

APPENDIX VIII – UNIT CRITERIA AND UNIVERSITY STANDARDS

A8.1

Unit Criteria are departmental performance indicators that are used for administrative reviews of all faculty, tenure and/or promotion, and post-tenure review of tenure-track and tenured faculty, and contract renewals, and promotions of instructors and clinical faculty.

Each Unit will develop its criteria according to its accreditation, unit expectations, and discipline standards while remaining aligned with the university, mission statement, employment responsibilities as outlined in Chapter 4 of the *Faculty Manual*, and university standards of evaluation for employee retention and advancement.

University Standards: establish an overall basis for tenure and/or promotion, or satisfactory post-tenure by defining which evaluative terms are acceptable for positive administrative action. Performance indicators of the unit criteria are aligned with the evaluative terms.

- A. Unit criteria should be aligned with the university's evaluative terms for review.
 1. Excellent
 2. Highly effective
 3. Effective
 4. Less than Effective
 5. Ineffective

- B. *Unit criteria should address three categories of faculty work.*
 1. Teaching/Librarianship
 2. Scholarship (scholarly and creative pursuits)
 3. Service (Unit, University, profession, and community)

- C. Unit Criteria for tenure and/or promotion, and post-tenure review. Unit criteria should indicate appropriate activity levels and define the evidence to support promotion at each of the levels below, and/or tenure based on rank eligibility. Unit criteria for post-tenure review must indicate define evidence and appropriate activity levels that meet university standards to justify a favorable review.
 1. Tenure
 2. Associate Professor/Librarian
 3. Professor/Librarian
 4. Post-tenure

- D. Unit Criteria for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review must meet the following additional conditions:
 1. Criteria must specify how faculty can demonstrate that they have met the University's standards for promotion and tenure, and post-tenure, including specific examples of appropriate evidence.
 2. Criteria should be internally consistent and consistent with the university and state rules and laws.
 3. Criteria should closely relate to the appropriate department/school, program, college, and university mission.
 4. Criteria should be realistic, such that they can be achieved by talented and dedicated faculty within the constraints of available and attainable resources. Faculty should consider ways to mitigate different emphases in performance that may reflect both personal interests and departmental needs.
 5. Criteria should be easily understood by those in the academic community who will employ

them in making judgments. They should be equally clear to those who will be evaluated by the criteria.

6. Criteria should be as complete and explicit as possible, addressing the broadest possible range of activities to which faculty can be assigned and on which they can be evaluated.
7. Criteria should be fair, providing all faculty with equal opportunity to be objectively judged on their accomplishments.
8. Learning Evaluation Surveys (formally SOPs) are a criterion, please consider including this statement: "When considering student opinion polls, the peer review committee will acknowledge that biases may exist in student evaluations based on, but not limited to, sex, race, sexual orientation, and content rigor, and that these biases are established in the academic literature."
9. No Item Counts Twice. Some activities may qualify as two activities. Unit criteria should make clear that the candidate must present evidence under only one area of assessment.

A8.2 Unit Criteria for Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Unit criteria for non-tenure track faculty should align with the duties of their position.

- A. Unit criteria should be aligned with the university's evaluative terms for review.
 1. Excellent
 2. Highly effective
 3. Effective
 4. Less than Effective
 5. Ineffective
- B. Unit criteria should address three categories of faculty work.
 1. Teaching/Librarianship
 2. Scholarship (scholarly and creative pursuits)
 3. Service (Unit, University, profession, and community)
- C. Unit criteria for professional track faculty should indicate appropriate activity levels and define the evidence to support contract renewal and/or promotion based on eligibility.
 1. Criteria must specify how faculty can demonstrate that they have met the University's standards for contract renewal and/or promotion, including specific examples of appropriate evidence.
 2. Criteria should be internally consistent and consistent with the university and state rules and laws.
 3. Criteria should closely relate to the appropriate department, program, college, and university mission.
 4. Criteria should be realistic, such that they can be achieved by talented and dedicated faculty within the constraints of available and attainable resources.
 5. Criteria should be easily understood by those in the academic community who will employ them in making judgments. They should be equally clear to those who will be evaluated by the criteria.
 6. Criteria should be as complete and explicit as possible, addressing the broadest possible range of activities to which faculty can be assigned and on which they can be evaluated.
 7. Criteria should be fair, providing all faculty with equal opportunity to be objectively judged on their accomplishments.
 8. Learning Evaluation Surveys (formally SOPs) are a criterion, please consider including this statement: "When considering student opinion polls, the peer review committee will acknowledge that biases may exist in student evaluations based on,

but not limited to, sex, race, sexual orientation, and content rigor, and that these biases are established in the academic literature.”

- D. Unit Criteria for professional track faculty contract renewal or promotion must meet the following additional conditions:
1. Criteria must specify how faculty can demonstrate that they have met the University's standards and performance indicators for contract renewal or promotion, including specific examples of appropriate evidence.
 2. Criteria should be internally consistent and consistent with the university and state rules and laws.
 3. Criteria should closely relate to the appropriate department/school, program, college, and university mission.
 4. Criteria should be realistic, such that they can be achieved by talented and dedicated faculty within the constraints of available and attainable resources. They should consider ways to mitigate different emphases in performance that may reflect both personal interests and departmental needs.
 5. Criteria should be easily understood by those in the academic community who will employ them in making judgments. They should be equally clear to those who will be evaluated by the criteria. The criteria must align with the expectation that professional track faculty are required to be evaluated in teaching and either scholarship or service.
 6. Criteria should be as complete and explicit as possible, addressing the broadest possible range of activities to which faculty can be assigned and on which they can be evaluated.
 7. Criteria should be fair, providing all faculty with equal opportunity to be objectively judged on their accomplishments.
 8. Learning Evaluation Surveys (formally SOPs) are a criterion, please consider including this statement: “When considering student opinion polls, the peer review committee will acknowledge that biases may exist in student evaluations based on, but not limited to, sex, race, sexual orientation, and content rigor, and that these biases are established in the academic literature.”

A8.3 Process for Changing Criteria: Unit criteria are faculty-driven, specific to the discipline(s) represented within the unit and are therefore approved primarily by the appropriate faculty members within the unit. Tenure-track criteria are approved by the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Professional track faculty criteria are approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee.

A. Drafting and modifying the college/unit criteria

1. Only Tenured and Tenure-track faculty are responsible for developing Unit Criteria applicable to tenure and promotion. For criteria for professional track faculty the committee must include professional track faculty and may include tenure-track or tenured faculty if there are insufficient instructors in the unit to comprise a committee.
2. Units may use the Peer Review Committee for tenure track criteria or may establish a Unit Criteria Committee for composing a draft of both documents and submitting them to eligible members (i.e. only tenured and tenure-track in the case of criteria for tenure/promotion) of the department/unit for consideration. The criteria should be derived from a clearly-stated unit mission that aligns with the college and university missions.
3. Eligible faculty review, make recommendations, and approve a draft of the unit criteria at the departmental/unit level.

B. Chain of Approval

1. P&T committee

- i. For tenure and promotion criteria, the unit submits this draft of unit criteria to the P&T Committee.
- ii. The Promotion and Tenure Committee evaluates the proposed criteria to ensure they are consistent with the *Faculty Manual* and are sufficiently clear. The Promotion and Tenure Committee approves the criteria and forwards them to the provost for review.
- iii. If the Promotion and Tenure Committee observe deficiencies in this draft, the proposal will be returned to the Unit with an explanation and suggested changes. The chair of P&T works with unit representative on appropriate improvements.
- iv. The Unit will revise its proposed criteria and resubmit them to the P& T Committee.
- v. If the Unit and the P&T Committee cannot reach an agreement, the chair of the P&T Committee will convene a meeting with the Unit and selected members of the P&T Committee to resolve the issues. If there continues to be unresolved aspects of the unit criteria, the provost will endeavor to resolve the differences.

2. Faculty Advisory

- i. For non-tenure track criteria, the department submits this draft of Unit Criteria to the Faculty Chair for consideration by the Faculty Advisory Committee.
 - ii. The Faculty Advisory Committee evaluates the proposed criteria to ensure they are consistent with the *Faculty Manual* and are sufficiently clear, The Faculty Advisory Committee approves the criteria and forwards them to the provost for review.
 - iii. If the Faculty Advisory Committee observes deficiencies in this draft, the proposal will be returned to the Unit with an explanation and suggested changes. The faculty chair works with unit representative on appropriate improvements.
 - iv. The unit will revise its proposed criteria and resubmit them to the Faculty Advisory Committee.
 - v. If the department and the Faculty Advisory Committee cannot reach an agreement, the faculty chair will convene a meeting with the Unit and selected members of the Faculty Advisory Committee to resolve the issues. If there continues to be unresolved aspects of the unit criteria, the provost will endeavor to resolve the differences.
3. Provost reviews and approves or returns to the Unit for additional changes.
 4. Once approved, the Unit Criteria will note the date of approval and will be published on the P&T and faculty reviews documents site..

C. Implementation and Review

1. All approved unit criteria become effective immediately for new hires. Those hired under previous criteria have the right to continue their progress toward a decision of tenure, promotion, post-tenure, or contract renewal under the provisions of the criteria in force at the time of their hire. However, subsequent reviews may require using more recently approved criteria. For details on choosing which unit criteria to follow, see Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion in Chapter 5. For procedures related to contract renewal and promotion or professional track faculty see Appendix VII.
2. Unit criteria should be reviewed every 3-5 years, or when: the unit mission has changed, there are problems with/confusion about the criteria, or unit faculty wish to modify them. Even when there are no modifications, the most recent date of review should be noted on the criteria.

A8.3 Faculty Review Form—Classroom Faculty

Faculty Member:	Academic Unit:
Review: Annual () Peer () Tenure and/or Promotion () Post-Tenure ()	Date:

Notes: Definitions of terms below. Additional pages may be attached.

1. Teaching effectiveness. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of teaching effectiveness.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

2. Service. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of service.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

3. Scholarly Achievement and Creativity. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of scholarly achievement and creativity.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

4. Overall Performance. Narrative assessment must be included. For candidates at Assistant Professor level, narrative must include statement about progress toward tenure and promotion.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

DEFINITION OF EVALUATIVE TERMS

The evaluative terms below must be used on all unit criteria. The performance indicators to achieve each level of evaluation must be stated clearly.

Excellent. Persons considered to be excellent significantly exceed the normal requirements of their position; the quality of their performance is such to make it worthy of special note. Their level of performance indicates extra thought, time, effort, and imagination; they make important contributions to the University and its mission. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Highly Effective. The category of highly effective is reserved for persons whose performance exceeds the normal requirements of their position. The quality of their performance makes significant contributions to the University and its mission. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Effective. The category of effective is reserved for persons whose performance clearly meets the requirements of their position. Their accomplishments support the mission of the University. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Less than Effective. Less than effective is applied to those persons whose performance falls slightly short of meeting the requirements of their position. Continued performance at this level risks impeding the mission of the university. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Ineffective. Ineffective is applied to those faculty members whose performance falls far short of the requirements of their position. Continued performance at this level would certainly impede the mission of the University. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

RELEVANT SIGNATURES	DATE
Unit Administrator	
Chair, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Dean	
Provost	
Candidate	

A8.4 Faculty Review Form – Library Faculty

Faculty Member:	Academic Unit:
Review: Annual () Peer () Tenure and/or Promotion () Post-Tenure ()	Date:

Notes: Definitions of terms on reverse. Additional pages may be attached.

2. Effectiveness as a Library Faculty Member. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of effectiveness.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

2. Service. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of service.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

3. Scholarly Achievement and Creativity. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of scholarly achievement and creativity.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

4. Overall Performance. Narrative assessment must be included. For candidates at Assistant Professor level, narrative must include statement about progress toward tenure and promotion.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

DEFINITION OF EVALUATIVE TERMS

The evaluative terms below must be used on all unit criteria. The performance indicators to achieve each level of evaluation must be stated clearly.

Excellent. Persons considered to be excellent significantly exceed the normal requirements of their position; the quality of their performance is such to make it worthy of special note. Their level of performance indicates extra thought, time, effort, and imagination; they make important contributions to the University and its mission. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Highly Effective. The category of highly effective is reserved for persons whose performance exceeds the normal requirements of their position. The quality of their performance makes significant contributions to the University and its mission. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Effective. The category of effective is reserved for persons whose performance clearly meets the requirements of their position. Their accomplishments support the mission of the University. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Less than Effective. Less than effective is applied to those persons whose performance falls slightly short of meeting the requirements of their position. Continued performance at this level risks impeding the mission of the university. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Ineffective. Ineffective is applied to those faculty members whose performance falls far short of the requirements of their position. Continued performance at this level would certainly impede the mission of the University. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

SIGNATURES:

RELEVANT SIGNATURES	DATE
Unit Administrator	
Chair, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Dean	
Provost	
Candidate	