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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, and shared governance. 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 (Section 3.1f, Departmental Standards and Criteria Document) and procedures for reviewing faculty (Section 3.1g, Professional Assessment Committee Procedures) must align 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\(^1\), research/scholarship/creative activity, and service. Specific definitions of Teaching or Librarianship, Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity, and Service are included in Chapter 4 (Workload). Evaluators should acknowledge that faculty work may be relevant to more than one area (e.g., it could be evaluated as both teaching and service, or scholarship).

Subdivision 3.1b Teaching or Librarianship
Faculty members’ primary role is to provide high quality teaching 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/creative activity and service.

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. 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.

---

\(^1\) Hereafter, “teaching” represents “teaching or librarianship” as appropriate.
Subdivision 3.1c Scholarship/Creative Activity
UNI faculty engage in the collective endeavor of creating knowledge, enhancing civic life, and influencing communities through scholarship/creative activity, according to their portfolio (see Chapter 4 for faculty portfolio definitions). Scholarship/creative activities are valuable and meaningful parts of faculty life. Scholarship/creative activities are 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/creative activity. 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 workload for all faculty members. Service obligations are to be shared and fulfilled equitably by faculty members according to their assigned Workload 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, substantially and constructively contribute, provide facilitative and servant leadership, and have a positive and 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/Creative Activity, and Service
The specific weighting of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service shall be according to the faculty member’s most recently assigned Workload Portfolio (see Chapter 4 for faculty portfolio definitions). It is recognized that faculty will have varied degrees of accomplishment in the three areas.

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 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 Associate Provost for Faculty 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/creative activity 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 any form 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’s designee, 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.
If resolution still cannot be achieved, the Faculty Handbook Committee shall create a joint faculty-administration committee with equal representation to create a **Departmental Standards and Criteria Document**. The committee shall be chaired by the Associate Provost for Faculty and a faculty member selected by the Faculty Leadership.

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

PACs must create a PAC procedures document titled, **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures**, which 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 approved annually by the department head, dean (in consultation with the College Review Committee (CRC)), and Associate Provost for Faculty. 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 Approve Professional Assessment Committee Procedures**

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 3.10) and other general university policies and procedures.

**Paragraph 3.1g.3 Failure to Develop Professional Assessment Committee Procedures**

Failure to develop PAC procedures shall follow the same process outlined in **Paragraph 3.1f.5**.

**Section 3.2 Roles**

**Subdivision 3.2a Faculty Member Being Evaluated**

The faculty member being assessed shall adhere to the procedures, guidelines, and timetable contained in this handbook, and any pertinent **Professional Assessment Committee Procedures**. When seeking promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member shall notify the department head by April 15 in the spring semester prior to the fall evaluation when teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service contributions or portfolios are reviewed. The faculty member is responsible for submitting evidence and supporting materials to document excellence in teaching,
research/scholarship, and service (see Sections 3.6 - 3.9). These materials should be aligned to reflect the assigned workload portfolio and must be organized in a coherent manner.

**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, research/scholarship/creative activity, and service using established standards and criteria.

**Paragraph 3.2b.1 PAC Membership**

The Professional Assessment Committee shall consist of 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 (see Conflicts of Interest 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 must work with the department head to seek outside membership from tenured faculty members from another academic department. Faculty on phased retirement may choose to serve on the department PAC and continue to fulfill PAC membership and/or chair responsibilities.

**Paragraph 3.2b.1a Lecturers and Senior Lecturers**

Adjunct, Term, and Renewable Term faculty who have been promoted to the Lecturer or Senior Lecturer may serve on the PAC for the purposes of reviewing faculty of a lower rank (see Paragraph 3.18d.2).

**Paragraph 3.2b.2 PAC Chair**

The position of the PAC chair is a rotating term position of one or two years among all members of the PAC committee. 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 and associated duties. The PAC chair/co-chair shall not be a faculty member who is being assessed for promotion by PAC in that year. Such person is automatically recused from the chair/co-chair position, and PAC shall designate a replacement.

**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 represent PACs as members of the College Review Committee (see Subdivision 3.2d).

**Paragraph 3.2b.4 PAC Responsibilities**
PACs shall annually review renewable term and probationary faculty. They also review all remaining faculty for the purposes of retention, termination, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews.

**Subdivision 3.2c Department Head**
In collaboration with the PAC chair, department heads ensure that the department has developed the **“Departmental Standards and Criteria Document”** and **“Professional Assessment Committee Procedures”** that align with University Guiding Standards, the Faculty Handbook, and university policies and procedures. The department head carries out an annual review of all faculty, including probationary, tenured, adjunct, term, and renewable term faculty. See Section 3.11 for a timeline of activities related to the department head’s annual review.

**Paragraph 3.2c.1 Responsibilities**
The department head shall provide the entire department an electronic copy of all official documents utilized in the evaluation process at the beginning of the academic year. These documents include the **“Faculty Handbook,”** **“Departmental Standards and Criteria Document”** and **“Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document.”** In addition, the department head will distribute a memo requesting nominations or self-nominations for promotion and/or tenure by the end of the fall semester 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 office hours in a timely fashion and that all materials remain in the office.

**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 alignment 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. The CRC also receives the dean’s annual report on the allocation of faculty ratings and merit for oversight purposes.
Subdivision 3.2e Deans
Each dean will conduct an independent review of faculty. They examine the faculty evaluation portfolio, Probationary Summary Cover Sheet, Letter of Offer, Faculty Narrative, Statement of Teaching/Librarianship Philosophy, PAC evaluation letter, PAC minority letter (if present), Department Head evaluation letter, external letters (if available or required by the PAC or department), and current Curriculum Vitae. The dean provides a recommendation to the provost. Deans will provide specific written rationale when evaluative decision is contrary to both department head and PACs recommendations.

Paragraph 3.2e.1 Reporting
Deans shall report to the CRC and faculty leadership every fall a summary of how many faculty received each evaluation rating (i.e., meets, exceeds or fails to 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 faculty. The provost will examine the Probationary Summary Cover Sheet, Letter of Offer, Faculty Narrative, Statement of Teaching/Librarianship Philosophy), PAC evaluation letter, PAC minority letter (if present), Department Head evaluation letter, external letters (if available or required by the PAC or department), and current Curriculum Vitae. The provost provides a recommendation to the Board of Regents. 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 promotion decisions.

Section 3.3 Conflicts of Interest
Conflicts of interest shall be avoided in professional assessment of faculty members by the Professional Assessment Committee (PAC) and administrators.

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. Individuals who have filed or had filed against them a formal complaint, such as through OCEM, faculty petition, faculty grievance, or legal action, are automatically excluded from the evaluation of the respective person for which the complaint was filed. Individuals are automatically excluded from evaluating faculty with whom they have currently or previously engaged in legal action. While it is not possible to define all potential conflicts of interests, examples include individuals connected to the evaluatee by blood, family, domestic partnership, romantic, or sexual relationships should recuse themselves from the PAC or
department head review. In the case of the recusal of a department head, reviews shall be conducted by an associate dean or the next academic administrator in rank. Such conflicts of interest should be reported to the Associate Provost for Faculty.

Section 3.5 Evaluation Files

An evaluation file 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 areas of teaching, research/scholarly/creative activity, and service. 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 3.5a Evaluation File Access

The file shall be located and secured in the departmental office or in a protected electronic faculty portal with controlled access. 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 included within the file. Departments 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.

Subdivision 3.5b Evaluation File 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 3.5b.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 (with bibliographic listing of publications, presentations, scholarly activities, and creative activities)
E. Faculty Narrative Letter (see Section 3.11)
F. Annual Faculty Activity Reports (FAR)
G. MOUs Related to Course Reassignments, Differentiated Portfolios, and Modified Duties
H. Clock Suspension or Extension Documentation (signed cover sheet with personal information removed; suspension & clock stoppage), available in the Forms Repository: Faculty Request to Suspend the Probationary Tenure/Promotion Clock or Faculty Request to Extend the Probationary Period for a Seventh Year (see Paragraph 3.1421)

2 There are no separate “PAC Files.”
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
N. Statement of Teaching/Librarianship Philosophy (optional)

Paragraph 3.5b.2 Evidence of Teaching or Librarianship
A. Statement of Teaching/Librarianship Philosophy (optional)
B. Teaching Artifacts (syllabi, sample assignments or exams, as specified in
   Departmental Standards and Criteria)
C. Student Assessment Results (required)
D. Teaching Awards or Nominations received
E. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness

Paragraph 3.5b.3 Evidence of Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity
A. Research Agenda (may be optional or required)
B. Peer-Reviewed Publications/Products
C. Documentation of Peer Review (e.g., acceptance letter, MOU with PAC for
   peer-review process)
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 research/scholarship/creative activity

Paragraph 3.5b.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 3.5b.5 Supplemental and Other Materials
A. Supplemental Files
B. Thank you letters
C. Miscellaneous
D. Outdated Files
Subdivision 3.5c 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 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 3.5d 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 3.5e Faculty Member Review

Each Faculty Member shall have the right to review the contents of her/his evaluation file during regular working hours, or at such other time as mutually agreed upon with the Department Head. The faculty member may scan or copy their file upon request.

Subdivision 3.5f 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 working hours in the departmental office or in the faculty member’s office as documented in the PAC Procedures document, 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 business day.

Subdivision 3.5g Materials Removal Upon the End of Employment at UNI

Faculty may request back their original materials, such as books, upon the end of employment in writing to the department head. Removal of specific materials must be documented in writing.

Subdivision 3.5h Maintaining Copies

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

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.

**Paragraph 3.6d.4 Bias against Protected Classes**
Comments regarding faculty member’s status in a protected class shall be disregarded.

**Paragraph 3.6d.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 available.

**Subdivision 3.6e Required Component: Teaching Philosophy**
All faculty members shall develop a statement of teaching philosophy, not to exceed two pages single spaced in no smaller than 11-point font. The teaching philosophy, located in the Evaluation Files, should be updated periodically if the faculty member’s philosophy changes across time.
Subdivision 3.6f Required Component: Syllabi
Faculty submit syllabi with learning outcomes for all classes they are teaching in the beginning of the semester.

Subdivision 3.6g Optional Component: Professional Development
Faculty are encouraged to participate in professional development activities (e.g., UNI Teaching Certificate, SGIDs, Teaching Mentorship, Discipline-based Training/Conferences, Teaching Awards) to enhance their teaching and curriculum development.

Subdivision 3.6h 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 include in the FAR, teaching portfolio or the Evaluation File as evidence of teaching performance.

Section 3.7 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. Faculty shall document their librarianship accomplishments in their portfolio, consisting of departmental 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 3.8 Materials and Methods for Measuring Faculty Performance in Scholarship/ Creative Activity
Scholarship/creative activity 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/Creative Activity effectiveness will be evaluated and documented through multiple methods in order to provide a comprehensive representation of a faculty member's overall performance. Faculty shall document their scholarship/creative activity accomplishments in the FAR (see 3.6b) and in a scholarship portfolio, consisting of departmental required and optional artifacts. Scholarship portfolios shall be succinct and well organized with each component clearly identified or labeled. Faculty may document research accomplishments, appropriate for their discipline, through the submission of a variety of scholarly/creative activity 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/creative activity. Those criteria shall be documented in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document for faculty evaluation.

Subdivision 3.8a Definition of Traditional Peer Review

Traditional peer review of scholarship involves the anonymous review 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 also includes review by jury or equivalent professional organization or disciplinary experts.

Subdivision 3.8b 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 in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document. When peer review by disciplinary experts is intrinsic to the process of disseminating research/scholarship/creative activity 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/creative activity. Examples include but are not limited to receiving a major external grant that underwent peer review, being invited by colleagues to present scholarly or creative work 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, including external confirmation (e.g., copy of the peer-review process as printed on the organization’s website, a letter from the editor inviting a contribution to a book because of one’s expertise).

Subdivision 3.8c Soliciting Peer Review for Scholarship/Creative Activity

Some 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/Creative Activity for Tenured Faculty). In order to recognize these additional forms of scholarship/creative activity 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 to 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 to the PAC chair of disciplinary experts who can assess the scope, quality, and impact of the work.

C. The PAC chair or designee, in consultation with department head and PAC, shall select disciplinary expert(s) from the above list 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 she/he developed, or a PAC chair may solicit feedback from a nonprofit director about the benefits of a program review performed by a faculty member.

Subdivision 3.8d Additional Methods
Departments may develop additional methods for assessing the quality or meaningful impact of scholarship/creative activity. Any such methods must be in the Departmental Standards and Criteria document. Departments may not create review methods which prefer one type of research/scholarship/creative activity over another for tenured faculty.

Section 3.9 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 four of this handbook. Faculty shall document their service accomplishments in a portfolio, consisting of departmental required documentation in the 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-based, 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 3.9a 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 3.10 Oral Communication

The oral communication competence of each member of the faculty shall be evaluated each academic period as prescribed by Iowa law. The university shall implement this policy.

Section 3.11 Faculty Narrative

Faculty are required to submit a faculty narrative when seeking promotion and/or tenure, and during the year three probationary review. 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/creative activity, 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/creative activity should 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 3.12 University Guiding Standards for Teaching, Librarianship, Scholarship/Creative Activity, 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 align with the University Guiding Standards and methods for measuring as documented in Chapter 3 of this Handbook.

Tables 3.12a, 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/creative activity, 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 3.12a 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><strong>Meets Expectations</strong>³</td>
<td>Teaching reflects rich content knowledge of the discipline.</td>
<td>Teaching reflects rich content knowledge of the discipline.</td>
<td>Teaching reflects rich content knowledge of the discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching fosters critical thinking.</td>
<td>Teaching fosters critical thinking.</td>
<td>Teaching fosters critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicates and provides feedback related to instruction to students in a timely manner</td>
<td>Communicates and provides feedback related to instruction to students in a timely manner</td>
<td>Communicates and provides feedback related to instruction to students in a timely manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional design and delivery contribute to course and program objectives, goals, and/or outcomes.</td>
<td>Instructional design and delivery contribute to course and program objectives, goals, and/or outcomes.</td>
<td>Instructional design and delivery contribute to course and program objectives, goals, and/or outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course syllabi provide clear and comprehensive information about the course, structure, evaluation methods and course-level student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Course syllabi provide clear and comprehensive information about the course, structure, and evaluation methods, and course-level student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Course syllabi provide clear and comprehensive information about the course, structure, and evaluation methods, and course-level student learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>Assignments and/or activities used for assessing student work (e.g., projects, exams) contribute to course and program learning goals or outcomes.</td>
<td>Assignments and/or activities used for assessing student work (e.g., projects, exams) contribute to course and program learning goals or outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active and meaningful participation in faculty development regarding teaching or learning (e.g., staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, CETL workshops).</td>
<td>Active and meaningful participation in faculty development regarding teaching or learning (e.g., staying abreast of the literature, conferencing, CETL workshops).</td>
<td>Active and meaningful participation in faculty development, which contributes substantially to teaching practices (e.g., staying abreast of the literature,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ 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.
| Meets Expectations Cont. | Thoughtful self-assessment and reflection on teaching which inform teaching practice.\(^4\) | Thoughtful self-assessment and reflection on teaching which inform teaching practice.\(^2\) | conferencing, CETL workshops).  
Sustained self-assessment and reflection on teaching inform teaching practice and improved teaching and learning.\(^2\)  
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\(^5\) | 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 pedagogy within the field or university. | 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 pedagogy within the field or university. | 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.  
Widespread adoption of teaching curriculum or pedagogy out in the field. |

\(^4\) See Paragraph 3.6d.2 Faculty Reflection for details.  
\(^5\) This list provides examples of performance that exceeds expectations. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Exceeds Expectations Cont.</strong></th>
<th>Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary recognition for teaching excellence or contribution to teaching or curriculum.</th>
<th>Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary recognition for teaching excellence or contribution to teaching or curriculum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Widespread adoption</strong></td>
<td>Widespread adoption of teaching curriculum or pedagogy out in the field.</td>
<td>Widespread adoption of teaching curriculum or pedagogy out in the field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Needs Improvement</strong>&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Excessive class cancellations or late arrivals.</th>
<th>Excessive class cancellations or late arrivals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional design, delivery, or assessment of student work is weak, misaligned with course/program objectives, does not deliver content knowledge, or does not foster critical thinking.</td>
<td>Instructional design, delivery, or assessment of student work is weak, misaligned with course/program objectives, does not deliver content knowledge, or does not foster critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.</td>
<td>No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No or inadequate syllabi.</td>
<td>No or inadequate syllabi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not participate in faculty development related to teaching or learning, or does not use it to inform meaningful pedagogical practices.</td>
<td>Does not participate in faculty development related to teaching or learning, or does not use it to inform meaningful pedagogical practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not demonstrate leadership regarding curriculum, teaching, or learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not demonstrate leadership regarding curriculum, teaching, or learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No innovation or experimentation in teaching practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>6</sup> This list provides examples of performance that needs improvement. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs Improvement Cont.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Does not engage with the scholarship of teaching and learning or best practices.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Approved by FHC 9/28/18)

### Table 3.12b University Guiding Standards: Scholarship/Creative Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>Reflects a rich knowledge of one’s field. Demonstrates methodological, intellectual, or creative rigor. Demonstrates intellectual or creative independence. Demonstrates regular and sustained productivity, which has undergone traditional peer review (and/or other forms of peer review as appropriate to the field). Makes a meaningful contribution or impact through discovery (and/or integration or application as appropriate to the field).</td>
<td>Reflects a rich knowledge of one’s field. Demonstrates methodological, intellectual, or creative rigor. Demonstrates regular or sustained productivity, which will lead to peer review as defined in Section 3.8. Makes a meaningful contribution or impact through discovery, integration, or application.</td>
<td>Stays abreast of developments within one’s field. Uses scholarship by self or others to inform teaching. 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 one’s field.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

8 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.

10 Traditional peer review and other forms of peer review are defined in Section 3.8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Expectations&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt; Cont.</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Needs Improvement&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</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><strong>Substantial collaboration with students</strong>, which results in peer-reviewed products (e.g., articles, conference presentations, exhibits, performances).</td>
<td>Peer review does not meet criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Securing a major competitive <strong>grant</strong>.</td>
<td>Lacks rigor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publishing or performing in a very highly regarded venue or with major, lasting impact to the field.</td>
<td>No or too few peer-reviewed products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely high or extensive scholarly or creative output.</td>
<td><strong>Substantial collaboration with students</strong>, which results in peer-reviewed products (e.g., articles, conference presentations, exhibits, performances).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receives substantial national peer or disciplinary <strong>recognition</strong> for scholarly/creative contribution.</td>
<td>Peer review does not meet criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Substantial collaboration with students</strong>, which results in peer-reviewed products (e.g., articles, conference presentations, exhibits, performances).</td>
<td>Lacks rigor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Securing a major competitive <strong>grant</strong>.</td>
<td>No or too few peer-reviewed products.&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publishing or performing in a very highly regarded venue or with major, lasting impact to the field, university, or community.</td>
<td><strong>Substantial scholarly/creative collaboration with students.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely high or extensive scholarly or creative output.</td>
<td>Demonstrates regular or sustained productivity, which has undergone peer review as defined in Section 3.8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receives substantial national peer, disciplinary, or community <strong>recognition</strong> for scholarly/creative contribution.</td>
<td>Receives peer, disciplinary, university, or community <strong>recognition</strong> for scholarly/creative contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Routine or sustained</strong> scholarly or creative output.</td>
<td><strong>Routine or sustained</strong> scholarly or creative output.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>9</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>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 needs improvement. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.

<sup>13</sup> All forms of peer review are available to tenured faculty. See Section ##.
Needs Improvement cont.

- Found to have engaged in research misconduct.
- Does not demonstrate any intellectual or creative independence.
- Substandard quality.

- Found to have engaged in research misconduct.
- Substandard quality.

Teaching is not informed by scholarship.

No engagement with scholarship/creative activity.

(Approved by FHC 9/28/18)

Table 3.12c University Guiding Standards: Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Expectations¹⁵</th>
<th>Term, Renewable Term, or Adjunct¹⁴ 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>Active participation in service to the department, as specified in offer letter.</td>
<td>Active participation in service to the department. For term, renewable term, and adjuncts, as specified in offer letter.</td>
<td>Active participation in service to the department.</td>
<td>Active participation in service to the department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active participation in service to the college, university, discipline, or broader community, as specified in offer letter.</td>
<td>Active participation in service to the college, university, discipline, or broader community. For term, renewable term, and adjuncts, as specified in offer letter.</td>
<td>Active participation in service to the college, university, discipline, or broader community.</td>
<td>Active participation in service to the college, university, discipline, or broader community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful contributions to processes or products of service.</td>
<td>Meaningful contributions to processes or products of service.</td>
<td>Meaningful contributions to processes or products of service.</td>
<td>Meaningful contributions to processes or products of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations align with workload, including specially assigned differentiated portfolios (e.g., course reassignments for service).</td>
<td>Service growth over the course of the probationary period for faculty with reduced service expectations at the beginning.</td>
<td>Demonstrates leadership in service.</td>
<td>Demonstrates leadership in service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁴ As specified in contract.

¹⁵ 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>Meets Expectations cont.</th>
<th>Expectations align with workload, including specially assigned differentiated portfolios (e.g., course reassignments for service).</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Exceeds Expectations**<sup>16</sup> | Contributing service above or beyond that specified in appointment letter.  
Receives substantial peer, disciplinary, or community recognition for service.  
Meaningful participation in program review and/or student outcome assessment. | Sustained widespread service or extensive service in multiple areas.  
Demonstrates substantial, sustained leadership in service.  
**Critical contributions** to major service projects.  
Substantial mentorship of students or colleagues.  
Receives substantial peer, disciplinary, or community recognition for service.  
Meaningful participation in program review and/or student outcome assessment. |
| **Needs Improvement**<sup>17</sup> | Weak or no constructive service as specified in offer letter. | Weak or not broadly enough participation in service.  
Participation is not active or does not contribute meaningfully.  
Never or rarely demonstrates leadership. |

<sup>16</sup> This list provides examples of performance that exceeds expectations. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.  
<sup>17</sup> This list provides examples of performance that needs improvement. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.
## Table 3.12d University Guiding Standards: Librarianship (for Library Faculty)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Probationary Faculty, Term, Renewable Term, or Temporary Instructors</th>
<th>Tenured Faculty of Any Rank, Lecturers, or Senior Lecturers</th>
<th>Tenured Faculty of Any Rank with an Extended Librarianship Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarianship reflects rich content knowledge of the area of practice (e.g., reference, cataloging, archiving, etc.)</td>
<td>Librarianship reflects rich content knowledge of the area of practice (e.g., reference, cataloging, archiving, etc.)</td>
<td>Librarianship reflects rich content knowledge of the area of practice (e.g., reference, cataloging, archiving, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarianship fosters information literacy, discovery, and/or access.</td>
<td>Librarianship fosters information literacy, discovery, and/or access.</td>
<td>Librarianship fosters information literacy, discovery, and/or access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation and provision of information, resources, and services advances critical thinking, scholarly research, and learning in an evolving information landscape.</td>
<td>Creation and provision of information, resources, and services advances critical thinking, scholarly research, and learning in an evolving information landscape.</td>
<td>Creation and provision of information, resources, and services advances critical thinking, scholarly research, and learning in an evolving information landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities contribute to university and library priorities and goals.</td>
<td>Activities contribute to university and library priorities and goals.</td>
<td>Activities contribute to university and library priorities and goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtful self-assessment and reflection on collections and/or services inform professional practice.</td>
<td>Thoughtful self-assessment and reflection on collections and/or services inform professional practice.</td>
<td>Thoughtful self-assessment and reflection on collections and/or services inform professional practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

18 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meets Expectations&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt; Cont.</th>
<th>Collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners to advance university and library priorities and goals.</th>
<th>Collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners to advance university and library priorities and goals.</th>
<th>Collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners to advance university and library priorities and goals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Collaboration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Collaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with library and university colleagues and community partners to advance university and library priorities and goals.</td>
<td>with library and university colleagues and community partners to advance university and library priorities and goals.</td>
<td>with library and university colleagues and community partners to advance university and library priorities and goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong> in librarianship.</td>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong> in librarianship or faculty development within the discipline.</td>
<td>Sustained engagement with the scholarship of librarianship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustained engagement</strong> with the scholarship of librarianship.</td>
<td><strong>Exceeds Expectations</strong>&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Extensive participation in faculty professional development, which contributes substantially to the practice of librarianship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extensive participation in faculty professional development, which contributes substantially to the practice of librarianship.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Substantial innovation</strong> in areas information literacy, discovery, and/or access.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantial leadership</strong> in area of practice.</td>
<td><strong>Widespread adoption</strong> of librarianship practices out in the field.</td>
<td><strong>Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary recognition</strong> in the practice of librarianship or contribution to the profession.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substantial leadership</strong> in area of practice.</td>
<td><strong>Widespread adoption</strong> of librarianship practices out in the field.</td>
<td><strong>Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary recognition</strong> in the practice of librarianship or contribution to the profession.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Widespread adoption</strong> of librarianship practices out in the field.</td>
<td><strong>Receives substantial student, peer, or disciplinary recognition</strong> in the practice of librarianship or contribution to the profession.</td>
<td><strong>Widespread adoption</strong> of librarianship practices out in the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>19</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>20</sup> This list provides examples of performance that exceeds expectations. It is inclusive but not exhaustive.
Needs Improvement

Librarianship is weak.
Limited fostering of information literacy, discovery, and/or access
Weak contribution to student success, fails to support faculty research, and/or fails to enhance resources and services.
Minimal or no collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners
No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.
Minimal or no participation in faculty professional development.

Librarianship is weak.
Limited fostering of information literacy, discovery, and/or access
Weak contribution to student success, fails to support faculty research, and/or fails to enhance resources and services.
Weak or no collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners
No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.
Minimal or no participation in faculty professional development.

Librarianship is weak.
Limited fostering of information literacy, discovery, and/or access
Weak contribution to student success, fails to support faculty research, and/or fails to enhance resources and services.
Minimal or no collaboration with library and university colleagues and community partners
No or superficial self-assessment or reflection.
Weak or no participation in faculty professional librarianship development.
No faculty development around librarianship.
No leadership around librarianship.
No innovation.
No engagement in the scholarship of librarianship.

Section 3.13 Timeline Overview*

By March 1 - Departments Complete Revisions of Standards and Criteria and 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.

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

April 30 - Request Consideration for Promotion/Promotion & Tenure
1. Faculty must request consideration for seeking Promotion/Promotion & Tenure for the following academic year. [Faculty who request consideration for promotion to full professor may withdraw their request in a letter to the PAC chair(s), department head, dean, and provost, by the following Feb. 5, or the first business day thereafter if it falls on a weekend.]
2. Department Heads notify tenured faculty who will be candidates for post-tenure review in the following academic year.

Sept. 15 - Distribution of Evaluation Standards
On or before September 15 of each year, Department Heads will distribute evaluation standards to all faculty members in their department with an explanation of how faculty will be evaluated on their workload with respect to teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, and service.

By Sept. 25 - Review Department Standards and Criteria
1. PAC chair/s and Department Head shall meet with new PAC members, probationary faculty members, and 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.
2. Deans convene the College Review Committee (CRC), which includes all department heads and PAC chairs, for the purpose of discussion of Departmental Standards and Criteria Document and Professional Assessment Committee Procedures. The discussion should include oversight of standards and procedures, training, 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
Date by which faculty members (renewable term, probationary, candidates for tenure and promotion, and candidates for post-tenure review) must submit/organize materials for the professional assessment file. (Professional assessment file not required of new fall hires in first year, but they are still observed by PAC.)

September-November (as determined by department PACs) - Peer Observations
1. PAC conducts peer teaching observations of probationary faculty, renewable term, 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 (or the first business day thereafter, if the 15th falls on a weekend).

Mid-January - Dean’s Retreat
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.

Feb. 5 - Withdrawal from Consideration
Faculty who request consideration for promotion to full professor may withdraw their request in a letter to the PAC chair(s), department head, dean, and provost, by the following Feb. 5, or the first business day thereafter if it falls on a weekend.

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.

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.

Spring - Department Heads Meet with Faculty
During the Spring 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.
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 any faculty members not already reviewed in Feb. 1 annual letters, 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 faculty members of salary statement.

* for all dates on timeline, if the date falls on a weekend, it shall be alternately on the first business day thereafter
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>BY STUDENTS</th>
<th>BY DEPARTMENT HEAD</th>
<th>BY PAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Review</td>
<td>Review for Promotion or Tenure, as applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Tenure Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Instructor</td>
<td>Every class, every semester</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Every class once a year&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>Every class once a year&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary TT Faculty of Any Rank</td>
<td>Every class, every semester</td>
<td>Yes, extensive in year 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty of Any Rank</td>
<td>Every class once a year&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>22</sup> Includes merit designations

<sup>23</sup> 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. See Subdivision 3.6
Section 3.14 Annual Review for All Faculty by Department Head

Subdivision 3.14a 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 3.14b Eligibility for Annual Review
Department heads shall annually evaluate the teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and professional 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 (fall, spring, summer).

Subdivision 3.14c Conflicts of Interest
Department heads shall recuse themselves from reviewing faculty with whom they have a conflict of interest in adherence to Section 3.3.

Subdivision 3.14d Timeline for Annual Review
The annual review process follows the timeline in Section 3.11.

Subdivision 3.14e Standards and Criteria for Annual Review
University Guiding Standards and Principles are found in 3.10. Specific criteria for annual review are documented in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document (see 3.16).

Subdivision 3.14f Annual Meeting with Department Head
During the fall semester, the department head shall have individual meetings with all faculty members. The purpose of the 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 3.14g 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 (teaching24, scholarship/creative activity, service), according to the criteria by portfolio and rank as specified in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document.

Subdivision 3.14h Outcomes for Retention/Continuance of Probationary, Renewable Term, Term, and Adjunct Faculty

---

24 Hereafter, “teaching” represents “teaching or librarianship” as appropriate.
Paragraph 3.14h.1 Continued Probation
Department Heads shall recommend Continued Probation 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 3.14h.2 Continued Probation With Difficulties
Department Heads 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, 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 the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning for teaching improvement plans. Mentoring by faculty peers is strongly recommended for research and service improvement plans.

Paragraph 3.14h.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, Department Head 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 3.14i Third Year Review for Probationary Faculty
Department heads provide a comprehensive review of probationary faculty member’s performance to date in year three.

Subdivision 3.14j Outcomes for Promotion and/or Tenure
For promotion and/or tenure cases, Department Heads shall recommend (a) Promotion or (b) Deny Promotion and/or (c) Support Tenure or (d) Deny Tenure, as appropriate for the case. Department Heads shall provide a thorough rationale for their decisions in the evaluation letter.

Subdivision 3.14k Outcomes for Full Review of Tenured Faculty
Department Heads shall assign a rating of (a) meets expectations, (b) exceeds expectations, or (c) needs improvement for each area of performance (teaching).

25 Hereafter, “teaching” represents “teaching or librarianship” as appropriate.
scholarship/creative activity, service), according to the criteria by portfolio and rank as specified in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document.

Subdivision 3.14l 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/creative activity, and service according to the faculty member’s designated workload or contract. Letters are recommended to be 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 improvements made in teaching and learning over time. Assessments of scholarship/creative activity 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 3.14g (outcomes for all), 3.14h (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 letters shall be transmitted concurrently to the Dean and faculty member and shall be placed in the evaluation file.

Subdivision 3.14m 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 in July.

Paragraph 3.14m.1 Eligibility for Merit

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

Paragraph 3.14m.2 Merit Formula

The department head shall calculate a merit score for each faculty member based on his/her workload and performance. Department heads shall assign half points up to a maximum of 2 points for each area of performance (teaching, research/creative activity, service). Then, they multiply each designation by the percentage of workload for that area, according to the faculty member’s workload assignment. The department head will add the score for each area to determine the Faculty Member’s Merit Score for each faculty member.
Merit Calculation Summary:

Exceeds expectations= 2 the percentage
Meets expectations= 0.5, 1.0, or 1.5 x of workload
Needs improvement= 0 for each area

Faculty Member’s Merit Score = Teaching rating x teaching workload percentage + Scholarship/Creative Activity rating x Scholarship/Creative Activity workload percentage times + Service rating x Service workload percentage

Only faculty who receive a 0.5 or higher and no 0 ratings will receive merit pay in a given year. The total amount allocated for university merit pay is divided by the total number of points for all faculty (ranging from 0 to 2 for each faculty member). The quotient is how much each point is worth. For each faculty merit award, multiply each point worth times number of points awarded.

Individual faculty member annual merit = total funds available x (Faculty Member’s Merit Score / Total of all Faculty Members’ Merit Scores).

Section 3.15 Review by PAC

Subdivision 3.15a 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 performance are documented in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document (Section 3.1f) and the University Guiding Standards (see Section 3.12).

26 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 load with designations of meeting expectations for teaching and service and exceeds expectations for scholarship:
1 x .6 (for teaching) + 2 x .25 (for scholarship/c.a.) + 1 x .15 (for service) = 1.25

For a term faculty member who meets expectations in all areas and teaches and performs service 15% of the time:
1 x .85 + 1 x .15 = 1

For a faculty member who has a course reassignment to do service:
1 x .40 + 1 x .25 + 1.5 x .35 = 1.175
Subdivision 3.15b Eligibility for Review
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 year six or sooner as decided by the PAC and documented in the Professional Assessment Committee Procedures document. They also review lecturers and senior lecturers in year 6. PACs provide comprehensive, multi-year reviews for all tenure or promotion cases, regardless of faculty rank or appointment.

Paragraph 3.15b.1 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 3.17f), 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 3.17e).

Subdivision 3.15c 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 3.15c.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 3.15c.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 3.15c.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 3.15c.4 Timeline for Review**
The review process follows the timeline in Section 3.11.

**Paragraph 3.15c.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 3.15c.6 Requesting Outside Members**
PACs may choose to invite outside members to serve on the PAC to review a specific case when additional expertise is necessary to make an informed decision.

**Paragraph 3.15c.7 Procedures for Reviewing Files**
See Subdivision 3.5e.

**Paragraph 3.15c.8 Additional Procedures**
PACs shall document any additional procedures according to Subdivision 3.1g Professional Assessment Committee Procedures Document.

**Subdivision 3.15d Standards and Criteria for Review**
University Guiding Standards and Principles are found in Section 3.10. Specific criteria for review are documented in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document (see Section 3.16).

**Subdivision 3.15e Outcomes of Annual Review for Faculty**
An annual evaluation will be based on performance in the preceding academic year (fall, spring, summer). For annual reviews of probationary faculty, PACs shall assign a rating of (a) meets expectations, (b) exceeds expectations, or (c) needs improvement for each area of performance (teaching, scholarship/creative activity, 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 3.15f Outcomes for Retention/Continuance of Probationary, Renewable Term, Term, and Adjunct Instructors**
For probationary faculty and renewable term, term, and adjunct instructors, PACs shall recommend (a) Continued Probation, (b) Continued Probation with Difficulties, (c) Termination, or (d) Abstain. PACs shall provide a thorough rationale for their decisions in the PAC report.

**Paragraph 3.15f.1 Continued Probation**

---

27 Hereafter, “teaching” represents “teaching or librarianship” as appropriate.
PACs shall recommend Continued Probation 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 PAC report shall state perceived strengths and any areas where improvement is needed.

**Paragraph 3.15f.2 Continued Probation With Difficulties**
PACs shall recommend Continued Probation with Difficulties if the faculty member does not meet expectations in one or more of the areas under review. The PAC 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 the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning for teaching improvement plans. Mentoring by faculty peers is strongly recommended for research and service improvement plans.

**Paragraph 3.15f.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, 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 3.15g Third Year Review for Probationary Faculty**
PACs provide a comprehensive review of probationary faculty member’s performance to date in year three.

**Subdivision 3.15h Outcomes for Promotion and/or Tenure**
For promotion and/or tenure cases, 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. PACs shall provide a thorough rationale for their decisions in the PAC report.

**Subdivision 3.15i 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/creative activity, 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.

---

28 Hereafter, “teaching” represents “teaching or librarianship” as appropriate.
Subdivision 3.15j 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 3.226).

PAC reports will include a summary of the assessment of the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service according to the faculty member’s designated workload or contract. Letters are recommended to be 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/creative activity 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 3.15g (annual outcomes), 3.15h (retention/continuance), and 3.15i (promotion or tenure). The letters shall also specify the annual merit designations for each area of performance, according to Subdivision 3.15j.

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

Paragraph 3.15j.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 3.15k 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 3.16 Promotion and/or Tenure of Probationary and Tenured Faculty

Subdivision 3.16a Eligibility for Promotion and/or Tenure

Probationary faculty are eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and tenure. 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 faculty are eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.
Paragraph 3.16a.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.29

Paragraph 3.16a.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 and service.

Paragraph 3.16a.3 Years Credit
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.

Subdivision 3.16b Materials Submission
Faculty submit a Faculty Activity Report, Faculty Narrative, and other evaluation materials for their evaluation files, according to Subdivisions 3.5 - 3.10.30

Subdivision 3.16c Timeline
Materials for the evaluation files for individuals seeking promotion and/or tenure are due on October 15. Faculty shall adhere to the timeline described in Section 3.13.

29 https://java.access.uni.edu/FormsRepository/faces/formList.jspx#F
30 See Subdivisions 3.2e (Deans) and 3.2f (Provosts) regarding which file materials get submitted to the Deans and Provost.
Subdivision 3.16d. 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 3.16d 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 3.17 Review of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)

Subdivision 3.17a 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 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 AAUP principles of academic freedom.

Subdivision 3.17b 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 3.17c Post-Tenure Review Process**

The annual review process is the foundation of post-tenure review. As described in Section 3.14, 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 3.13) and Departmental Standards and Criteria Document (Subdivision 3.1f).

**Subdivision 3.17d 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 3.17d.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 3.17d.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 3.17e 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 3.17e.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 3.17e.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 3.17.e.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 ask the faculty member to develop a Performance Improvement Plan in order to strengthen performance in future annual reviews.

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 3.17e.4 Sanctions

In extremely rare cases, sanctions, up to and including termination, may be levied due to poor performance that is both persistent and unresponsive. If
sanctions are invoked, it must be done in strict accordance with Faculty Handbook procedures and university Policies and Procedures.

**Paragraph 3.17e.5 Appeals**
A faculty member may file a faculty petition to appeal a review’s findings according the procedures in Chapter 11 of the Faculty Handbook. Sanctions levied due to poor performance that is both persistent and unresponsive may also be appealed via this mechanism. Termination decisions may be appealed according the procedures in Chapter 12 of the Faculty Handbook.

**Subdivision 3.17f 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 3.17g 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.

**Subdivision 3.17h 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 3.17i 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 3.18 Review and Promotion of Adjunct, Term, Renewable Term Faculty**

**Subdivision 3.18a 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 habits necessary for productive citizenship. Thus, in carrying out the responsibilities set
forth in their workload, adjunct, term, renewable term faculty members are expected to meet the high professional standards. 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 exists for adjunct, term, and renewable term faculty.

**Subdivision 3.18b Appointment Types**
Faculty members holding one of the three Instructor ranks defined below in Subdivision 3.18c may have different appointments types. These include: (i) Temporary Adjuncts, (ii) Term, and (iii) Renewable Term. 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 3.18c Review of Adjunct, Term, and Renewable Term Faculty**
Instructors (level 1), Lecturers (level 2), and Senior Lecturers (level 3) shall be evaluated annually by the department head (see Section 3.14 Annual Review for All Faculty by Department Head). PACs review each faculty member in year 6, when seeking promotion, or more frequently as documented in the Professional Assessment Committee PAC Procedures Document (Subdivision 3.1g) (see Section 3.15 Review by PAC).

**Paragraph 3.18c.1 Materials Submission**
Faculty submit a Faculty Activity Report, Faculty Narrative, and other evaluation materials for their evaluation files, according to Sections 3.5 - 3.10.31

**Paragraph 3.18c.2 Timeline**
The Faculty Activity Report and other evaluation materials for the evaluation files are due October 15. Faculty shall adhere to the timeline described in Section 3.13.

**Paragraph 3.18c.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 3.12. Criteria for individual departments are found in the Departmental Standards and Criteria Document (Subdivision 3.1f).

---

31 See Subdivisions 3.2e (Deans) and 3.2f (Provosts) regarding which file materials get submitted to the Deans and Provost.
Subdivision 3.18d Promotion
Adjunct, Term, and Renewable Term Faculty in the collective bargaining unit are eligible for promotion every six years 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 3.18d.1 Promotion Salaries
Upon promotion to Lecturer or Senior Lecturer, faculty members shall receive salary increases to base pay as specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Paragraph 3.18d.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 3.19 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 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 be 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.
Name of Department __________________________________________
Academic Year:  2019-2020
Date of Revision _______________________

TEACHING CRITERIA* (annual)

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

*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></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)
### SERVICE CRITERIA* (annual)

<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>

- **Ranks:**
  - 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)*
**Summary of Service Criteria**: Expectations for Cumulative Reviews (6 years) for Promotion and Tenure; Promotion, and Post-tenure Review:

<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 Professors</td>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>Tenured Faculty (all ranks)</td>
</tr>
<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)*
<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></td>
<td>Term, Renewable Term, or Temporary Instructors</td>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Senior Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td>RATINGS:</td>
<td>RANKS:</td>
<td>TEACHING PORTFOLIO:</td>
<td>RESEARCH/SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES (if present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Term, Renewable Term, or</td>
<td>Lecturers</td>
<td>Criteria to be defined in offer or annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation letters according to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>individualized portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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 3.13) – (see abbreviated version below).

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.

The abbreviated timeline is to be utilized to assist PACs with deadlines (see Appendix C).
APPENDIX C: Abbreviated Timeline (see Section 3.11 Timeline Overview)

SPRING SEMESTER I

By March 1 - Departments Complete Revisions of Standards and Criteria and 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.

April 30 - Request Consideration for Promotion/Promotion & Tenure

1. Faculty must request consideration for seeking Promotion/Promotion & Tenure for the following academic year.
2. Department Heads notify tenured faculty who will be candidates for post-tenure review in the following academic year.

FALL SEMESTER

Sept. 15 - Distribution of Evaluation Standards

On or before September 15 of each year, Department Heads will distribute evaluation standards to all faculty members in their department with an explanation of how faculty will be evaluated on their workload with respect to teaching, research/scholarship/creative work, and service.

By Sept. 25 - Review Department Standards and Criteria

1. PAC chair/s and Department Head shall meet with new PAC members, probationary faculty members, and 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.
2. Deans convene the College Review Committee (CRC), which includes all department heads and PAC chairs, for the purpose of discussion of Departmental
Standards and Criteria Document and Professional Assessment Committee Procedures.

Oct. 15 - Deadline for Submission of Assessment Materials
Date by which faculty members (renewable term, probationary, candidates for tenure and promotion, and candidates for post-tenure review) must submit/organize materials for the professional assessment file. (Professional assessment file not required of new fall hires in first year, but they are still observed by PAC.)

September-November (as determined by department PACs) - Peer Observations
1. PAC conducts peer teaching observations of probationary faculty, renewable term, 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 (or the first business day thereafter, if the 15th falls on a weekend).

SPRING SEMESTER II

Mid-January - Dean’s Retreat
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.

Feb. 5 - Withdrawal from Consideration
Faculty who request consideration for promotion to full professor may withdraw their request in a letter to the PAC chair(s), department head, dean, and provost, by the following Feb. 5, or the first business day thereafter if it falls on a weekend.

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.

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.

Spring - Department Heads Meet with Faculty
During the Spring 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.

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 any faculty members not already reviewed in Feb. 1 annual letters, 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 faculty members of salary statement.

* for all dates on timeline, if the date falls on a weekend, it shall be alternately on the first business day thereafter
Section 1.0
APPENDIX D: Sample Teaching Observation Forms
APPENDIX E: Grandfathering Plan for Post Tenure-Review and Promotion for Contingent 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>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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tenured in 2014-2016</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty tenured in 2017 or after</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>New standards and criteria</td>
<td>Year 6 or later after tenure</td>
<td>New standards and criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct and Renewable Term Faculty hired prior to fall 2013</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>New standards and criteria</td>
<td>Most senior faculty first starting in 2022</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<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>
</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.