Distance Education Courses

Online, Hybrid, or Distance Education courses shall be observed by department heads and PAC members through becoming a guest in the class or reviewing available course organizational and delivery practices, as well as instructional materials. Department heads or PACs may also request copies of documents or recorded lectures used in online teaching.

Paragraph 3.5c.4 Forms for Peer Observation

Departments may develop forms for documenting peer observation. Example forms are available in Appendix D.

Subdivision 3.5d Required Component: Student Assessments

Student assessments are only one tool for faculty to use for a self-assessment of their teaching performance, and shall be used formatively to improve teaching and student learning. Student assessments best measure students’ perceptions of the clarity of delivery of material and content, classroom logistics and organization (e.g., timeliness of the professor), course organization, effectiveness of communication, professor availability, or the professor’s influence on students. Student assessments do not typically measure effectively the appropriateness of course objectives, knowledge of the discipline, or suitability of assessment procedures. Student assessments may not be reliable if the response rate is too low. In keeping with the University Standards and Guidelines (see Table 3.11a), faculty shall reflect on the feedback provided by students regarding these elements and how they can improve their teaching and student learning in their annual goals in the FAR to meet or exceed expectations.

Paragraph 3.5d.1 Frequency and Access

Frequency of administration of student assessments varies by faculty rank (see Table 3.13 for a summary of the review schedule by faculty rank) and teaching performance. A summary of the results of student assessments of a Faculty Member shall be transmitted to the Faculty Member by ten
(10) working days after the date grades are required to be submitted each semester.

**Subparagraph 3.5d.1a Probationary Faculty, Adjunct Instructors (including Associate and Senior), Term Instructors (1-4 years), and Assistant Instructors (renewable term)**

Student assessments shall be administered in every class every semester for probationary faculty, Assistant Instructors (renewable term and term), and Adjunct Instructors.

**Subparagraph 3.5d.1b Tenured Faculty, Associate Instructors (renewable term) and Senior Instructors (renewable term)**

Student assessments shall be administered in every class in the fall for tenured faculty, Associate Instructors (renewable term) and Senior Instructors (renewable term), Associate Adjunct Instructors, and Senior Adjunct Instructors, not counting years on leave or non-teaching assignments.

Additional student assessments shall be required in every class in the spring semester for faculty who have received a designation of “needs improvement” in the area of teaching in the previous annual review or for whom an improvement plan pertaining to teaching has been created.

Tenured faculty and Associate Instructors (renewable term) and Senior Instructors (renewable term) may also request informational student assessments or have them placed in their evaluation file for the spring semester. The University shall process informational assessments, but no record of the results shall be kept in the evaluation file or utilized in the review process. These same faculty may request spring students assessments to be included in their evaluation file at their own discretion, however, decisions as to the type of assessments must be made at the beginning of the semester and are non-revocable.

**Paragraph 3.5d.2 Faculty Reflection on Teaching**

Faculty shall provide a reflection on student assessments in their annual goals on the FAR (see Subdivision 3.5b). This reflection shall connect student assessments to the faculty member’s statement of teaching philosophy or specific aspects of teaching. Faculty reflection may also contextualize student assessments, for example by connecting them to the level of the course (e.g., lower- versus upper-division/level), curricular needs being met by the course (e.g., general education students versus
majors only), rigor of the course, and other relevant factors. Faculty may also reflect on other aspects of their teaching in this part of the FAR. For action cases (applying for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review), faculty will reflect cumulatively on all years since their last review in the “Faculty Narrative” (see Section 3.10). Faculty shall complete their reflection to receive a “meets expectations” or higher.

Paragraph 3.5d.3 Interpretation
Department heads and PACs should focus their evaluation of student assessments on the faculty member’s meaningful and documented use of the assessments for the purpose of improvement in teaching and learning over time. PACs, departments heads and deans shall interpret results of student assessments in the context of the response rate, other data sources (e.g., course artifacts, faculty observations), and the self-reflection document which must demonstrate the way in which teaching and student learning has been improved as a result of the feedback of the assessments. The faculty member has the opportunity to consider and analyze the student assessments through their annual goals.

Paragraph 3.5d.4 Bias
Review of student assessments by a PAC or Department Head shall take into consideration bias, including direct and implicit, that may negatively influence a student’s evaluation of a faculty member. Student comments regarding a faculty member’s status in a protected class shall not be used to evaluate faculty negatively.

Paragraph 3.5d.5 Non-Standard Modes of Delivery
When the regular student assessment instrument does not fit the mode of delivery, for example for online classes or non-standard teaching, assessing teaching may require alternative or supplemental student input. For example, a faculty member, PACs, or department head may include additional questions in the student assessment instrument when officially approved and available.

Subdivision 3.5e Required Component: Teaching Philosophy
All faculty members shall develop a succinct statement of their teaching philosophy, not to exceed two pages single spaced in no smaller than 11-point font. The teaching philosophy, located in the FAR, should be updated periodically if the faculty member’s philosophy changes across time.

Subdivision 3.5f Required Component: Syllabi
Faculty shall submit syllabi with learning outcomes for all classes they are teaching at the beginning of each semester. Learning outcomes should be
connected to the learning goals of the program (e.g., General Education, Major, etc.). Learning outcomes for multiple sections of the same course should be consistent; additional outcomes for a particular section can be added. The syllabi should state the faculty member’s office hours. See Appendix X regarding Essential Components.

**Subdivision 3.5g Optional Component: Professional Development**

Faculty are encouraged to participate in professional development activities (e.g., CETL Faculty Teaching Certificate Program, CETL Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID), Teaching Mentorship, Discipline-based Training/Conferences, etc.) to enhance their teaching and curriculum development. Professional development activities are to be documented in the FAR.

**Subdivision 3.5h Optional Component: Other Evidence**

Departments may wish to develop additional forms of evidence to document teaching evaluation or additional methods of evaluating teaching performance. These additional forms of evidence should be described in the Department Standards and Criteria document. Departments shall consider any additional optional components that a faculty member chooses to document in the FAR or teaching portfolio (part of the Evaluation File) as evidence of teaching performance.

**Section 3.6 Materials and Methods for Measuring Faculty Performance in Librarianship**

Librarianship effectiveness will be evaluated and documented through multiple methods in order to provide a comprehensive representation of a library faculty member’s overall performance. Library faculty shall document their librarianship accomplishments in their portfolio, consisting of required and optional artifacts including, but not limited to, syllabi, projects, etc. Librarianship portfolios shall be succinct and well organized with each component clearly identified or labeled.

**Section 3.7 Materials and Methods for Measuring Faculty Performance in Scholarship/ Creative Activity**

Scholarship is reviewed for its quality and meaningful impact. Definitions of scholarship appear in Chapter 4 of this Handbook. Peer review is the process for validating the quality and meaningful impact of scholarship by disciplinary peers. Scholarship effectiveness will be evaluated and documented through multiple methods in order to provide a comprehensive representation of a faculty member’s overall performance.
**Subdivision 3.7a Required Components: Portfolio, FAR and Vitae**

Faculty shall document their scholarship accomplishments in the FAR (see 3.5b) and in a portfolio located in their evaluation file, that consists of departmental required and optional artifacts. Scholarship portfolios shall be succinct and well organized with each component clearly identified or labeled. Faculty may document scholarship accomplishments in their evaluation file, appropriate for their discipline, through the submission of a variety of scholarly artifacts, including, but not limited to, scholarly projects in progress or in press, articles and books, recordings, videos, compositions, artwork, project accomplishments, etc. Departments may choose to evaluate additional dimensions of scholarship. Those criteria shall be documented in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document for faculty evaluation.

**Subdivision 3.7b Required Component: Annual Goals**

See Section 3.5b.

**Subdivision 3.7c Definition of Traditional Peer Review**

Traditional peer review of scholarship involves the review, often anonymous, by colleagues of the work with expertise in the utilized methodologies and/or content area, resulting in public dissemination of work. In the case of creative work, peer review includes review by jury or equivalent professional organization or disciplinary experts.

**Subdivision 3.7d Additional Forms of Peer Review for Tenured Faculty**

The university acknowledges that additional forms of peer review are available for all tenured faculty and for probationary faculty when deemed appropriate by the department as specified in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document. When peer review by disciplinary experts is intrinsic to the process of disseminating scholarship or receiving substantial public recognition for scholarly achievement, the university accepts that peer review process as validating the appropriate quality and meaningful impact of the scholarship. Examples include but are not limited to receiving a major external grant that underwent peer review, editor-reviewed trade press, being invited by colleagues to present scholarship as an expert at a prestigious professional conference or performance/exhibit, or winning an award for achievement in scholarship from colleagues. Faculty members must document the peer-review process in their evaluation file, including external confirmation (e.g., copy of the peer-review process as printed on the organization’s website, reviewer comments, or a letter from the editor inviting a contribution to a book because of one’s expertise).
Some high-quality and meaningful scholarship within the tenured faculty member’s discipline may not have a peer-review process intrinsic to its dissemination or recognition (see Section 4.5 Scholarship for Tenured Faculty). In order to recognize these additional forms of scholarship for the purposes of annual review, post-tenure review, or promotion, departments shall develop a peer-review process to assess that scholarship is making use of the faculty member’s disciplinary expertise, is of acceptable quality, and has a meaningful impact. Additionally, departments may choose to include integration or application scholarship for probationary faculty in their Departmental Standards and Criteria Documents (see Chapter Section 4.4 Scholarship/Creative Activity for Probationary Faculty). Such a process must be documented in the Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document in writing and include all of the following elements:

A. Faculty engaged in scholarship without an intrinsic peer-review process must submit a request for approval to their department head and PAC chair in writing for consideration of their work for evaluation purposes. The request must document the faculty member’s contribution to the product, as well as the work’s scope, quality, and impact.

B. Faculty members shall provide a list, according to applicable PAC procedures, of disciplinary experts who can assess the scope, quality, and impact of the work.

C. The department head and the PAC chair shall select disciplinary expert(s), according to applicable PAC procedures, to assess the work’s scope, quality, and impact.

D. Additionally, departments or faculty members may solicit constituencies outside of the academic discipline to assess the work’s scope, quality, or impact. For example, a faculty member may solicit a letter from a community organization attesting to the influence of a curriculum the faculty member developed, or a department head may solicit feedback from a nonprofit director about the benefits of a program review performed by a faculty member.

Subdivision 3.7e Additional Methods

Departments may develop additional methods for assessing the quality or meaningful impact of scholarship. Any such methods must be in the Departmental Standards and Criteria document. Departments may not create review methods which preference one type of scholarship over another for tenured faculty.
Section 3.8 Materials and Methods for Measuring Faculty Performance in Service

Service effectiveness will be evaluated and documented through multiple methods in order to provide a comprehensive representation of a faculty member's contributions or accomplishments. The definition of service appears in Chapter 4 of this handbook.

Subdivision 3.8a Required Components: Portfolio, FAR and Vitae

Faculty shall document their service accomplishments in a portfolio located in the evaluation file, and in departmental required documentation in their FAR (see 3.52) and vita. This documentation should be according to the faculty member’s role (including any leadership role), level of participation, and meaningful contributions. Service activities, including those completed at the university, for the profession, or community, should all be similarly documented.

Probationary, renewable term, and term faculty contribute to service at levels appropriate for their appointments (see expectations related to service and specific to types of review in the University Guiding Standards). Service portfolios shall be succinct and well organized with each component clearly identified or labeled.

Subdivision 3.8b Required Component: Annual Goals

See Section 3.5b.

Subdivision 3.8c Additional Methods

Departments may develop additional methods for assessing the quality or meaningful impact of service activity. Any such methods must be in the Departmental Standards and Criteria document.

Section 3.9 Oral Communication

Please see the Board of Regents policy 3.21 English Language Proficiency (Oral Communication Competence), as per Iowa Code 262.9(24).

Section 3.10 Faculty Narrative

Faculty are required to submit a faculty narrative in their evaluation file on or before October 15 when seeking promotion and/or tenure, and during the year three probationary review period. The narrative should be no more than five pages in length, single spaced in no smaller than 11-point font. The narrative shall address teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service in the following ways. The section on teaching shall include (a) a reflection on teaching/librarianship, (b) improvements made across time and in response to student assessments and peer observations, and (c) future directions. The
section on scholarship shall include (a) a bibliographic listing of peer-reviewed work for the period under review, separated by types of publications and presentations, (b) reflection on the quality and quantity of scholarly work, and (c) future directions. The section on service shall include (a) a bulleted list of service activities for the period under review, broken out by type of activity (e.g., international, national, regional, state, local, university, college, department, community, etc.), (b) reflection on the quality and quantity of service activities and contributions, and (c) future directions.

Section 3.11 University Guiding Standards for Teaching, Librarianship, Scholarship, and Service

University Guiding Standards provide broad, guiding standards to departments for evaluating faculty performance annually and cumulatively for promotion, tenure, or post-tenure review. The Departmental Standards and Criteria document should specify criteria for faculty performance regarding particular operationalization of the University Guiding Standards, including expected products/contributions/measures of productivity, their extent (e.g., how many), their frequency, and other important dimensions, for Annual Review, Tenure and/or Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review. The Departmental Standards and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation must be consistent with the University Guiding Standards and methods for measuring as documented in Chapter 3 of this Handbook.

Tables 3.11a, b, c, and d below document University Guiding Standards which meet expectations, exceed expectations, and need improvement for each area of faculty performance (teaching, scholarship, service and librarianship) by faculty rank and portfolio. Although there may be disciplinary differences which render some expectations more or less important or moot in a particular circumstance documented in the Departmental Standards and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation, the “Meets Expectations” rows document comprehensive standards, all of which should generally apply to faculty. The “Exceeds Expectations” and “Needs Improvement” rows offer examples and are therefore inclusive but not exhaustive. (Approved by FHC 9/28/18)

Table 3.11a University Guiding Standards: Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Probationary Faculty, Term, Renewable Term, or Temporary Instructors</th>
<th>Tenured Faculty of Any Rank with a Standard Portfolio, Lecturers, or Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Tenured Faculty of Any Rank with an Extended Teaching Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Meets Expectations Cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching reflects rich content knowledge of the discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching fosters critical thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates and provides feedback related to instruction to students in a timely manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional design and delivery contribute to course and program objectives, goals, and/or outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course syllabi provide clear and comprehensive information about the course, structure, evaluation methods and course-level student learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments and/or activities used for assessing student work (e.g., projects, exams) contribute to course and program learning goals or outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active and meaningful participation in faculty development regarding teaching or learning (e.g., staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, CETL workshops).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| |
| Teaching reflects rich content knowledge of the discipline. |
| Teaching fosters critical thinking. |
| Communicates and provides feedback related to instruction to students in a timely manner. |
| Instructional design and delivery contribute to course and program objectives, goals, and/or outcomes. |
| Course syllabi provide clear and comprehensive information about the course, structure, and evaluation methods, and course-level student learning outcomes. |
| Assignments and/or activities used for assessing student work (e.g., projects, exams) contribute to course and program learning goals or outcomes. |
| Active and meaningful participation in faculty development regarding teaching or learning (e.g., staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, CETL workshops). |

---

9 Generally, faculty are expected to meet all of these expectations. There may be some disciplinary differences, however, that render some more or less important or moot in particular circumstances.
| Thoughtful self-assessment and reflection on teaching which inform teaching practice. | Thoughtful self-assessment and reflection on teaching which inform teaching practice. | conferencing, CETL workshops).  
Sustained self-assessment and reflection on teaching inform teaching practice and improved teaching and learning.  
Innovation in course design, curriculum development, teaching or learning.  
Leadership in curriculum or faculty development around teaching or learning.  
Sustained engagement with the scholarship of teaching and learning or best practices. |
|---|---|---|
| **Exceeds Expectations**<sup>11</sup> | Extensive participation in faculty development, which contributes substantially to teaching practices.  
Substantial innovation in course design, curriculum development, teaching or learning  
**Substantial leadership** in curriculum or faculty development around teaching or learning.  
Contributes to the knowledge or practice of | Extensive participation in faculty development, which contributes substantially to teaching practices.  
Substantial innovation in course design, curriculum development, teaching or learning  
**Substantial leadership** in curriculum or faculty development around teaching or learning.  
Contributes to the knowledge or practice of | Extensive leadership in curriculum or faculty development around teaching or learning.  
 Receives peer recognition for substantial innovation in course design, curriculum development, teaching or learning.  
 Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary recognition for teaching excellence or contribution to teaching or curriculum. |
| **Exceeds Expectations**<sup>12</sup> cont. | Extensive participation in faculty development, which contributes substantially to teaching practices.  
Substantial innovation in course design, curriculum development, teaching or learning  
**Substantial leadership** in curriculum or faculty development around teaching or learning.  
Contributes to the knowledge or practice of | Extensive participation in faculty development, which contributes substantially to teaching practices.  
Substantial innovation in course design, curriculum development, teaching or learning  
**Substantial leadership** in curriculum or faculty development around teaching or learning.  
Contributes to the knowledge or practice of | Extensive leadership in curriculum or faculty development around teaching or learning.  
 Receives peer recognition for substantial innovation in course design, curriculum development, teaching or learning.  
 Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary recognition for teaching excellence or contribution to teaching or curriculum. |

<sup>10</sup> See Paragraph 3.6d.2 Faculty Reflection for details.  
<sup>11</sup> This list provides examples of performance that exceeds expectations. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.  
<sup>12</sup> This list provides examples of performance that exceeds expectations. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="left"><strong>pedagogy</strong> within the field or university.</th>
<th align="left"><strong>pedagogy</strong> within the field or university.</th>
<th align="left">Widespread adoption of teaching curriculum or pedagogy out in the field.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="left">Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary recognition for teaching excellence or contribution to teaching or curriculum.</td>
<td align="left">Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary recognition for teaching excellence or contribution to teaching or curriculum.</td>
<td align="left">Widespread adoption of teaching curriculum or pedagogy out in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Widespread adoption of teaching curriculum or pedagogy out in the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Improvement&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th align="left">Excessive class cancellations or late arrivals.</th>
<th align="left">Excessive class cancellations or late arrivals.</th>
<th align="left">Excessive class cancellations or late arrivals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional design, delivery, or assessment of student work is weak, misaligned with course/program objectives, fails to deliver content knowledge, or fails to foster critical thinking.</td>
<td align="left">Instructional design, delivery, or assessment of student work is weak, misaligned with course/program objectives, fails to deliver content knowledge, or fails to foster critical thinking.</td>
<td align="left">Instructional design, delivery, or assessment of student work is weak, misaligned with course/program objectives, fails to deliver content knowledge, or fails to foster critical thinking.</td>
<td align="left"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.</td>
<td align="left">No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.</td>
<td align="left">No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.</td>
<td align="left"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No or inadequate syllabi.</td>
<td align="left">No or inadequate syllabi.</td>
<td align="left">No or inadequate syllabi.</td>
<td align="left"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not participate in faculty development related to teaching or learning, or fails to use it to inform meaningful pedagogical practices.</td>
<td align="left">Does not participate in faculty development related to teaching or learning, or fails to use it to inform meaningful pedagogical practices.</td>
<td align="left">Does not participate in faculty development related to teaching or learning, or fails to use it to inform meaningful pedagogical practices.</td>
<td align="left"></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does not demonstrate leadership regarding curriculum, teaching, or learning.

---

<sup>13</sup> This list provides examples of performance that needs improvement. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Expectations&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Probationary Faculty</th>
<th>Tenured Faculty of Any Rank with Standard Portfolio</th>
<th>Tenured Faculty of Any Rank with an Extended Teaching Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflects a rich knowledge of one’s field.</td>
<td>Reflects a rich knowledge of one’s field.</td>
<td>Stays abreast of developments within one’s field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates methodological, intellectual, or creative rigor.</td>
<td>Demonstrates methodological, intellectual, or creative rigor.</td>
<td>Uses scholarship by self or others to inform teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates intellectual or creative independence.</td>
<td>Demonstrates regular or sustained productivity, which has undergone traditional peer review&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt; (and/or other forms of peer review as appropriate to the field).</td>
<td>Engages in some scholarship/creativity activity by; producing scholarship/creative activity of any type, participating in conferences/productions/performances, using expertise in service, engaging in scholarship-oriented faculty development, submitting grants, or other activity appropriate to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes a meaningful contribution or impact through discovery, integration, or application.</td>
<td>Makes a meaningful contribution or impact through discovery, integration, or application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations align with workload, including differentiated portfolios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>14</sup> Generally, faculty are expected to meet all of these expectations. There may be some disciplinary differences, however, that render some more or less important or moot in particular circumstances.

<sup>15</sup> Traditional peer review and other forms of peer review are defined in Section 3.8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution or impact through discovery (and/or integration or application as appropriate to the field).</th>
<th>(e.g., course reassignments or reduced service expectations for specialization in research/scholarship/creative activity).</th>
<th>one's field.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations align with workload, including differentiated portfolios (e.g., course reassignments or reduced service expectations for specialization in research/scholarship/creative activity).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Substantial collaboration with students, which results in peer-reviewed products (e.g., articles, conference presentations, exhibits, performances).</th>
<th>Substantial collaboration with students, which results in peer-reviewed products (e.g., articles, conference presentations, exhibits, performances).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Securing a major competitive grant.</td>
<td>Securing a major competitive grant.</td>
<td>Substantial scholarly/creative collaboration with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing or performing in a very highly regarded venue or with major, lasting impact to the field.</td>
<td>Publishing or performing in a very highly regarded venue or with major, lasting impact to the field, university, or community.</td>
<td>Demonstrates regular or sustained productivity, which has undergone peer review as defined in Section 3.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely high or extensive scholarly or creative output.</td>
<td>Extremely high or extensive scholarly or creative output.</td>
<td>Receives peer, disciplinary, university, or community recognition for scholarly/creative contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receives substantial national peer or disciplinary recognition for scholarly/creative contribution.</td>
<td>Receives substantial national peer, disciplinary, or community recognition for scholarly/creative contribution.</td>
<td>Routine or sustained scholarly or creative output.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs</th>
<th>Peer review does not</th>
<th>Peer review does not</th>
<th>Does not stay abreast of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

This list provides examples of performance that exceeds expectations. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Term, Renewable Term, or Adjunct Instructors (Level 1, entry level)</th>
<th>Probationary Faculty, Instructor Level 2, Senior Instructor Level 3</th>
<th>Tenured Faculty of Any Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meet criteria.</td>
<td>meet criteria.</td>
<td>meet criteria.</td>
<td>developments within one's field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacks rigor.</td>
<td>Lacks rigor.</td>
<td>Lacks rigor.</td>
<td>Found to have engaged in research misconduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No or too few peer-reviewed products.</td>
<td>No or too few peer-reviewed products.</td>
<td>Found to have engaged in research misconduct.</td>
<td>Teaching is not informed by scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not demonstrate any intellectual or creative independence.</td>
<td>Substandard quality.</td>
<td>Substandard quality.</td>
<td>No engagement with scholarship/creative activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Approved by FHC 9/28/18)

**Table 3.11c University Guiding Standards: Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Expectations&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Active participation in service to the department, as specified in offer letter.</th>
<th>Active participation in service to the department. For term, renewable term, and adjuncts, as specified in offer letter.</th>
<th>Active participation in service to the department.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Active participation in</strong> service to the college, university, discipline, or broader community, as specified in offer letter.</td>
<td><strong>Active participation in</strong> service to the college, university, discipline, or broader community. For term, renewable term, and adjuncts, as specified in offer letter.</td>
<td><strong>Active participation in</strong> service to the college, university, discipline, or broader community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Meaningful contributions to</strong> processes or products of service.</td>
<td><strong>Meaningful contributions to</strong> processes or products of service.</td>
<td><strong>Meaningful contributions to</strong> processes or products of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty of Any Rank</td>
<td>Active participation in service to the department.</td>
<td>Active participation in service to the department.</td>
<td>Demonstrates leadership in service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<sup>17</sup> This list provides examples of performance that needs improvement. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.

<sup>18</sup> All forms of peer review are available to tenured faculty. See Section ##.

<sup>19</sup> As specified in contract.

<sup>20</sup> Generally, faculty are expected to meet all of these expectations. There may be some disciplinary differences, however, that render some more or less important or moot in particular circumstances. Adjuncts do not do service outside of that specified in their offer letter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations Cont.</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectations align with workload, including specially assigned differentiated portfolios (e.g., course reassignments for service).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meaningful contributions to processes or products of service.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service growth</strong> over the course of the probationary period for faculty with reduced service expectations at the beginning.</td>
<td><strong>Expectations align with workload, including specially assigned differentiated portfolios (e.g., course reassignments for service).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Widespread service or extensive service in multiple areas (may include discipline or broader community).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Critical contributions</strong> to major service projects.</td>
<td><strong>Substantial mentorship</strong> of students or colleagues.</td>
<td><strong>Sustained widespread service or extensive service in multiple areas.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demonstrates substantial, sustained leadership in service.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Substantial mentorship</strong> of students or colleagues.</td>
<td><strong>Receives substantial peer, disciplinary, or community recognition for service.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Demonstrates substantial, sustained leadership in service.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaningful participation in program review and/or student outcome assessment.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meaningful participation in program review and/or student outcome assessment.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meaningful participation in program review and/or student outcome assessment.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meaningful participation in program review and/or student outcome assessment.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

21 This list provides examples of performance that exceeds expectations. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.
| Needs Improvement ²² | Weak or no constructive service as specified in offer letter. | Weak or no constructive participation or contributions in department, college, or university service. Does not grow in service over time. | Weak or not broadly enough participation in service. Participation is not active or does not contribute meaningfully. Never or rarely demonstrates leadership. |

(Approved by FHC 9/28/18)

**Table 3.11d University Guiding Standards: Librarianship (for Library Faculty)**

| Meets Expectations ²³ | Librarianship reflects rich content knowledge of the area of practice (e.g., reference, cataloging, archiving, etc.) Librarianship fosters information literacy, discovery, and/or access. Creation and provision of information, resources, and services advances critical thinking, scholarly research, and learning in an evolving information landscape. Activities contribute to university and library | Librarianship reflects rich content knowledge of the area of practice (e.g., reference, cataloging, archiving, etc.) Librarianship fosters information literacy, discovery, and/or access. Creation and provision of information, resources, and services advances critical thinking, scholarly research, and learning in an evolving information landscape. Activities contribute to university and library | Librarianship reflects rich content knowledge of the area of practice (e.g., reference, cataloging, archiving, etc.) Librarianship fosters information literacy, discovery, and/or access. Creation and provision of information, resources, and services advances critical thinking, scholarly research, and learning in an evolving information landscape. Activities contribute to |

²² This list provides examples of performance that needs improvement. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.

²³ Generally, faculty are expected to meet all of these expectations. There may be some disciplinary differences, however, that render some more or less important or moot in particular circumstances.
priorities and goals.

Active and meaningful participation in **faculty professional development** regarding librarianship and specific area of practice (e.g., staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, webinars, CETL workshops).

Thoughtful **self-assessment and reflection** on collections and/or services inform professional practice.

**Collaboration** with library and university colleagues and community partners to advance university and library priorities and goals.

priorities and goals.

Active and meaningful participation in **faculty professional development** regarding librarianship and specific area of practice (e.g., staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, webinars, CETL workshops).

Thoughtful **self-assessment and reflection** on collections and/or services inform professional practice.

**Collaboration** with library and university colleagues and community partners to advance university and library priorities and goals.

university and library priorities and goals.

Active and meaningful participation in **faculty professional development** regarding librarianship and specific area of practice (e.g., assisting others in staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, webinars, CETL workshops).

Thoughtful **self-assessment and reflection** on collections and/or services inform professional practice.

**Collaboration** with library and university colleagues and community partners to advance university and library priorities and goals.

**Innovation** in librarianship.

**Leadership** in librarianship or faculty development within the discipline.

Sustained engagement with the **scholarship** of librarianship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Exceeds Expectations</strong></th>
<th>Extensive participation in faculty professional development, which</th>
<th>Extensive participation in faculty professional development, which</th>
<th>Extensive <strong>leadership</strong> in area of practice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

24 This list provides examples of performance that exceeds expectations. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Librarianship is weak.</th>
<th>Librarianship is weak.</th>
<th>Librarianship is weak.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited fostering of information literacy, discovery, and/or access</td>
<td>Limited fostering of information literacy, discovery, and/or access</td>
<td>Limited fostering of information literacy, discovery, and/or access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak contribution to student success, fails to support faculty research, and/or fails to enhance resources and services.</td>
<td>Weak contribution to student success, fails to support faculty research, and/or fails to enhance resources and services.</td>
<td>Weak contribution to student success, fails to support faculty research, and/or fails to enhance resources and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak Minimal or no collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners</td>
<td>Weak Minimal or no collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners</td>
<td>Weak Minimal or no collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.</td>
<td>No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.</td>
<td>No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Librarianship is weak.</th>
<th>Librarianship is weak.</th>
<th>Librarianship is weak.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited fostering of information literacy, discovery, and/or access</td>
<td>Limited fostering of information literacy, discovery, and/or access</td>
<td>Limited fostering of information literacy, discovery, and/or access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak contribution to student success, fails to support faculty research, and/or fails to enhance resources and services.</td>
<td>Weak contribution to student success, fails to support faculty research, and/or fails to enhance resources and services.</td>
<td>Weak contribution to student success, fails to support faculty research, and/or fails to enhance resources and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak Minimal or no collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners</td>
<td>Weak Minimal or no collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners</td>
<td>Weak Minimal or no collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.</td>
<td>No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.</td>
<td>No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 This list provides examples of performance that exceeds expectations. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.
26 This list provides examples of performance that needs improvement. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.
| Needs Improvement Cont. | Minimal or no participation in faculty professional development. | Minimal or no participation in faculty professional development. | No faculty development around librarianship. No leadership around librarianship. No innovation. No engagement in the scholarship of librarianship. |

(Approved by FHC 10/26/18)

Section 3.12 Calendar*

By March 1 - Departments Complete Revisions of “Departmental Standards and Criteria Document” and “Professional Assessment Committee Procedures”

Departments complete revisions of Departmental Standards and Criteria Document and Professional Assessment Committee Procedures. Department PAC committees should also select PAC chair/co-chairs for the coming academic year.

Between March 1-15 - Convene College Review Committee

Deans convene the College Review Committee (CRC), which includes all department heads and PAC chairs, for the purpose of reviewing the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document and Professional Assessment Committee Procedures.

April 15 - Distribute Evaluation Standards

Department Heads will distribute the Departmental Standards and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation and Professional Assessment Committee Procedures to all faculty members for faculty appointments, promotions and tenure, and post-tenure review, except that when no changes have been made, provision of these materials to a Faculty Member in a previous year shall be understood to comply with this Section. The evaluation standards and PAC procedures should be simultaneously distributed to members of the PAC, the dean, and provost or designee.

April 30 - Request Consideration for Promotion/Promotion & Tenure
1. By this date, faculty must request consideration for seeking Promotion/Promotion & Tenure for the following academic year. Request for consideration may be made earlier, per department procedures.

2. Department Heads notify tenured faculty who will complete post-tenure review in the following academic year.

**August-September - Department Heads Meet with Faculty**
During the Fall semester, the department head shall have individual meetings with all faculty members eligible for annual review. The purpose of the meeting is developmental and formative, to review progress on the faculty member’s previous year’s goals, and discuss future short-term and long-term goals for the faculty member. (See **Subdivision 3.13f.**)

**By Sept. 25 - Review Department Standards and Criteria**
1. **PAC chair/ and Department Head** shall meet with new PAC members, probationary faculty members, and any faculty members who have applied for promotion and/or tenure or will be participating in post-tenure review to review the Department Standards and Criteria for faculty appointments, promotions and tenure, and post-tenure review.

2. Deans may convene the **College Review Committee (CRC)**, which includes all department heads and PAC chairs, for the purpose of orienting them regarding the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document and Professional Assessment Committee Procedures. The discussion may include reviewing the Faculty Handbook, departmental standards and criteria, PAC procedures, consistency across the college, and other forms of training or discussion, and reporting out of prior year data [summary of how many faculty received each evaluation rating (i.e., meets, exceeds or fails to meet expectations) and merit allocation by department].

**Oct. 15 - Deadline for Submission of Assessment Materials**
Faculty members (renewable term, probationary, candidates for tenure and promotion, and candidates for post-tenure review) must submit materials, including the **faculty narrative** (when seeking promotion and/or tenure, and during the year three probationary review period; see 3.10), for their **evaluation file** no later than this date. Materials may be earlier, per department procedures. See **Subdivision 3.4b Evaluation File (including portfolios) Contents** for a list of all materials.

**September-November** (as determined by department PACs) - **Peer Observations**
1. PAC conducts peer teaching observations of probationary faculty, renewable term, tenured faculty applying for promotion, and post-tenure review faculty. Also PAC meetings to discuss and vote on cases.

2. PACs may opt to conduct some peer teaching observations in the spring semester in advance of their reviews of faculty for the following fall semester, in order to reduce PAC workload and for cases in which certain courses are only taught by faculty in the spring semester.

3. Department heads may observe at this time, as well as other times during the academic year.

Dec. 15 - PAC Letters
A written report of the collective judgments of the PAC, together with any concurring or minority reports, shall be transmitted to all probationary faculty, faculty candidates for promotion and tenure, renewable term faculty, and faculty under consideration for post-tenure review, the Department Head, and the Dean, and shall be entered in the evaluation file no later than December 15.

Mid-January - Dean’s Retreat (optional)
College-level Dean’s retreat with department heads to review all promotion and/or tenure and post-tenure review cases within the college.

Feb. 1 - Head’s Evaluation of Faculty Members
The Department Head’s written evaluation of all probationary faculty, faculty candidates for promotion and tenure, renewable term faculty, and faculty under consideration for post-tenure review shall be transmitted concurrently to the Dean and the Faculty Member.

After Feb. 1 - Heads Meet with Faculty Members
Department heads and probationary faculty may meet a second time in the spring semester.

Mid-February Provost’s Retreat
Provost retreat with all Deans, to review all promotion and/or tenure and post-tenure review cases in the university.

Feb. 20 - Withdrawal from Consideration for Promotion to Professor
Faculty who request consideration for promotion to Professor may withdraw their request in a letter to the PAC chair(s), department head, dean, and provost any time before February 20.

Mar. 1 - Provost Letters
All probationary faculty, faculty candidates for promotion and tenure, renewable term faculty, and faculty under consideration for post-tenure review, shall receive official written evaluation of their work from the provost.

**March 31 - Deadline for Submission of Faculty Activity Report**
Date by which all faculty members [temporary (adjunct), term, renewable term, probationary, and tenured faculty] submit materials for the Annual Review, including completing the **Faculty Activity Report (FAR)**, and reporting on the previous academic year activities from April 1 of the previous year through March 31 of the current year.

**June 25 - Department Head Annual Review Letters**
1. Department Heads will provide written annual evaluation of all faculty members, including **term faculty and temporary faculty**. The letters shall be transmitted concurrently to the Dean and the Faculty Member.
2. **Human Resource Services** will also provide notice to all non-temporary faculty members of their salary statement for the following academic year.

* for all dates on timeline, if the date falls on a weekend, it shall be alternately on the first business day thereafter

**Section 3.13 Annual Review for All Faculty by Department Head**

**Subdivision 3.13a Purpose**
Annual review provides an annual assessment of faculty performance, feedback for faculty reflection, an opportunity for faculty to access professional development resources, and the allocation of merit pay. Annual reviews are also used for continuation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review cases.

**Subdivision 3.13b Eligibility for Annual Review**
Department heads shall annually evaluate the teaching, scholarship, and service of all faculty, according to their designated workload or contract, regardless of their faculty position or rank. The evaluation will be based on performance in the preceding academic year (summer, fall, spring).

**Subdivision 3.13c Conflicts of Interest**
Department heads who have a conflict of interest should follow University Policy 4.03 Conflicts of Interest in Employment (Nepotism).
Subdivision 3.13d Timeline and Process Schedule for Annual Review by Faculty Rank: Summary

The annual review process follows the timelines and process schedule in Section 3.12.

Subdivision 3.13e Standards and Criteria for Annual Review

University Guiding Standards and Principles are found in 3.11. Specific criteria for annual review are documented in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document (see 3.1f).

Subdivision 3.13f Annual Meeting with Department Head

During the fall semester, the department head shall have individual meetings with all faculty members. The purpose of each meeting is developmental and formative. The discussion should review progress on the faculty member’s previous year’s goals and discuss future short-term and long-term goals. Department heads and probationary faculty may meet a second time in the spring semester.

Subdivision 3.13g Outcomes of Annual Review for All Faculty

Department heads shall assign a rating of (a) meets expectations, (b) exceeds expectations, or (c) needs improvement for each area of performance (teaching, scholarship, service), according to the criteria by portfolio and rank as specified in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document.

Subdivision 3.13h Outcomes for Retention/Continuance of Probationary and Renewable Term Faculty

Paragraph 3.13h.1 Continued Probation

Department Heads should recommend Continued Probation (probationary faculty) or retention (renewable term faculty) only if the faculty member meets or exceeds expectations in each area of job performance (teaching and scholarship/creative activity, service) required by portfolio and rank. The Department Head shall state the strengths of faculty performance and any recommendations for improvement.

Paragraph 3.13h.2 Continued Probation With Difficulties

Department Heads should recommend Continued Probation With Difficulties if the probationary faculty member does not meet expectations in one or more of the areas under review. The Department Head, in consultation with the dean, shall provide specific actions to be taken and
outcomes to be completed in the next year to address the deficiencies. The Department Head shall meet with the faculty member to create a plan for improving performance. The department head and faculty will consult the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning for teaching improvement plans. Mentoring by faculty peers is strongly recommended for teaching, scholarship, and service improvement plans.

**Paragraph 3.13h.3 Termination**
Poor performance (flagrant or persistent) is sufficient cause for a recommendation to terminate a faculty member’s probationary or renewable term appointment. (Faculty Handbook, Section 2.1, Subdivision 2.42 & Subdivision 2.45). In making such a recommendation, Department Heads must explain in detail why the performance warrants termination. If termination is approved, the faculty member shall remain employed by the university for a period up to one academic year, performing duties assigned by the department head and dean.

**Subdivision 3.13i Third Year Review for Probationary Faculty**
Department heads provide a comprehensive review of probationary faculty member’s performance to date in year three in order to assess cumulative accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service in relation to departmental standards and criteria.

**Subdivision 3.13j Outcomes for Promotion and/or Tenure**
For promotion and/or tenure cases, Department Heads shall recommend (a) Promotion, (b) Promotion Denied, (c) Tenure, (d) Tenure Denied, or (e) Termination, as appropriate for the case. Department Heads shall provide a substantive rationale for their decisions in the evaluation letter.

**Subdivision 3.13k Outcomes for Review of Tenured Faculty**
Department Heads shall assign a rating of (a) meets expectations, (b) exceeds expectations, (c) needs improvement for each area of performance (teaching, scholarship, and service), according to the criteria by portfolio and rank as specified in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document.

**Subdivision 3.13l Evaluation Letters**
Evaluation letters provide faculty with feedback and decision outcomes. An evaluation letter shall include a summary of the assessment of the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service according to the faculty member’s appointment and designated portfolio. Letters should not typically exceed a maximum of three pages, single space in no

---

27 Hereafter, “teaching” represents “teaching or librarianship” as appropriate.
smaller than 11-pt font. Assessments of teaching/librarianship shall include a summary of teaching observations and student assessments, as well as a narrative describing the improvements made in teaching and librarianship over time. Assessments of scholarship shall be both qualitative and quantitative but shall not include a narrative describing each scholarly work. Assessments of service activities shall address both the quality and quantity of service. Each letter shall include the relevant outcomes specified in Subdivisions 3.13g (outcomes for all), 3.13h (retention/continuance), and 3.13i (promotion or tenure). The letters shall also specify the annual merit designations for each area of performance, according to Subdivision 3.13.m2. The letters shall be transmitted concurrently to the Dean and faculty member and shall be placed in the evaluation file.

**Subdivision 3.13m Awarding of Annual Merit**

Merit pay is awarded annually through the university at the university-level, based on department head’s annual review designations according to the formula below, as funds are available. Department Heads assign annual merit points in their annual review letter. Merit pay is added to the faculty member’s base pay. A letter with the following year’s salary, designating the increase to base pay and merit award amount, shall be distributed to faculty.

**Paragraph 3.13m.1 Eligibility for Merit**

All tenured, probationary, renewable term, and term faculty are eligible for merit pay.

**Paragraph 3.13m.2 Merit Formula**

The department head shall calculate a total merit score for each faculty member based on his/her portfolio and performance. Department heads shall assign full points up to a maximum of 4 points for each area of performance (teaching, research/creative activity, service). Then, they multiply each designation by the percentage of the portfolio for that area, according to the faculty member’s portfolio assignment. The department head will add the score for each area to determine the Faculty Member’s Merit Score.

Merit Calculation Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td>1, 2, or 3 (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs improvement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the percentage of the portfolio for each area
Faculty Member’s Merit Score = (Teaching rating x teaching portfolio percentage) + (Scholarship rating x Scholarship Activity portfolio percentage times) + (Service rating x Service portfolio percentage)\(^2\)

Only faculty who receive no 0 ratings will receive merit pay in a given year. (They will receive an overall 0 for their Faculty Member Merit Score.) The total amount allocated for university merit pay is divided by the total number of points for all faculty (ranging from 0 to 4 for each faculty member). For the calculation of the university merit pool of available funds, those who will receive no merit (a “0” merit score) are excluded from the total number of faculty in the university merit pool for that year. The quotient is how much each point is worth. For each faculty merit award, multiply each point worth times number of points awarded.

The total merit funds disbursed cannot exceed the amount allotted for merit in a given year.

Section 3.14 Review by PAC

Subdivision 3.14a Purpose

The Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) conducts independent reviews of faculty performance. PAC reviews include recommendations regarding continuation/retention, promotion, tenure, post-tenure (during a Comprehensive Review), and performance improvement plans. The procedures for the evaluation process shall be detailed in the departmental Professional Assessment Committee Procedures document. Standards and criteria for evaluating faculty

\(^2\) When a faculty member does not have an area as a part of their workload designation, remove it from the equation altogether.

Examples:

The equation for a faculty member on a standard portfolio with designations at a high level of meeting expectations for teaching and service, and exceeds expectations for scholarship:

\((3 \times .6)\) (for teaching) + \((4 \times .25)\) (for scholarship) + \((3 \times .15)\) (for service) = 3.25

For a faculty member on a standard portfolio exceeding expectations for teaching and meeting expectations at mid-level for scholarship and service:

\((4 \times .6)\) (for teaching) + \((2 \times .25)\) (for scholarship) + \((2 \times .15)\) (for service) = 3.2

For a faculty member who has a course reassignment to do service and performs at a high level of meeting expectations:

\((3 \times .40)\) + \((3 \times .25)\) + \((3 \times .35)\) = 3.0

For a term faculty member who meets expectations at a high level in teaching (80%) and performs service at mid-level of meeting expectations (20% of the time):

\((3 \times .80)\) + \((2 \times .20\) = 2.8
Subdivision 3.14b Eligibility for Review of Probationary, Renewable Term and Adjunct Faculty

PACs shall annually evaluate the performance of all probationary faculty. PACs provide comprehensive, multi-year reviews of probationary faculty in years three and six. They review adjuncts (regardless of type of contract) in the twelfth accumulated semester or sooner as decided by the PAC and documented in the Professional Assessment Committee Procedures document. They also review assistant, associate and senior instructors (renewable term appointments) in year 6. PACs provide comprehensive, multi-year reviews for all tenure or promotion cases of probationary or renewable term faculty members. PACs will provide a comprehensive, multi-semester review for any adjunct faculty members seeking promotion after 12 semesters at 50% or more time appointments as an Adjunct; or 24 semesters at 50% or more time appointments as an Associate Adjunct. Semesters do not have to be consecutive.

Subdivision 3.14c Eligibility for Review of Tenured Faculty

PACs provide a comprehensive, multi-year review of tenured faculty when (a) the faculty member is seeking promotion, (b) the faculty member has requested a comprehensive review by the PAC (see Subdivision 3.16f), or (c) the faculty member has received “needs improvement” designations in three annual reviews within the six-year review period by the department head (see Subdivision 3.16e).

Subdivision 3.14d Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty by the Professional Assessment Committee

The review may be conducted by the full membership of the PAC or by a subcommittee, as specified in the departmental procedures.

Paragraph 3.14d.1 PAC Deliberations

PAC deliberations are to remain confidential and professional throughout the evaluation process. A PAC member may not disclose to a candidate another member’s vote on, or comments about, the candidate, nor disclose any votes on, or comments about, a candidate to others, except in the form of a report from the PAC or minority report. Faculty should report violations to the PAC chair for resolution or to the Faculty Petition Committee in the case of a violation of university policy.

Paragraph 3.14d.2 PAC Statement on Parliamentary Authority
Where possible, the PAC will conduct its business consistent with the motion to consider informally. The parliamentary authority shall be the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order in all cases where they are not inconsistent with this structure of Professional Assessment Committee Procedures document or other university policies.

**Paragraph 3.14d.3 Voting**

PACs shall vote on recommendations of retention, tenure, promotion, termination, and post-tenure review. Votes shall be by secret ballot distributed to all PAC members.

**Paragraph 3.14d.4 Timeline for Review**

The review process follows the timeline and process schedule in section 3.13d.1 and Section 3.13d.2. **Subdivision 3.13d Timeline and Process**

**Paragraph 3.14d.5 Conflicts of Interest**

PAC members shall recuse themselves from reviewing faculty with whom they have a conflict of interest in adherence to Section 3.3.

**Paragraph 3.14d.6 Requesting Outside Members**

PACs may choose to invite faculty members from another department to serve on the PAC to review a specific case when additional expertise is necessary or if the PAC lacks the necessary membership to make an informed decision.

**Paragraph 3.14d.7 Procedures for Reviewing Files**

See Subdivision 3.4e.

**Paragraph 3.14d.8 Additional Procedures**

PACs shall document any additional procedures according to Subdivision 3.1g Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document.

**Subdivision 3.14e Standards and Criteria for Review**

University Guiding Standards and Principles are found in Section 3.11. Specific criteria for review are documented in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document (see Section 3.1f).

**Subdivision 3.14f Outcomes of Annual Review for Faculty**

An annual evaluation will be based on performance in the preceding academic year (summer, fall, spring). For annual reviews of probationary and renewable
term faculty, PACs shall assign a rating of (a) meets expectations, (b) exceeds expectations, or (c) needs improvement for each area of performance (teaching, scholarship, service), according to the criteria by portfolio and rank as specified in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document. PACs shall provide a thorough rationale for their decisions in the PAC report.

Subdivision 3.14g Outcomes for Retention/Continuance of Probationary and Renewable Term Faculty
For probationary and renewable term faculty, term, and adjunct instructors, PACs shall recommend (a) Continued Probation or Retention (renewable term faculty), (b) Continued Probation or Retention (renewable term faculty) with Difficulties, (c) Termination, or (d) Abstain. PACs shall provide a thorough rationale for their decisions in the PAC report.

Paragraph 3.14g.1 Continued Probation
PACs shall recommend Continued Probation or Retention if the faculty member meets or exceeds expectations in each area of job performance (teaching, scholarship/creative activity, service) required by portfolio and rank. The PAC report shall state perceived strengths and any areas where improvement is needed.

Department heads shall recommend Continued Probation or Retention if the faculty member meets or exceed expectations in all areas of job performance (teaching, scholarship, and service).

Paragraph 3.14g.2 Continued Probation With Difficulties
PACs shall recommend Continued Probation or Retention with Difficulties if the faculty member does not meet expectations in one or more of the areas under review. The PAC shall recommend specific actions to be taken and outcomes to be completed in the next year to address the deficiencies.

The department head shall recommend Continued Probation with Difficulties if the faculty member does not meet expectations in one or more of the areas under review. The department head shall recommend specific actions to be taken and outcomes to be completed in the next year to address the deficiencies.

The Department Head shall meet with the faculty member to review the above recommendations and create a plan, if warranted, for improving performance. The department head and faculty may will consult the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning for teaching

29 Hereafter, “teaching” represents “teaching or librarianship” as appropriate.
improvement plans. Mentoring by faculty peers is strongly recommended for research and service improvement plans.

**Paragraph 3.14g.3 Termination**
Poor performance (flagrant or persistent) is sufficient cause for a recommendation to terminate a faculty member’s probationary appointment. (Faculty Handbook, Section 2.1 Subdivision 2.45). In making such a recommendation, PACs must explain in detail why the performance warrants termination. If termination is approved, probationary or renewable term faculty members shall remain employed by the university for a period up to one academic year, performing duties assigned by the department head and dean.

**Subdivision 3.14h Third Year Review for Probationary and Renewable Term Faculty**
PACs provide a comprehensive review of a probationary or renewable term faculty member’s performance to date in year three.

**Subdivision 3.14i Outcomes for Promotion and/or Tenure**
For promotion and/or tenure cases of probationary faculty members, PACs shall recommend (a) Promotion or (b) Deny Promotion and/or (c) Support Tenure or (d) Deny Tenure, or (e) Abstain, as appropriate for the case. For promotion of renewable term faculty members, PACs shall recommend (a) Promotion or (b) Deny Promotion, or (c) Abstain. PACs shall provide a thorough rationale for their decisions in the PAC report.

**Subdivision 3.14j Outcomes for Full Review of Tenured Faculty**
PACs shall assign a rating of (a) meets expectations, (b) exceeds expectations, or (c) needs improvement for each area of performance (teaching, scholarship, service), according to the criteria by portfolio and rank as specified in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document. PACs shall provide a thorough rationale for their decisions in the PAC report.

**Subdivision 3.14k PAC Reports**
PACs shall submit recommendations through written reports to the department head upon completion of the assessment. Such reports should reflect the PAC’s comprehensive evaluation and collective judgments, as well as a report on the number of PAC members who voted according to each designated evaluation recommendation (see Paragraph 3.2b).

---

**Hereafter, “teaching” represents “teaching or librarianship” as appropriate.**
PAC reports will include a summary of the assessment of the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service according to the faculty member’s designated workload or contract. Letters should not typically exceed a maximum of three pages, single space in no smaller than 11-pt font. Assessments of teaching/librarianship shall include a summary of teaching observations and student assessments, as well as a narrative describing the success of improvements made in teaching and learning over time. Assessments of scholarship shall be both qualitative and quantitative but shall not include a narrative describing each scholarly work. Assessments of service activities shall address both the quality and quantity of service. Each letter shall include the relevant outcomes specified in Subdivisions 3.14f (annual outcomes), 3.14g (retention/continuance), and 3.14i (promotion or tenure). The letters shall also specify the annual merit designations for each area of performance, according to Subdivision 3.14j.

The department head and PAC both may have the right to call a meeting to discuss the majority report.

**Paragraph 3.14k.1 Minority Reports**

Minority reports are also permitted. A minority report must be submitted by the deadline for collective reports. PAC procedures should determine whether or not the submitted minority report will be signed by those PAC members creating the report.

**Subdivision 3.14l Meetings with the PAC**

PACs may choose to meet with probationary faculty members and/or any additional faculty members scheduled to be promotion and/or tenure cases, to review the Department Standards and Criteria for faculty appointments, promotions and tenure.

**Section 3.15 Promotion and/or Tenure of Probationary and Tenured Faculty**

**Subdivision 3.15a Eligibility for Promotion and/or Tenure**

Probationary faculty are eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and/or tenure. Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires that the candidate have a documented record of accomplishment in teaching, research/scholarship, and professional services. It is recognized that each candidate will have varied degrees of accomplishment in the three areas. Only after an affirmative judgment as to documented teaching effectiveness has been made can serious consideration by given to an evaluation of research/scholarship, and professional service. Individuals holding term, renewable term, temporary, non academic, or other non-probationary
appointments at the University are not eligible to be considered for tenure. **Tenured Associate Professors** are eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.

**Paragraph 3.15a.1 Time in Rank**

Probationary faculty are expected to undergo a review for tenure in year six of their tenure track appointment. An Assistant Professor must complete at least six years of service in rank, including at least three years at the rank of Assistant Professor at UNI, before promotion to Associate Professor.

An Associate Professor completes at least six years in rank before promotion to Professor.

Under extenuating circumstances, a faculty member may request to: 1) suspend the probationary tenure/promotion clock or 2) extend the probationary period for a 7th year by completing a Request to Suspend the Probationary Tenure/Promotion Clock or Request to Extend the Probationary Period for a Seventh Year, both of which are located in the forms repository.\(^{31}\)

**Paragraph 3.15a.2 Early Promotion or Tenure**

Because sufficient time is necessary to demonstrate consistent and satisfactory performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, early consideration for tenure and promotion is rare. The awarding of promotion to an associate professor and tenure or promotion to full professor one year prior to the expiration of the sixth year of service may be justified in cases of exceptional performance. Exceptional performance includes cases in which the candidate is clearly meeting expectations in all areas and consistently evaluated across time to exceed expectations in teaching plus one additional area of scholarship/creative activity or service, and must at least meet or exceed the cumulative standards and criteria for tenure and/or promotion to be eligible.

A faculty member may request early tenure or promotion to the department head; early tenure or promotion must be approved by the department head and Dean. Denial of tenure in an early tenure case leads to termination in the following year.

**Paragraph 3.15a.3 Years Credit**

\(^{31}\) [https://java.accessuni.edu/FormsRepository/faces/formList.jspx#F](https://java.accessuni.edu/FormsRepository/faces/formList.jspx#F)
Faculty may be awarded years of credit toward tenure and/or promotion upon hire. Years of credit must be documented in the faculty member’s offer letter. Faculty retain the choice to use prior years of service or not.

**Paragraph 3.15a.4 Withdrawal from Consideration**
Faculty who request consideration for promotion to Professor may withdraw their request in a letter to the PAC chair, department head, dean, and provost before the provost’s decision.

**Subdivision 3.15b Materials Submission**
Faculty submit a Faculty Activity Report, Faculty Narrative, and other evaluation materials for their evaluation files, according to Subdivisions 3.4 - 3.10.\(^{32}\)

**Subdivision 3.15c Timeline**
Materials for the evaluation files for individuals seeking promotion and/or tenure are due on October 15. Faculty shall adhere to the timeline and process schedule described in Section 3.13d.1 and Section 3.13d.2.

**Subdivision 3.15d Standards and Criteria for Review**
Standards and Criteria for tenure and/or promotion depend on the rank and portfolio of the faculty member. University-level standards are found in Subdivision 3.12. Criteria for individual departments are found in the **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document** (Subdivision 3.1f).

**Subdivision 3.15d Promotion Salaries**
Upon promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, faculty members shall receive salary increases to base pay according to the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

**Section 3.16 Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)**

**Subdivision 3.16a Purpose**
The source of the intellectual vitality of the University of Northern Iowa is the faculty. Individual faculty members, through the performance of their professional duties, create and nourish this vitality for the benefit of our students and the wider society. Tenured faculty members have an especially important role to play in sustaining and enhancing an academic environment in which free and rigorous inquiry can be pursued. Given their central role in serving our students and the

---

\(^{32}\) See Subdivisions 3.2e (Deans) and 3.2f (Provosts) regarding which file materials get submitted to the Deans and Provost.
wider community, it is critically important for the tenured faculty to be provided a mechanism for periodic assessment and reflection.

Post-Tenure Review affords the opportunity for the professional performance of each tenured faculty member to be assessed longitudinally every six years. Self-reflection within departmental and university contexts presents the faculty member with a guidepost for further professional growth and re-tuning, for example, to better address current institutional priorities. In addition, these periodic assessments allow UNI to reward tenured faculty for consistently high-quality work. Finally, for those faculty members who are found to be deficient in one or more areas, there will be an opportunity to design and implement a performance improvement plan.

Ultimately, the goal of Post-Tenure Review is to assist tenured faculty to engage in a process of professional development over the length of their careers.

Academic freedom is paramount in order for faculty members to be fully effective as teachers and scholars. The post-tenure review process at the University of Northern Iowa shall be conducted fully in accordance with the "Minimum Standards for Good Practice if a Formal System of Post-Tenure Review is Established in the 1999 AAUP report Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response."

Subdivision 3.16b Relationship of Post-Tenure Review to Promotion to Professor
Post-tenure review and Promotion to Professor are independent processes. A successful post-tenure review does not automatically qualify a faculty member for promotion to Professor. At the same time, a successful post-tenure review does not require meeting all the criteria necessary for promotion to Professor.

Subdivision 3.16c Post-Tenure Review Clock
Faculty undergo post-tenure review every six years, unless performance is substantially deficient for three years (see Subdivision 3.1f). A review for the purpose of promotion to full professor replaces post-tenure review and restarts the post-tenure review clock.

Subdivision 3.16d Post-Tenure Review Process
The annual review process is the foundation of post-tenure review. As described in Section 3.13, the department head conducts an annual review of the performance of each faculty member in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service. Performance in each of the three areas will be judged to be (a) meeting expectations, (b) exceeding expectations, or (c) needs improvement, according to the faculty member's rank and portfolio.
Standards and Criteria are documented in the University Guiding Standards (Section 3.11) and Departmental Standards and Criteria Document (Subdivision 3.1f).

**Subdivision 3.16e Summary Review**

If a faculty member is found to be meeting or exceeding expectations in all three areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, the post-tenure review shall be a brief summary evaluation (Summary Review) conducted by the department head. The department head’s report shall be submitted to the dean and faculty member, and placed in the evaluation file. The faculty member may submit a written response to the department head and the dean, which shall also be placed in the evaluation file.

**Paragraph 3.16e.1 Materials Required for Summary Review**

(i) Statement from the faculty member reflecting on accomplishments over the review period and outlining goals for the next review period;
(ii) Annual Review letters from the department head over the review period;
(iii) Faculty Activity Reports over the review period;
(iv) Curriculum Vitae

**Paragraph 3.16e.2 Department Head's Summary Review Report**

The department head shall summarize the results of the annual reviews over the post-tenure review period. The head may make recommendations for performance improvement and discuss professional development opportunities or workload adjustment per Chapter 4 of this Handbook.

**Subdivision 3.16f Comprehensive Review**

If a faculty member has received unsatisfactory (“needs improvement”) reviews in one or more review areas (teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, according to one’s portfolio) in three annual reviews (not necessarily consecutively) during the post-tenure review period, a Comprehensive Review shall be separately conducted by the departmental PAC and by the department head during the next academic year. The PAC’s report (along with an optional minority report) shall be submitted to the faculty member, department head, and dean; and the report will be placed in the evaluation file. The department head’s report shall be sent to the faculty member and dean, and placed in the evaluation file. The faculty member may submit a written response to the department head and dean, which shall be placed in the evaluation file.

**Paragraph 3.16f.1 Materials Required for Comprehensive Review**
(i) Statement from the faculty reflecting on performance over the review period and indicating how deficiencies have been or will be addressed. Goals for the next review period should also be discussed;
(ii) Annual Review letters from the department head over the review period;
(iii) Faculty Activity Reports over the review period;
(iv) Curriculum Vitae;
(v) Additional materials consistent with departmental review policies, as documented in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document (Subdivision 3.1f).

**Paragraph 3.16f.2 Outcome 1: Meets or Exceeds Expectations Comprehensive Review Result**
If the department head and PAC give a rating of meets or exceeds expectations in each of the areas for a Comprehensive Review, the post-tenure cycle is restarted.

**Paragraph 3.16f.3 Outcome 2: Fails to Meet Expectations Comprehensive Review Result**
If the department head or PAC gives a rating of needs improvement for one or more areas of faculty performance, the department head shall work with each faculty member to develop a Performance Improvement Plan in order to strengthen performance in future annual reviews. The Performance Improvement Plan must be approved by the department head and dean. If the faculty member does not create an acceptable plan, the department head will create one that is approved by the dean.

The faculty member must meet with the department head and PAC Chair to design and submit a Performance Improvement Plan to be included in the Evaluation File. The plan shall contain specific actions and measures to address the deficiencies found in the review. The department head and faculty member will consult the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning for teaching improvement plans. Mentoring by faculty peers is strongly recommended for research and service improvement plans. An initial Follow-up Report of the results of the Performance Improvement Plan must be completed by the end of the spring semester of an unsatisfactory review documenting the corrective actions taken and shall be signed by the faculty member, department head, and dean, and placed in the Evaluation File.

During the next two subsequent annual reviews, the department head shall use the Performance Improvement Plan and Follow-up Report as a
basis for evaluation. Significant progress on all corrective elements of the plan will be expected by the second annual review.

**Paragraph 3.16f.4 Sanctions**

In the event that recurring evaluations reveal continuing and persistent problems with faculty member’s performance that do not lend themselves to improvement after several efforts, and that call into question his or her ability to function in that position, than other possibilities, such as mutually agreeable reassignment to other duties or a separation should be explored. If these are not practicable, or if no other solution acceptable to the parties can be found, then the administration should invoke peer consideration regarding any contemplated sanctions.

The standard for dismissal or other severe sanction remind that of adequate cause, and the mere fact of successive negative reviews does not in any way diminish the obligation of the institution to show such cause in a separate forum before an appropriately consulted hearing body of peers convened for that purpose, in accordance with the Faculty Handbook.

The language above is from "Minimum Standards for Good Practice if a Formal System of Post-Tenure Review is Established in the 1999 AAUP report *Post-Tenure Review: AN AAUP Response*.

In extremely rare cases, sanctions up to and including termination, may be levied due to documented poor performance that is both persistent and unresponsive. Any sanctions must be levied in strict accordance with Faculty Handbook procedures and university Policies and Procedures, and including in accordance with Sections 2.1 and 2.7 of the Faculty Handbook.

In event that continuing and persistent problems and that call into question the faculty member’s

**Paragraph 3.16f.5 Appeals**

Appeal procedures are located in Chapter 11 and Chapter 12 of the Faculty Handbook.

**Subdivision 3.16g Requesting a Comprehensive Review**

Faculty may request a comprehensive review by the PAC by submitting a letter with the request to the PAC chair by September 15.
Subdivision 3.16h Reviews for Other Levels of Performance

If a faculty member’s annual reviews exhibit deficiencies but not at a level for which a comprehensive review is mandatory, the head may request either a Summary Review or a Comprehensive Review for the scheduled post-tenure review. In these cases, an adjustment of the faculty member’s workload may be considered as a means of strengthening overall performance, in addition to other professional development mechanisms.

Subdivision 3.16i Special Circumstances

(i) A faculty member may petition to defer post-tenure review for good cause, including PDA or Fulbright assignments. The faculty must submit a written petition to the department head as soon as practicable. If a deferment is granted, it shall be for a period of one year.

(ii) A faculty member who plans to go up for promotion the following year may delay post-tenure review for a year. In the case that the faculty member does not ultimately go up for promotion, the faculty member will undergo post-tenure review that year.

(iii) A faculty member who will fully retire within one year after a post-tenure review is scheduled may choose to forgo the review. An official retirement letter must be submitted in writing to Human Resource Services (HRS).

(iv) Faculty members on phased retirement shall not be required to undergo post-tenure review.

Subdivision 3.16j Outstanding Performance Rewards

Faculty who have received performance reviews of exceeds expectations in two or more areas and meets expectations in the others shall receive be awarded a monetary award of XXX.

Section 3.17 Review and Promotion of Adjunct, Term, Renewable Term Faculty

Subdivision 3.17a Purpose

A central goal of the University of Northern Iowa is that all students be afforded a high-quality learning environment for the development of the knowledge and skills and habits necessary for productive citizenship. Thus, in carrying out the responsibilities set forth in their portfolio workload, adjunct, term, and renewable term faculty members are expected to meet the same or similar high professional standards as tenure-track faculty members with similar experience levels.

Further, the university also seeks to provide an equitable and inclusive governance structure to ensure full and fair participation in the university’s affairs. This governance structure must include non-tenure-track faculty to the fullest level consistent with their workload but without the erosion of the rights and privileges of the tenure system. Given their important role in the life of the
university, a system of ranked positions, similar to those available on the tenure track, exists for adjunct, term, and renewable term faculty.

**Subdivision 3.17b Appointment Types**
Faculty members holding one of the three Instructor ranks defined below in Subdivision 3.17c may have different appointment types. These include: (i) Temporary Adjuncts, (ii) Term (1-4 years), and (iii) Renewable Term (rolling two-year contract). These appointment types are defined and explained in Sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5 of the Faculty Handbook, respectively. Clinical faculty (Handbook, Section 2.6) shall also hold an Instructor rank.

**Subdivision 3.17c Review of Adjunct, Term, and Renewable Term Faculty**
Adjunct Instructors include: Instructors (level 1), Lecturers (level 2), and Senior Lecturers (level 3) and shall be evaluated annually by the department head (see Section 3.13 Annual Review for All Faculty by Department Head). PACs review each faculty member in semesters 12 or 24 (or beyond if applying later), when seeking promotion, or more frequently as documented in the Professional Assessment Committee PAC Procedures Document (Subdivision 3.1g) (see Section 3.14 Review by PAC).

**Paragraph 3.17c.1 Materials Submission**
Faculty submit a Faculty Activity Report, Faculty Narrative, and other evaluation materials for their evaluation files, according to Sections 3.4 - 3.10.33

**Paragraph 3.17c.2 Timeline**
The Faculty Activity Report and other evaluation materials for the evaluation files are due March 31. Faculty shall adhere to the timeline and process schedule described in Section 3.13d.1 and Section 3.13d.2.

**Paragraph 3.17c.3 Standards and Criteria for Review**
Standards and Criteria depend on the rank and portfolio of the faculty member. University-level standards are found in Section 3.11. Criteria for individual departments are found in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document (Subdivision 3.1f).

**Subdivision 3.17d Promotion**
Adjunct, Term, and Renewable Term Faculty in the collective bargaining unit are eligible for promotion every 12 semesters (adjuncts above 50%

---

33 See Subdivisions 3.2e (Deans) and 3.2f (Provosts) regarding which file materials get submitted to the Deans and Provost.
load each semester), or six years (renewable term) in rank up to the rank of Senior Lecturer. Faculty members shall meet or exceed expectations annually in their assigned duties. Applying for promotion is a personal choice of the faculty member. There shall be no penalty for not applying for promotion when eligible.

**Paragraph 3.17d.1 Promotion Salaries**
Upon promotion to Lecturer or Senior Lecturer, faculty members shall receive salary increases to base pay as specified by the Provost in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

**Paragraph 3.17d.2 Other Benefits and Responsibilities**
Faculty shall receive priority for office space by rank. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers may serve on the PAC for the purposes of review of faculty below their rank (see Paragraph 3.2b.1a).

**Section 3.18 Faculty/Administrators Eligible for Tenure Upon Hire**
Well-established faculty or faculty-administrators may be eligible for tenure in a department in their area of expertise at the time of hire, as documented in an offer letter. Such faculty must submit appropriate materials to the department head, dean and PAC of the designated department for consideration. Department Heads and PACs shall follow regular procedures for promotion, including a vote regarding the conference of tenure.

**Section 3.19 Appealing Content in a Review**
A faculty member may file a faculty petition to appeal a review’s findings according the procedures in Chapter 11 of the Faculty Handbook. An attempt should be made to resolve the complaint informally through meetings between the faculty member, department head, dean, and PAC chair if the PAC was involved in the review. If the complaint cannot be resolved informally, then a formal petition should be filed with the Faculty Petition Committee as described in Chapter 11 of this handbook.

**Section 3.20 Administrative Evaluation Procedures**
Department heads are evaluated annually by a process approved by the Faculty Handbook Committee.
APPENDIX A: Department Standards and Criteria document template

Department Standards and Criteria Document
(Instructions for Development)

This document identifies the process for the specific operationalization of criteria for evaluating faculty performance at the departmental level. Departments are to complete the attached templates by adding criteria for 1) Annual Evaluation and 2) Cumulative Reviews. These templates are to include specific criteria appropriate for each rank according to each evaluative review time period.

All probationary and tenured faculty, PACs, and department heads are expected to collaborate together in order to create clear, consistent department-level standards and criteria for the purposes of evaluation, promotion, and tenure. Departments should consult with adjuncts, term, and renewable term faculty regarding standards for their performance.

All criteria are to be reviewed annually in the spring semester by all departmental faculty members and department heads and submitted to the dean for approval. The Dean will consult with the College Review Committee (CRC) and Associate Provost for Faculty (in consultation with the Faculty Evaluation Committee during initial development and the Faculty Handbook Committee thereafter as needed). Upon approval of the document it is to be distributed by department heads to the faculty of each department.

UNI recognizes, values, and prioritizes teaching as a faculty member’s primary responsibility. The university also values and rewards scholarship/creative activity and service when such activities are part of the faculty member’s assigned workload.

Departments shall list criteria specifying any materials to demonstrate teaching effectiveness in addition to the required components in scholarship/research/creative activity and service. Tenured faculty may engage in Discovery, Integration, or Application research within their field of expertise. Additionally, the templates must specify which if any Integration or Application scholarship is to be recognized for promotion and tenure for probationary faculty. Discovery, Integration and Application components must be included in scholarly/research/creative activity criteria developed.

Criteria should specify departmental expectations for meeting expectations, exceeding expectations, and needing improvement for annual review, which align with expectations for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review. All criteria must be consistent with the
University Guiding Standards and Criteria (Faculty Handbook (FH), Section 3.9).
Criteria should specify departmental expectations for meeting expectations, exceeding expectations, and needing improvement for continuation, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review by rank and work portfolio.

Below are important definitions included in the Faculty Handbook which inform the development of specific criteria:

**Teaching**
Faculty members’ primary role is to provide high quality teaching to students. Because excellence in teaching is the top priority of UNI, teaching is evaluated first and foremost. Only after an affirmative judgment as to documented teaching or librarianship effectiveness has been made can serious consideration by given to an evaluation of research/scholarship/creative achievement and service. UNI expects faculty to foster critical thinking and knowledge in the content area of study, as well as to tailor course content and rigor to the course level, curricular needs, program learning goals and outcomes, and UNI’s student body. Faculty teaching should evolve over time as faculty members continue to refine and develop their teaching skills across their career. UNI encourages faculty to consider new pedagogical approaches when appropriate for their discipline. Teaching should be informed by the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or one’s research.

**Definition of Teaching (FH, Section 4.1)**
Teaching is the development, preparation, and delivery of course content. Teaching also includes communicating with students in a course in a timely fashion and supervising and evaluating student performance for courses. The standard form of instruction consists of a course offered by an academic department and delivered in a traditional classroom or classroom equivalent setting, such as through distance education.

**Section 3.6 Materials and Methods for Measuring Faculty Performance in Teaching**
Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated and documented through multiple methods in order to provide a comprehensive representation of a faculty member’s teaching performance. Faculty shall document their teaching performance in a teaching portfolio, consisting of departmental required and optional artifacts. Teaching portfolios shall be succinct and well organized with each component clearly identified or labeled. Faculty may document teaching performance through a variety of teaching artifacts, including, but not limited to, syllabi, sample assignments, sample lectures, in-class activities, sample exams, or sample projects.
Subdivision 3.6a Required versus Optional Teaching Components

The Departmental Standards and Criteria document must include all of the five required components, as delineated below, for the evaluation of teaching. Optional components may also be included. Departments shall consider any additional optional components that a faculty member chooses to include in the FAR, teaching portfolio, or the Evaluation File as evidence of teaching performance.

Subdivision 3.6b Required Component: Self-Assessment

All faculty shall develop annual goals for teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. The annual goals are discussed between the faculty member and the department head each fall for the purposes of portfolio and professional development, as well as allocation of resources. The annual self-assessment should be a reflection on achieving these goals, faculty development efforts (if pursued), feedback from teaching observations (see Subdivision 3.6c) and student assessments (see Subdivision 3.6d), research/creative activity accomplishments, service contributions. All Self-Reflection of Goals and Self-Assessments should be succinct and substantive, and documented in the FAR.

Subdivision 3.6c Required Component: Observations for Probationary Faculty and Action Cases

Observations of teaching shall be conducted by department heads and faculty members of the PAC for probationary faculty and other action cases (when faculty members are applying for tenure and/or promotion or undergoing comprehensive post-tenure review), according to PAC Procedures. Observations in the Fall semester shall be completed by mid-November.

Paragraph 3.6c.1 Training

Individuals engaging in peer observation shall be trained in conducting and reporting effective peer observation by PAC members or through the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) before doing so.

Paragraph 3.6c.2 Observations by Pedagogy Expert

Additional trained observers with expertise in a variety of pedagogies are available through Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) to assess pedagogy and facilitate faculty development in teaching. Faculty members, PACs, or department heads may solicit observation by an expert in pedagogy. Pedagogy observers cannot review disciplinary content or knowledge. Observations by pedagogy experts shall not be used in place of observations by faculty with disciplinary expertise.
Paragraph 3.6c.3 Online, Hybrid, or Distance Education Courses
Online, Hybrid, or Distance Education courses shall be observed by becoming a guest in the class or reviewing available course organizational and delivery practices, as well as instructional materials. Department heads or PACs may also request copies of documents or recorded lectures used in online teaching.

Paragraph 3.6c.4 Example Forms for Peer Observation
Departments may develop forms for documenting peer observation. Results must be summarized in annual and PAC reviews. Example forms are available in Appendix D.

Subdivision 3.6d Required Component: Student Assessments
Student assessments are only one tool for faculty to use for a self-assessment of their performance, and shall be used formatively to improve teaching and student learning. Student assessments best measure students’ perceptions of the clarity of delivery of material and content, classroom logistics and organization (e.g., timeliness of the professor), course organization, effectiveness of communication, professor availability, or the professor’s influence on students. Faculty shall reflect on their FAR regarding the feedback provided by students regarding these elements and how they can improve their teaching and student learning. Student assessments do not measure effectively the appropriateness of course objectives, knowledge of the discipline, or suitability of assessment procedures.

Paragraph 3.6d.1 Frequency and Access
Frequency of administration of student assessments varies by faculty rank (see Table 3.14 for a summary of the review schedule by faculty rank) and teaching performance. A summary of the results of student assessments of a Faculty Member shall be transmitted to the Faculty Member by ten (10) working days after grades are required to be submitted.

Subparagraph 3.6d.1a Probationary Faculty and Instructors
Student assessments shall be administered in every class every semester for probationary faculty and instructors.

Subparagraph 3.6d.1b Tenured Faculty, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers
Student assessments shall be administered in every class one semester per year for tenured faculty, lecturers, and senior lecturers, not counting years on leave or non-teaching
assignments. Faculty choose the semester for assessment administration.

Additional student assessments shall be required in every class the opposite semester for faculty who have received a designation of “needs improvement” in the area of teaching in the previous annual review or for whom an improvement plan pertaining to teaching has been created.

Tenured faculty may also request informational student assessments for the opposite semester at their own discretion. The University shall process such assessments, but no record of the results shall be kept in the evaluation file or any other file maintained by the University.

Paragraph 3.6d.2 Faculty Reflection
Faculty shall provide a reflection on student assessments annually in the “Annual Self-Reflection of Goals and Self-Assessment” as part of the FAR (see Subdivision 3.6b). This reflection may connect student assessments to the faculty member’s statement of teaching philosophy or specific aspects of teaching. Faculty reflection may also contextualize student assessments, for example by connecting them to the level of the course (e.g., lower- versus upper-division/level), curricular needs being met by the course (e.g., general education students versus majors only), rigor of the course, and other relevant factors. For action cases (applying for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review), faculty will reflect cumulatively on all years since their last review in the “Faculty Narrative” as part of the (see Subdivision 3.6b).

Paragraph 3.6d.3 Interpretation
Department heads and PACs should focus their evaluation of student assessments on the faculty member’s meaningful and documented use of the assessments for the purpose of improvement in teaching and learning over time. PACs shall interpret results of student assessments in context, including the level of the course (e.g., lower- versus upper-division), curricular needs being met, rigor of the course, mode of delivery, and other relevant factors.

Definition of Librarianship (FH, Section 4.2)
Librarianship is the creation and provision of information, resources, and services that advance critical thinking, scholarly research, and learning in an evolving information landscape. This includes, but is not limited to, the provision of reference services,
research consultations, and instruction in support of information literacy; the selection, acquisition, organization, preservation, and administration of library collections and other information resources; and supporting sharing of and access to library collections and other information resources.

**Definition of Scholarship/Creative Activity (FH, Section 4.3)**
Scholarship and creative activity are those discipline-specific or professional expertise activities that result in a tangible artifact or outcome. Scholarship makes use of the faculty member’s professional expertise, and it must be of appropriate quality and be disseminated. The university recognizes, evaluates, and rewards three types of scholarship/creative activity (Discovery, Integration, Application), which are defined and illustrated below. The definitions include but are not limited to the examples provided. The Departmental Standards and Criteria Document may provide additional specific examples of products or outcomes in order to demonstrate these forms of scholarship.

Probationary faculty are expected to engage in the scholarship/creative activity of Discovery, including the scholarship of teaching and learning when it produces original knowledge. Some departments may also evaluate and reward peer-reviewed Integration or Application scholarship/creative activity when consistent with disciplinary expectations and applicable accreditation requirements. Typically, twenty-five percent of a probationary faculty member’s workload shall be allocated for scholarly or creative work, unless a different portfolio has been assigned to the faculty member.

Tenured faculty may engage in Discovery, Integration, or Application research within their field of expertise. Each type of scholarship shall be recognized as legitimate for the purposes of annual review, post-tenure review, and promotion to full professor when it has undergone peer review that attests to its acceptable quality and meaningful impact. Faculty members are expected to collaborate with their colleagues and department head to ensure their scholarship is consistent with requirements for scholarship for program accreditation. Typically, twenty-five percent of a tenured faculty member’s workload shall be allocated for scholarly or creative work, unless a different portfolio has been assigned to the faculty member.

**Discovery (FH, Subdivision 4.31)**
Discovery is the original production or testing of a theory, principle, knowledge, or artistic creation. Examples include a traditional quantitative and/or qualitative data analysis, as well as an artistic or literary artifact (such as a fiction or non-fiction writing, art exhibition, musical composition, or musical/theatrical performance). The university recognizes the scholarship of teaching and learning, such as the evaluation of curricula or pedagogy, as discovery when it produces original knowledge. All discovery scholarship is evaluated within the faculty member’s field of expertise through traditional peer review and is publicly disseminated in traditional outlets, such as journals, books,
recordings, performances, or refereed exhibitions. Products produced from the acquisition of grants may contribute to the scholarship of Discovery.

**Integration (FH, Subdivision 4.32)**
Integration is the use of knowledge found within or across disciplines to create an original understanding or insight that reveals larger intellectual patterns. Examples include the writing of a textbook, curating an artistic exhibition, editing an anthology, or integrative work that summarizes or extends what is known about a topic or process. Being awarded a competitive external grant may be considered Integration scholarship. Integration scholarship is peer reviewed and may appear in a variety of outlets. Products produced from the acquisition of grants may contribute to the scholarship of Integration.

**Application (FH, Subdivision 4.33)**
Application brings discipline-specific knowledge to bear to address a significant issue or problem or to influence a current or future condition. Examples include producing a technical report; performing public policy analysis; creating program, curriculum, or tools that are adopted across the state/nation; evaluating a community-based program; or being awarded a patent. Application scholarship is distinguished from service by the presence of peer review and may appear in a variety of outlets. Products produced from the acquisition of grants may contribute to the scholarship of Application.
**TEACHING CRITERIA** (annual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKS:</th>
<th>STANDARD PORTFOLIO:</th>
<th>EXTENDED TEACHING PORTFOLIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probability Faculty/Assistant Professors</td>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>Professors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATINGS:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Differentiated portfolios are to be evaluated according to the terms of the approved Memorandum of Understanding (Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 4.81)*
Summary of Teaching Criteria*: Expectations for Cumulative Reviews (6 years) for Promotion and Tenure; Promotion, and Post-tenure Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKS:</th>
<th>STANDARD PORTFOLIO:</th>
<th>EXTENDED TEACHING PORTFOLIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationary Faculty/Assistant Professors</td>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty (all ranks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATINGS:

- Meets Expectations
- Exceeds Expectations
- Needs Improvement

*Differentiated portfolios are to be evaluated according to the terms of the approved Memorandum of Understanding (Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 4.81)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATINGS:</th>
<th>RANKS:</th>
<th>STANDARD PORTFOLIO:</th>
<th>EXTENDED TEACHING PORTFOLIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probationary Faculty/Assistant</td>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>Professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured Faculty (all ranks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Differentiated portfolios are to be evaluated according to the terms of the approved Memorandum of Understanding (Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 4.81)
Summary of Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity Criteria* - Expectations for Cumulative Reviews (6 years) for promotion and tenure: promotion, and post-tenure review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKS:</th>
<th>STANDARD PORTFOLIO:</th>
<th>EXTENDED TEACHING PORTFOLIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probationary Faculty/Assistant Professors</td>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>Professors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATINGS:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Differentiated portfolios are to be evaluated according to the terms of the approved Memorandum of Understanding (Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 4.81)
## Service Criteria** (Annual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>RANKS:</strong></th>
<th><strong>STANDARD PORTFOLIO:</strong></th>
<th><strong>EXTENDED TEACHING PORTFOLIO</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probationary Faculty/Assistant Professors</td>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATINGS:**

- Meets Expectations
- Exceeds Expectations
- Needs Improvement

---

*Differentiated portfolios are to be evaluated according to the terms of the approved Memorandum of Understanding (Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 4.81)
Summary of Service Criteria*: Expectations for Cumulative Reviews (6 years) for Promotion and Tenure: Promotion, and Post-tenure Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKS:</th>
<th>STANDARD PORTFOLIO:</th>
<th>EXTENDED TEACHING PORTFOLIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RATINGS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Probationary Faculty/Assistant Professors
Associate Professors
Professors
Tenured Faculty (all ranks)

*differentiated portfolios are to be evaluated according to the terms of the approved Memorandum of Understanding (Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 4.81)
### TEACHING (Scholarship/Research/Creative Activity/Service – if present) CRITERIA (annual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKS:</th>
<th>TEACHING PORTFOLIO:</th>
<th>RESEARCH/SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES (if present)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RATINGS:</strong></td>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Term, or Temporary Instructors</td>
<td>Senior Lecturers</td>
<td>Criteria to be defined in offer or annual evaluation letters according to individualized portfolio assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Meets Expectations
- Exceeds Expectations
- Needs Improvement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATINGS:</th>
<th>RANKS:</th>
<th>TEACHING PORTFOLIO:</th>
<th>RESEARCH/SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES (if present)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Term, or Temporary Instructor</td>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Senior Lecturers</td>
<td>Criteria to be defined in offer or annual evaluation letters according to individualized portfolio assignments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Professional Assessment Committee Procedures template

Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) Procedures  
(Instructions for Development)

The “Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) Procedures” (Faculty Handbook, subdivision 3.22) document defines how each Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) organizes, functions, schedules and complete its work.

The document is to be created separately but in conjunction with the “Department Standards and Criteria Document,” which is utilized by individual departments as their guiding resource for faculty evaluation (see Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 3.1f). Any PAC procedures developed must be consistent with the Faculty Handbook and are to be approved annually by the department head, dean (in consultation with the College Review Committee (CRC)), and Associate Provost for Faculty (in consultation initially upon development with the Faculty Evaluation Committee and then the Faculty Handbook Committee as needed in the future). The procedures are then distributed to the faculty of each department. The procedures must adhere to the timeline in the Faculty Handbook (Section 3.12).

If the department head, dean, or Provost designee reject the department’s document, they shall provide clear direction and feedback for revising the document to meet the University Guiding Standards (Faculty Handbook, Section 3.9) and other general university policies and procedures. Departments which fail to create or document specific approved department-level standards and criteria for evaluating faculty shall default to the University Guiding Standards documented in this Handbook.

Faculty Handbook provisions related to roles, responsibilities, deliberations, parliamentary authority, scheduling of meetings and PAC reports is documented in the Faculty Handbook, Subdivision 3.2b.
Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) Procedures Document

Name of Department

Academic Year: 2019-2020

Date of Revision

PAC Chair (signature)

Department Head (signature)

Dean (signature)

Associate Provost for Faculty (signature)

Section 1.0
APPENDIX C: Sample Teaching Observation Forms
APPENDIX D: Grandfathering Plan for Post Tenure-Review and Promotion for non-Tenure Track Faculty

The university recognizes the challenges that come with implementing a new evaluation system with new standards and criteria. This appendix documents the plan for grandfathering individuals into the new system.

Grandfathering Schedule: Start Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Review Start Date</th>
<th>Tenure and/or Promotion Standards and Criteria</th>
<th>Eligibility for Promotion</th>
<th>Post-tenure Review Standards and Criteria</th>
<th>Post-tenure Review Start Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All faculty hired for 2019 or after</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>New standards and criteria</td>
<td>Fall 2025</td>
<td>New standards and criteria</td>
<td>Year six after tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary faculty starting prior to 2019</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>Choice of new or old standards and criteria</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>New standards and criteria</td>
<td>Year six after tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tenured in 2013 or prior</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>Choice of new or old standards and criteria through fall 2022.</td>
<td>Year 6 or later after tenure</td>
<td>New standards and criteria</td>
<td>2022, 2023, or 2024 (randomly assigned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Faculty tenured in 2014-2016 | Fall 2019               | Choice of new or old standards and criteria through fall 2023. | Year 6 or later after tenure | New standards and criteria                  | Tenured in 2014 = PTR in 2022  
Tenured in 2015 = PTR in 2023  
Tenured in 2016 = PTR in 2024 |
<p>| Faculty tenured in 2017 or after | Fall 2019               | New standards and criteria                      | Year 6 or later after tenure | New standards and criteria                  | 6 years after tenure or promotion, or |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjunct and Renewable Term Faculty hired prior to fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>New standards and criteria</th>
<th>Most senior faculty first starting in 2022</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct and Renewable Term Faculty hired fall 2013 or after</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>New standards and criteria</td>
<td>Year 6 starting in 2022</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Review**

All faculty are subject to the University Guiding Standards and the Departmental Standards and Criteria for the purposes of annual review and merit pay beginning in fall 2019.

**Faculty Hired for Fall 2019 or Beyond**

Faculty starting in fall 2019 and after are subject to the new University Guiding Standards and Departmental Standards and Criteria for the purposes of annual review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review.

**Probationary Faculty Starting Prior to Fall 2019**

Faculty who started prior to fall 2019 shall have the choice of seeking promotion and/or tenure under the standards and criteria of the old or new system. Faculty shall declare in writing which system of standards they wish to be assessed on by April 15 of the prior spring in their request to seek promotion and/or tenure.

**Adjunct and Renewable Term Faculty**

Faculty who are not on the tenure-track are eligible for promotion starting in year six. Faculty with more than six years of service at UNI (i.e., those who started prior to fall 2013) are eligible to seek promotion on an expedited timeline after three years of annual reviews, starting in 2022. Faculty who wish to seek promotion starting in 2022 may request promotion by April 15 of the previous spring semester. In the event that more faculty are seeking promotion than can be reasonably accommodated by the department head or PAC, then faculty shall be broken evenly into 2 or 3 groups based on seniority (i.e., faculty with the most years of service at UNI first) to be evaluated for promotion over 2022 and 2023 (with an extension to 2024 as an option in very large departments).
Tenured Faculty
Faculty who were tenured prior to the implementation of the new system shall have the choice of seeking promotion to Professor under the standards and criteria of the old or new system through fall 2022. Faculty shall declare in writing which system of standards they wish to be assessed on by April 15 of the prior spring in their request to seek promotion and/or tenure.

Tenured Faculty with more than six years of service to the university (tenured in 2013 or prior) are subject to post-tenure review starting in fall 2022, after three consecutive years of annual review. Each of those faculty members shall be randomly assigned to one of three equally distributed groups to undergo post-tenure review in the years 2022, 2023, and 2024.

For tenured faculty with under six years post-tenure (tenured after 2013), faculty are encouraged to seek promotion in year six following tenure. Faculty who are six years post-tenure in 2022, 2023, and 2024 (tenured in 2016, 2017, 2018) shall undergo post-tenure review in the appropriate year. Faculty who are six years post-tenure in 2019 will undergo post-tenure review in 2022; those six years post-tenure in 2020 shall undergo post-tenure review in 2023; and those six years post-tenure in 2021 shall undergo post-tenure review in 2024.