

Brigham Young University

College of Physical and Mathematical Sciences

Rank and Status Policy

Creation of university policy: 14 January 2008

Document approved by the AVP Council on May 20, 2015

Amended document approved by the AVP Council on February 24, 2016

This college Rank and Status Document contains all pertinent sections of the university's rank and status document. Sections from the university document that do not apply to our college, such as those addressed to athletic trainers and librarians, are excluded.

Executive Summary

This policy governs the hiring, retention, granting of continuing faculty status, and rank advancement of faculty. It specifies the steps to be taken in hiring to fill faculty vacancies, including obtaining appropriate clearances. It establishes standards of performance in all three areas of faculty responsibility, citizenship, teaching, and scholarship, and criteria by which faculty performance is to be evaluated. The policy also establishes the procedures to be followed in evaluating faculty in the initial (third-year) review, the final (sixth- or seventh-year) review, and for rank advancement, along with the timetable for the scheduled reviews. The policy also specifies the responsibilities of faculty members for preparing materials to be used as the basis of evaluation in the reviews, as well as the responsibilities of department rank and status committees, department chairs, department faculty, college rank and status committees, deans, and the university council on rank and status. It also establishes the timetable for mandatory reviews. In its treatment of this process, the policy also deals with issues of confidentiality, the adding of materials to the file, procedures for delaying continuing status reviews, and support for the mission of the university. The policy also establishes the process of independent examination of rank and status decisions available to faculty members. Attached as appendices to the policy are checklists to be used in making sure all relevant materials are placed in the faculty members' files, and sample letters for use by chairs in soliciting external reviews of the faculty members' work.

1. Introduction

1.1 Overview This policy describes the university's standards and procedures for hiring faculty and for granting candidacy for continuing faculty status, continuing faculty status, and rank advancement. Continuing faculty status is defined at the university as "an automatically renewed appointment." The automatic renewal is accomplished by the issuance of a contract for the next academic year unless the faculty member is terminated for cause. A faculty member's rejection of a contract has the effect of indicating a withdrawal from the university and a relinquishment of continuing faculty status. Such an action ends the employment relationship with the university.

1.2 Individual Responsibility Fundamental to the purpose of this policy is the understanding that the individual bears the burden of becoming familiar with the university's policies, procedures, and standards for review, and for presenting persuasive evidence to the university that he or she is appropriately qualified for

hiring or for receiving candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. While the university is not obligated to hire or to grant candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement to any individual, the university agrees to provide a fair review process as described in this policy.

1.3 Changes These standards and procedures may be changed from time to time, and such changes apply to all faculty regardless of when they were hired or the standards and procedures that then prevailed.

1.4 Exceptions The academic vice president may approve exceptions to this policy to accommodate particular needs.

1.5 College and Department Policies Colleges and departments are encouraged to create their own rank and status policies and to review and update them periodically to reflect current expectations, department, college, and university needs, and disciplinary standards. College and department rank and status policies must be approved by the dean and the academic vice president. College and department rank and status policies may not contradict or waive any requirement of this policy or apply a lower standard. If there is a conflict between a college or department policy and this policy, this policy governs.

1.6 Nondiscrimination The standards and procedures in this policy will be applied without illegal discrimination on the basis of gender, race, color, national origin, age, veteran status, or disability. Because of the university's religious mission, in hiring decisions strong preference is given to members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

2. Appointment of Faculty Members

2.1 Appointments Faculty members are appointed by the university president as authorized by the Board of Trustees. Faculty appointments are for one year, except that some visiting appointments are for one semester. Faculty appointments on a continuing faculty status track are renewable at the university's discretion for additional one-year terms until continuing faculty status is granted. Continuing faculty status is awarded at the discretion of the university president with the aid of recommendations generated from the procedures found in this policy. The appointments of faculty with continuing faculty status are automatically renewed each year unless they are terminated for adequate cause (see [Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy](#)).

2.2 Vacancies The associate academic vice president for faculty authorizes the filling of a vacancy. When a vacancy occurs, the department chair and dean should submit memos justifying the filling of the vacancy accompanied by a Faculty Position Vacancy Form.

2.3 Search Committee To fill a continuing faculty status track position, the department chair will refer the matter to a search committee composed of at least three faculty members. Departments are encouraged to begin the search process early in the academic year preceding the vacancy.

2.4 Identifying Candidates The department should make a vigorous effort to identify the most qualified candidates for a faculty position. This effort may include

tracking potential candidates, recruiting at conferences, and advertising broadly in professional publications, on the university's website, in BYU Magazine, in the Church News, etc.

2.5 Clearance to Interview Following an appropriate search period, the department search committee will recommend which candidates to invite to campus for interviews. Invitations to campus for interviews must be approved by the department chair, the dean, the associate academic vice president for faculty, and the Church Commissioner of Education. Clearance to interview must precede any express or implied invitation to interview. The associate academic vice president for faculty will pay for visits of up to two candidates for each approved position vacancy, but the department may interview additional candidates at the department's expense, provided proper clearance to interview is obtained. Departments are encouraged to interview at least two candidates for each position.

2.6 Interviews Generally, candidates invited to campus should make a formal presentation to the faculty and teach a class or make some other presentation in which they interact with students. During the visit, all available department faculty should have the opportunity to meet individually or in small groups with the candidate. The candidate will also interview with the department chair, the dean, the associate academic vice president for faculty, and a General Authority.

2.7 Hiring Decision After the interviews, and following open discussion in a meeting of the department committee of the whole, department faculty who have continuing faculty status and faculty who are in continuing faculty status track positions will vote by secret ballot on which candidate, if any, should be offered a position. To be hired, candidates must be approved by at least a majority of voting faculty, and approved by the department chair, the dean, the academic vice president, the president, and the Board of Trustees.

2.8 Offers All offers must be in writing, with the terms and conditions specified in detail. All offer letters must be approved by the dean and the associate academic vice president for faculty before they are sent. Those participating in the hiring process must not make or imply any commitments regarding employment terms, including rank or salary, before the offer letter is approved. Deans or chairs may discuss academic rank, possible schedules for the rank and status review process, and salary ranges with candidates, but must not make commitments in addition to those approved in the offer letter. An offer letter is binding on the university only if it is approved by the associate academic vice president for faculty, the academic vice president, or the president, and only if the approvals required in section 2.7 have been obtained.

2.9 Initial Rank Appointment as an assistant professor in a continuing faculty status track requires the completion of a terminal or other degree appropriate to the candidate's discipline and position, or equivalent professional experience or training. (See 5.1.D, 6.6.1.C.) If the candidate does not meet this standard, the appointment will be at the rank of instructor. The instructor's offer letter will specify the conditions that need to be met to become eligible for a continuing faculty status track appointment and the rank of assistant professor, and a fixed term within which the person must become eligible for such an appointment. When the instructor has met the conditions described in the offer letter, the dean should notify the associate

academic vice president for faculty, who will authorize moving the person to a continuing faculty status track and granting immediate rank advancement to assistant professor. Appointment as an instructor is intended to be a limited appointment and may not be extended beyond a reasonable time.

2.10 Starting the Timetable for Continuing Faculty Status Time spent as an instructor does not count toward the time required for continuing faculty status. The timetable for the continuing faculty status process begins with the start of the fall semester following the granting of a continuing faculty status track appointment and the rank of assistant professor. The timetable for faculty hired midyear also begins the following fall semester.

2.11 Moving Visiting and Other Faculty to a Continuing Faculty Status Track To move a visiting, temporary, part-time, or adjunct faculty member to a continuing faculty status track, the procedures for hiring continuing faculty status track faculty, specified in this policy must be followed. Upon the recommendation of the dean, the university may count the period of the visiting or temporary appointment toward continuing faculty status if the appointment was at a professorial rank, and if all requirements specified in section 2.9 were satisfied at the time of hiring into the visiting or temporary appointment. The offer letter for the continuing faculty status track appointment will specify the timetable for the continuing faculty status process.

2.12 Credit for Previous Work The University may count time as a visiting or temporary faculty member at BYU, or as a faculty member at another university or college or in comparable professional work toward initial rank, rank advancement, or continuing faculty status. In such cases, the final review for continuing faculty status may be held in the faculty member's third year at BYU or at such other time as is agreed upon in writing. The timetable for the continuing faculty status process must be determined at the time of hiring, approved by the dean and the associate academic vice president for faculty, and specified in the offer letter. The offer letter may also specify the schedule of review for rank advancement as approved by the associate academic vice president for faculty.

2.13 Appointments with Continuing Faculty Status In very unusual cases, the university may appoint a faculty member with continuing faculty status. This action must be approved by the department chair (after appropriate consultation with department faculty), the dean, and the academic vice president. The academic vice president will consult with the appropriate Faculty Council on Rank and Status before granting approval.

3. Expectations of Faculty Members

3.1 General Expectations

3.1.1 Faculty Standards Brigham Young University is a private university with unique goals and aspirations that arise from the mission of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. A faculty member's responsibility is to engage in high quality citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and to make affirmative contributions to the university mission. Faculty should provide students an education that is spiritually strengthening, intellectually enlarging, character building, and leading to lifelong learning and

service. (See The Aims of a BYU Education.) It is a condition of employment that faculty members observe the behavior standards of the university, including the Church Educational System Honor Code, and refrain from behavior or expression that seriously and adversely affects the university mission or the Church. Faculty who are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints also accept as a condition of employment the standards of conduct consistent with qualifying for temple privileges. They are expected to live lives reflecting a love of God, a commitment to keeping his commandments, and loyalty to the Church. They are expected to be role models to students of people who are proficient in their discipline and faithful in the Church. All faculty are expected to be role models for a life that combines the quest for intellectual rigor with spiritual values and personal integrity. They are expected to engage in continuing faculty development, and to maintain high levels of performance throughout the course of their careers.

3.1.2 Faculty Development Plan New faculty should meet with their department chair during their first year to develop a faculty development plan for the period of employment through their final continuing faculty status review. The faculty development plan should describe the faculty member's proposed activities in the areas of citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty). The faculty development plan should include a statement of:

- 1) The faculty member's self-assessment of his or her strengths, skills, competencies, interests, opportunities, and areas in which the faculty member wishes to develop.
- 2) The faculty member's professional goals in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and the plan to accomplish these goals.
- 3) The relationship between individual goals and department and university aspirations and needs.
- 4) Resources needed to accomplish the professional goals, including budgetary support, equipment, time, etc.
- 5) The faculty member's activities and accomplishments so far in achieving the goals.
- 6) The faculty member's comments, if desired, on measures used to assess success in his or her professorial or professional responsibilities and in accomplishing the goals set forth in the plan.

Faculty are encouraged to use the Faculty Center's resources in developing the plan. Faculty members should update and review the plan with the department chair in their annual interviews. Parts of the faculty development plan may form the basis for the personal statement which the faculty member produces for the file at the time of the third-year and final continuing faculty reviews (Appendices A and B). The faculty development plan is a planning tool, and does not constitute a commitment that the university will employ the faculty member for the period covered by the plan or that the faculty member will receive continuing faculty status if the goals in the plan are met. Retention of faculty depends on the overall quality of their performance and on the university's evolving needs. Continuing faculty status reviews are performed at the department, college, and university levels, and continuing faculty status is granted only by the university president.

3.1.3 Effectiveness in All Areas of Responsibility Faculty are expected to perform high quality work in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty). Failure by faculty with continuing status to maintain acceptable performance constitutes adequate cause for termination. (See

2.1 and Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy) Faculty members have different strengths. However, the performance of faculty must be above acceptable minimum standards in all areas of responsibility. Most professorial faculty early in their careers should have a balance of teaching and scholarship, with lighter committee and other administrative assignments. The allocation of time in these three areas may vary among faculty or over a faculty member's career, depending on changes in assignments due to legitimate university and department needs. Reviewers in the rank and status process will exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing heavier responsibilities in one area against lighter responsibilities and performance in another.

CPMS 3.1.3 In order to assess the ability of a candidate to perform well long term in all three areas of responsibility simultaneously, the number of courses taught by the candidate should not be substantially lower than departmental norms. (While the department is responsible for teaching assignments, ultimate responsibility for the teaching portfolio lies with the candidate.)

If a candidate is granted a two-year delay, the review after delay will re-assess performance in all three areas during the delay period, not just the area(s) of weakness.

3.1.4 Annual Performance Reviews and Interviews Continuing performance evaluations will be carried out for all faculty. The department chair, dean or designee, will conduct an annual performance review of, and an annual stewardship interview with, each faculty member in the department, including faculty with continuing faculty status. These interviews are the primary vehicle for tracking and encouraging continuing faculty development, and through which the performance of faculty with continuing faculty status is monitored, and through which performance expectations are communicated. These interviews should identify performance problems early, implement progressive steps to help a faculty member be successful in all areas of professorial responsibility, and create a record of discussions about performance problems and attempts made to remedy them. Departments are encouraged to have a department committee assist in conducting the annual performance reviews. In the annual interview the chair and the faculty member will review performance and develop goals and strategies for development and improvement. A written summary of the department chair's evaluations should be given to the faculty member and a copy placed in his or her department personnel file. A copy of the letter will be sent to the dean. In addition to serving as a regular, systematic process for reviewing faculty members' past performance, the annual stewardship interview process should also contain a prospective, developmental component. It is the primary opportunity for department chairs to monitor and help encourage continuous faculty development. Faculty development needs and opportunities should be discussed in each annual interview, regardless of a faculty member's past performance. Faculty should include in the materials submitted for the annual review a statement of plans for faculty development. The interview should include discussion of time and other resource implications of the development plans. All faculty members are expected to engage in continuous development and improvement in scholarship and teaching. Department chairs should encourage efforts and support opportunities for faculty development.

3.1.5 Academic Freedom Occasionally, evaluation of faculty for rank and status may involve issues of academic freedom. In such cases, BYU's principles of academic freedom should be respected. These issues, however, will be reviewed within the

faculty rank and status process rather than under university procedures governing faculty discipline or academic freedom grievances. (See [Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy](#); [Faculty Grievance Policy](#)) Note that the faculty rank and status process considers academic freedom issues under a different standard than would apply in a disciplinary or academic freedom grievance proceeding. This is because disciplinary and academic freedom grievance proceedings are concerned with whether a faculty member has engaged in conduct or expression that seriously and adversely affects the university mission or the Church. A faculty rank and status review, on the other hand, focuses not merely on the presence or absence of harm, but on the "quality of the faculty member's overall affirmative contribution to the University." (See [Procedures for Termination and Academic Freedom Grievances Policy](#), footnote 3.) Thus, the faculty rank and status process applies a higher standard for citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) than would apply in a disciplinary or academic freedom grievance proceeding. For instance, assessments of teaching quality in a faculty rank and status review consider not just whether a teacher is incompetent or has harmed students or the university mission, but--far beyond the absence of harm--whether the teaching is affirmatively of high quality. The same approach applies to issues of citizenship and scholarship.

3.1.6 Annual Performance Reviews for Faculty with Continuing Status All faculty are expected to perform at acceptable levels in all areas of their responsibility, citizenship, teaching, and scholarship, or professional service. (See 3.1.2) The standard for judging acceptable performance will depend in part on particular assignments and expectations formulated during the annual review process. Such assignments and expectations may vary over the course of a faculty member's career. If, in the annual performance interview, a faculty member's performance is evaluated as below acceptable levels it is the faculty member who bears the responsibility for achieving and maintaining acceptable performance. The department chair should take steps to see that reasonable efforts and resources are expended to assist the faculty member's efforts toward development and the maintenance of acceptable levels of performance. These efforts along with the chairs' evaluations should be documented on an ongoing basis. Development opportunities and activities should also be discussed in each annual interview. Generally, three consecutive annual reviews in which the faculty member's performance is judged to be below acceptable standards constitute adequate cause for termination of the faculty member's employment. Furthermore, a recurrent pattern of negative performance reviews over a period of years, even if they do not occur in consecutive years, may also constitute adequate cause for termination. These provisions do not mean that the university must wait three years or more before terminating a faculty member's employment. In some situations, immediate termination may be appropriate. In other situations, termination may be appropriate if the faculty member does not correct the problem within a reasonable period of time (see 2.1 and [Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy](#)).

3.1.7 Unacceptable Performance by Faculty with Continuing Status - First Year Following an annual evaluation in which a faculty member's performance is judged to be unacceptable in any area, the faculty member and the chair will work together to produce a written improvement plan specifying in detail expectations and performance standards to be met, a reasonable time frame in which to meet the expectations and standards, criteria against which performance will be evaluated,

methods by which satisfactory performance will be assessed, and specific efforts and resources that will be committed by the faculty member and by the department to the process. A copy of this plan will be included in the faculty member's file along with the department chair's written summary evaluation. These documents will be reviewed as part of the next year's annual evaluation. The chair will notify the dean of the results of the evaluation and the improvement plan. The dean should evaluate the thoroughness and reasonableness of the evaluation and improvement plan, and may suggest modifications to the conclusions of the annual review or the plan for improvement as well as next steps to be carried out in the development process.

3.1.8 Unacceptable Performance by Faculty with Continuing Status - Second Year If, after following the procedures outlined in section 3.1.7, the next (a second) annual review also results in a judgment that the faculty member's performance, including the implementation of the improvement plan, is below acceptable levels, the chair will inform the dean, who will review the case and conduct a performance evaluation. The dean may enlist the participation of the College Rank and Status Committee in the evaluation. The faculty member may also request a performance review by the College Rank and Status Committee. The dean, the department chair, and the faculty member will meet to review the evaluation and the improvement plan, develop a strategy for addressing the below standard performance, and take steps determined by the dean to be necessary so that the faculty member has reasonable resources available to allow opportunity to achieve an acceptable level of performance. The dean will write a summary evaluation, provide a copy for the faculty member, and place a copy in the faculty member's file.

3.1.9 Unacceptable Performance by Faculty with Continuing Status - Third Year Following the procedures specified in Sections 3.1.7 and 3.1.8, in the event of a negative performance evaluation in the following year's (a third) annual performance review by the chair, the file containing the record of the last three annual performance reviews will be sent to the Academic Vice President. The Academic Vice President, the dean, and the department chair will meet to discuss the performance record of the faculty member, along with the efforts expended toward improvement by the faculty member and the support provided by the department and college. The dean, in consultation with the department chair, will make a recommendation to the Academic Vice President as to whether the faculty member's appointment should be terminated for adequate cause (failure to maintain acceptable standards of performance) at the end of the current contract period. The Academic Vice President will consider the recommendation and decide whether to terminate the faculty member's employment, or propose other remedies.

3.1.10 Appeal of the Academic Vice President's decision to not renew the faculty member's appointment for adequate cause is governed by the Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy.

3.2 Citizenship

3.2.1 The Citizenship Standard As a university owned by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Brigham Young University expects all faculty to adhere to the highest standards of personal behavior and to exemplify honor and integrity. Faculty who are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints should be loyal to the Church, and all faculty should support the university mission and work to

further the principles stated in the Mission of Brigham Young University and The Aims of a BYU Education. Faculty should observe university policies. They should willingly serve on committees and in other department, college, and university assignments. They should mentor, encourage, advise, and collaborate with colleagues. Although professionalism requires rigorous review and critique, faculty should always interact with colleagues, students, and others with civility and respect. They should promote collegiality and harmony in their departments. They should not denigrate other faculty or students or engage in disruption, manipulation, or contention. They should not abuse the moral climate of discourse on the campus. Faculty should be involved in the discipline by serving as referees of scholarship and by providing service and leadership in professional associations. They are encouraged to use their professional expertise to give service to the community and the Church. They should actively participate in the life of the university community by attending department, college, and university meetings.

3.2.2 Assessment of Citizenship The following citizenship criteria will be used in the assessment of all faculty members:

- A. For faculty who are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, loyalty to the Church.
- B. Support for and affirmative contributions to the university mission and The Aims of a BYU Education.
- C. Behavior reflecting honor, integrity, collegiality, civility, respect, concern for others, adherence to the university Church Educational System Honor Code, and observance of university policies.
- D. Although a faculty member may participate in only a portion of the following and other citizenship activities, evaluation of citizenship should consider the following evidence:
- E. Participation in activities that strengthen the university, including administrative service, committee service, assignments in the Jerusalem Center and Study Abroad, and the teaching of General Education, Honors, Religious Education, and interdisciplinary courses.
- F. Active participation in the intellectual life of the department, college, and university.
- G. Willing participation in citizenship, leadership, and governance activities in the department, college, and the university, including service in rank and status reviews, curriculum review and development, hiring processes, student advising, etc.
- H. Collaboration with colleagues in citizenship, teaching, or scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty).
- I. Mentoring colleagues.
- J. Service to the profession, including holding offices and committee assignments in professional associations, organizing professional meetings and panels, editing journals and newsletters, serving on editorial boards, and serving as referees of scholarship. Such service may include, but should extend beyond, strictly local and regional venues over a faculty member's career.
- K. Employment of professional expertise in service to the community and the Church.
- L. Attendance at department and college meetings, devotionals, forums, convocations, etc.
- M. Collaborative participation in international and service-learning activities and

other activities that enhance BYU's approved outreach efforts.

3.2.3 Review Letters of Citizenship Activities Department chairs and department review committees may solicit review letters evaluating a faculty member's citizenship activities from those who have closely observed these activities. Review letters should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the service.

3.3 Teaching

3.3.1 The Teaching Standard The high quality education of students is, and should be, the most important activity of Brigham Young University faculty. Good university teachers are themselves eager learners who imbue their teaching with the excitement of learning. They care about their students. They are enthusiastic about sharing their knowledge with students and helping them learn. They have high standards, set clear expectations, and hold students to high levels of academic performance. They are well prepared and well organized, and they make good use of class time. They prepare well-designed syllabi, course materials, assignments, and examinations. They provide helpful evaluations of student work in a timely manner. They are consistently available to help students at least during reasonable designated consultation hours outside class. They are always engaged in the process of improving their teaching. They master the content of their courses and stay current with the literature and techniques of their disciplines. They are mentors and role models to students. They provide an education that is spiritually strengthening, intellectually enlarging, character building, and leading to lifelong learning and service. (See The Aims of a BYU Education.)

CPMS 3.3.1 Classroom teaching in our college should provide a "stimulating setting where a commitment to excellence is expected" (BYU Mission Statement) in general education, service, and majors courses. The college views teaching and scholarship as equally important in supporting the university's mission as a primarily undergraduate institution. Consistent with that mission, we expect each candidate to show evidence of high quality teaching (as outlined in Section 3.3.2) at the undergraduate level. Of the unsuccessful rank advancement applications in our college, a significant percentage are due to poor teaching. As suggested by Brigham Young's instruction to Karl G. Maeser, teaching in our college is enhanced when the Spirit is brought into the classroom. Therefore, reviews will pay attention to evidence of this element of teaching in the candidate's file.

3.3.2 Assessment of Teaching In assessing a faculty member's overall performance, evaluators should be sensitive to teaching loads, the number of preparations required, extra time spent working with students individually, and similar factors. Although faculty may participate in only a portion of these and other teaching activities, evaluation of teaching should consider evidence such as:

- A. Description of teaching activities and quality, including:
 - 1. List of courses taught by semester, with enrollment numbers.
 - 2. New courses developed.
 - 3. Supervision of independent study and research.
 - 4. Supervision of academic internships and service-learning experiences.
 - 5. Supervision of graduate students as a committee chair or member.

- B. Student evaluations, including:

1. University student evaluation forms and students written comments.
 2. Written or oral comments solicited by the department review committee from a representative sample of students.
- C. Peer evaluations. Peer evaluation is as important for teaching as it is for scholarship. The department review committee will obtain at least two substantive confidential peer evaluations of teaching from BYU faculty members qualified to make evaluations of the faculty member's approach to pedagogy, teaching activities and materials. The faculty member will assemble a teaching portfolio containing syllabi, textbooks, handouts, multimedia materials, assignments, learning exercises, examinations, and other course materials. The peer evaluations should concentrate on a review of the teaching portfolio, but should also include classroom visits. Ideally, the classroom visits should be conducted over several semesters prior to the faculty member's third- and sixth-year reviews. Peer evaluations might best assess such areas as:
1. Whether the course reflects the current state of the discipline.
 2. The faculty member's mastery of the course content.
 3. The course objectives, including whether the course meets the objectives of the curriculum of which it is a part.
 4. The course organization.
 5. The methods used to foster and measure learning.
 6. The materials in the teaching portfolio (syllabi, textbooks, handouts, multimedia materials, assignments, learning exercises, examinations, and other course materials).
 7. The faculty member's general concern for and interest in teaching.
 8. The overall quality of teaching.
- D. Other examples of meaningful peer evaluation of teaching might include reports from graduate schools or employers regarding students' performance, and professional invitations based on a faculty member's reputation as a teacher.
- E. Description of steps taken to evaluate and improve teaching, including:
1. Staying current in one's discipline.
 2. Performing self-evaluations of teaching.
 3. Studying teaching techniques.
 4. Obtaining assistance from the Faculty Center.
 5. Presenting at, or attending seminars, workshops, and conferences on teaching.
 6. Involving students or peers in improvement efforts.
 7. Appropriately implementing instructional innovations, including technology.
 8. Participating in course or curriculum development.
 9. Writing textbooks, supplements, or other instructional materials.
 10. Receiving grants aimed at improving teaching.
 11. Taking professional development leaves to improve teaching.
 12. Engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning.
- F. Other evidence of quality teaching, such as:
1. Teaching awards and honors received.
 2. The quality of text materials used.
 3. Information about the faculty member's availability to students.
 4. Effectiveness in implementing innovative teaching methods, including

technology.

5. Effectiveness in mentoring students.
6. Other evidence of positive impact on students, including working with students in mentored learning environments.

- G. Products of high quality teaching and mentoring, including:
 1. Evidence of student achievement.
 2. Student scores on standardized test when appropriate.
 3. Student papers and examinations that evidence learning.
 4. Students' scholarly or creative works.
 5. Honors and masters theses and Ph.D. dissertations supervised.
 6. Successful academic internship and service-learning programs.
 7. Student placement in graduate school or meaningful employment.

- H. Example of course materials, such as:
 1. Course materials prepared for students, including syllabi, textbooks, handouts, multimedia materials, assignments, learning exercises, examinations, and other course materials.
 2. Materials developed for on-campus, online, or distance education courses.

CPMS 3.3.2 In reviewing a candidate's teaching performance, student comments are studied and patterns of uncorrected weaknesses are noted. Candidates should make their own assessment of student comments and indicate in the personal statement on teaching what steps they have taken to remedy recurring problems. Numerical student ratings for each course are compared by the college against those of other instructors who have taught the same course. Low ratings the first time a course is taught are not viewed as a serious problem if in subsequent semesters performance is raised to acceptable levels. Other evidence might be presented in the file, including student performance on standardized or common exams, achievement of learning outcomes, or letters from students solicited by the department rank and status committee.

Departments should plan to have peer reviews completed in at least two different semesters before the candidate is considered. Absences from teaching assignments should be rare and a course for which a weak record was exacerbated by extensive absences is a serious negative. Faculty members are expected to provide adequate and positive support to their students outside of class. They are also responsible to assure helpful interactions between their teaching assistants and students. Evidence of high-quality teaching presupposes that the candidate has taught a variety of courses, ideally ranging from lower division to graduate courses.

3.4 Scholarship

3.4.1 Purpose of Scholarship The highest purpose of scholarly and creative work (collectively referred to in this policy as *scholarship*) is to serve God and humanity. Scholarship should contribute to the university mission. It should achieve one or more of the following objectives: improving the education of the minds and spirits of students, contributing to the expansion of truth throughout the world, facilitating the solution of pressing world problems, and enhancing the quality of people's lives. Scholarship extends the university's influence and reputation, which benefits our students, serves our local and worldwide communities, and makes friends for the

university and the Church. Scholarship should infuse and inspire the faculty member's teaching both directly and indirectly. It must not interfere with or detract from teaching, but support and strengthen it. University faculty members must be learners in order to be teachers worthy of the name. They must be intellectually alive and current in their disciplines, not only through participating in the substantive developments of the discipline, but also through constantly honing the skills and tools of scholarship used in the discipline. In most disciplines this means that faculty will bring to their work the rigor of writing, subject the work to the criticism of scholarly peers, and share their insights with colleagues and students. A scholar is characterized by devotion to discovering and learning, by rigor and thoroughness in that learning, and by the determination to profess what is learned.

3.4.2 Forms of Scholarship Because of diversity among the academic disciplines and because of the variety of intellectual tasks with which faculty are concerned, a faculty member's scholarship may take different forms, so long as the work is of high quality. Scholarship includes, among other things, the discovery of new knowledge and original insights that add to the world's body of knowledge and understanding; the application of existing knowledge to the solution of practical problems; the integration of existing knowledge through interdisciplinary work; studying and improving the presentation of existing knowledge; and aesthetic or intellectual expression reflecting achievement in creative or performing arts.

3.4.3 The Scholarship Standard Professorial faculty (and professional faculty whose responsibilities include scholarship) are expected to demonstrate consistent productivity of high quality scholarship over their entire careers. The scholar's record shows a growing body of works that have stood the test of exposure to and evaluation by other scholars in the discipline. Each discipline has its own scholarly traditions and its own channels for communication among scholars, and therefore each department should establish criteria for defining and evaluating scholarship within its discipline. A faculty member's scholarship should then be measured against those criteria. Both quality and quantity are relevant in assessing a faculty member's scholarly record. It should be recognized that one truly exceptional scholarly or creative work may be more important than several others. It should also be recognized that a faculty member may choose to work in an area in which progress is exceptionally difficult and in which results submitted for peer review are necessarily few and infrequent. While the expected type and quantity of scholarship vary by discipline, subject area, and the fraction of a faculty member's assignment devoted to scholarship, the expected level of quality must always be high.

CPMS 3.4.3.1 Research in the College of Physical and Mathematical Sciences should deal with important questions that promise to have significant impact on the discipline, the department, and students. The results of faculty and student research should normally be published in peer-reviewed venues. This research should (1) enrich and strengthen undergraduate and graduate teaching; (2) provide opportunities for students to learn to do physical/mathematical science while they learn about it; (3) help the faculty member to stay current and excited about the discipline by contributing to its development and/or application; (4) provide a model for students of a faculty member who loves research, and who has a significant record of ongoing success; (5) contribute to expanding the frontiers of knowledge; and (6) show through one's life and work that rigorous intellectual activity is consistent with the gospel.

External funding is important in our college because graduate programs are expected to be largely self-sustaining, because external funding is an important element of a viable research program, and because peer review of research proposals helps to validate the significance of research ideas. Professorial faculty members are generally expected to submit an external proposal each year unless their current funding levels are adequate for their research program and students. More specific expectations for external funding are provided in departmental rank and status documents. Faculty members are invited to pursue internal BYU research funding in addition to, but not in place of, external funding.

3.4.4 Assessment of Scholarship

3.4.4.1 Criteria Within the context of the various disciplines, the following criteria are relevant in evaluating scholarship:

- A. Scholarship should be consistent with disciplinary norms and department, college, and university missions.
- B. It should contribute to a faculty member's overall effectiveness as a teacher.
- C. It should be of high quality and contain some element of originality, either in the form of new knowledge, new understanding, fresh insight, or unique skill or interpretation.
- D. It should be subject to peer review in any of several appropriate ways on this campus and elsewhere, for the purpose of verifying the nature and quality of its contribution by those competent to judge it. In some departments and colleges, a variety of situations may make on-campus reviews of scholarship the most appropriate means of evaluation. A decision by a department or college to regularly use on-campus reviews as a primary method of peer review must be approved by the dean and the academic vice president.
- E. The reputation and selectivity of scholarly presses and journals are relevant in evaluating the quality and impact of scholarship. Generally, faculty are encouraged to publish in nationally and internationally recognized peer-reviewed scholarly presses and journals in the discipline. The further removed that scholarship is from this format, the greater the responsibility of the faculty member and the department to provide for a critical evaluation that verifies the quality of the work.
- F. Generally, publications count in the rank and status process when they are accepted for publication.
- G. The same criteria that apply in evaluating scholarship published in paper formats (quality, peer review, publisher's reputation and selectivity, etc.) also apply to scholarship published in electronic formats.
- H. Generally, course materials that are used primarily inside the university and that are not disseminated in the wider discipline count in the category of teaching rather than in the category of scholarship.

3.4.4.2 Evidence of Scholarship Evidence of scholarship includes but is not limited to the following, so long as the above criteria are satisfied. Evidence should emphasize work performed at BYU and since the last rank advancement.

- A. Refereed scholarly publications, including books, articles, refereed conference proceedings, etc.
- B. Other scholarly publications, including books, textbooks, monographs, book chapters, abstracts, translations which contribute to a body of knowledge or

- reflect significant scholarly activity and expertise, etc.
- C. Technical reports and similar publications that present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research, and which contribute to the professional literature, the advancement of professional practice, or the improvement of professional education.
 - D. Peer-reviewed or juried creative works, such as paintings, public performances, exhibits, published poetry, and published essays.
 - E. Other creative works.
 - F. Grants for research or creative work, when resulting from a competitive process of peer review. Grants may evidence the quality of the prior body of work upon which the research proposal is based. Proposals which received high ratings but no funding may also be considered.
 - G. Intellectual property developed, such as software or patents.
 - H. Presentations at professional meetings and conferences. Although presentations are evidence of scholarly activity, they should be developed into publications.
 - I. Awards or other recognition for scholarship.

CPMS 3.4.4.2 The college relies on department rank and status documents to define standards for quality and quantity of research, and to assign tier numbers (1, 2, 3, 4) for publication venues. The top venues are usually archival journals but some exceptions are spelled out in department rank and status documents. Open access journals are acceptable publication venues, assuming they undergo the rigorous peer review of traditional journals. Evidences of venue quality, such as tier number, ISI rankings, impact factors, acceptance rates, and editorial board, should be included in an annotated bibliography (CPMS 7.2.1, part 6a). Evidence of the quality of a given paper, independent of venue quality, can include comments from the external review letters, objective appraisals by internal peers, and the frequency of citations. Since it takes time for citations to accumulate, citation counts are less meaningful for CFS reviews than for advancement to professor. External funding plays no role in assessing the quality of a given publication.

While CFS and rank advancement can be achieved either via a focused line of research or through several different research interests, it is generally prudent to stay more focused until CFS is attained.

Most scholarship in the college is basic or applied scientific research, and interdisciplinary research is valued and encouraged. Department rank and status documents address the acceptability of a faculty member engaging heavily in other forms of research, such as scholarship of teaching or scholarship of practice.

While scholarship products such as textbooks and trade journal articles, perform a valuable service and can enhance the reputation of the college, they are not valued as much in rank and status reviews as peer reviewed research articles.

CPMS 3.5 Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students in research projects is highly valued in our college, and it is expected that most faculty members will involve undergraduate and graduate students in meaningful research experiences. Professors who are near the beginning of their CFS advancement process are encouraged to consult with their chair to determine the appropriate amount and timing of their student mentoring.

4. Continuing Faculty Status Reviews

4.1 Initial and Final Reviews The first six years of service after appointment in a continuing faculty status track until continuing faculty status is granted are a probationary period during which a faculty member's performance is reviewed annually by the department chair. New faculty members should receive mentoring during this probationary period. To receive continuing faculty status, faculty members must pass two formal university reviews. During the winter semester of their third year, an initial review will occur to assess their progress and to decide whether to advance them to candidacy for continuing faculty status. If the candidate continues to meet expectations during the probationary period, a final continuing faculty status review will occur beginning fall semester of their sixth year. An exception to this six-year schedule of reviews may be granted to an individual college based on considerations unique to the nature of the disciplines represented in the college. Colleges may petition to extend the probationary period to seven years for all faculty within the college. Permission to extend the probationary period must be requested in writing by the dean, and can be granted only in writing by the academic vice president. It is expected that the decision to extend the probationary period to seven years will reflect the individual nature of the disciplines and the best interests of the colleges and the university. Faculty members in colleges that have adopted a seven-year schedule for continuing status reviews may, at their sole discretion, elect to undergo a final continuing status review in their sixth year of service. Each faculty member must declare in writing to the department chair his or her intention whether to undergo a final review in their sixth or seventh year by April 1 of his or her fifth year. The same criteria of evaluation will apply for a sixth- as for a seventh-year review. If a faculty member elects to undergo a final continuing status review in the sixth year, and if that review is negative, or if the faculty member withdraws at any point during the review process, he or she will not be permitted to subsequently elect to undergo review in the seventh year. The decision as to whether to undergo review in the sixth or the seventh year should be made after careful consultation with the department chair and the dean. Except as provided otherwise by this policy, the initial and final continuing faculty status reviews and their timing are mandatory. Requests to delay a scheduled review or to review a faculty member early for either continuing faculty status or rank advancement must be made in writing by the faculty member, and approved by the department chair, the dean and the Academic Vice President. A faculty member may withdraw from the process at any stage, but withdrawal constitutes a resignation from the university at the end of the contract year. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

4.2 Purpose of the Reviews The purpose of the continuing faculty status reviews is to assure the present and future fulfillment of promise sufficient to warrant a permanent commitment to a faculty member by the university. Granting continuing faculty status creates a long-term relationship that significantly affects the quality of the university, its ability to fulfill its mission, and the lives of its students over many years. The principal reasons for the continuing faculty status reviews are to provide the best education for our students, to assist in faculty development, and to establish ongoing expectations for faculty. Assessments and recommendations by reviewers at all levels should be as candid, honest, and complete as feasible within the guidelines specified in this policy. Strengths and weaknesses of faculty members should be fully

discussed by reviewers, and specific reasons for positive or negative recommendations should be clearly stated.

4.3 Initial (Third-Year) Review The initial review will include an assessment of the faculty member's performance and promise in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty). Essentially the same procedures apply to initial and final continuing faculty status reviews, except that external reviews of scholarship are not required in initial (third-year) reviews. Faculty who are progressing satisfactorily will be granted candidacy for continuing faculty status. The Faculty Council on Rank and Status will draft comments to the faculty member indicating areas for praise and concern to help the faculty member prepare for the final review. The letter will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and included in the final review file. Faculty who are not progressing satisfactorily and who do not become candidates for continuing faculty status will be notified that they will not receive another contract after the existing contract year ends. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere. The normal calendar for initial reviews is:

Department reviews to college:	March 1
College review to university:	March 20
Final decisions to faculty:	June 1

4.4 Final (Sixth-Year) Review The final continuing faculty status review will include an assessment of the faculty member's performance and promise in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty). To receive continuing faculty status, faculty must clearly demonstrate by their performance that they meet or exceed the department, college, and university standards as set forth in their rank and status documents. The rationale for a negative decision will be communicated to the faculty member by the chair, the dean, or the Academic Vice President for Faculty. Faculty who are not granted continuing faculty status will be notified that they will not receive another contract after the existing contract year ends. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere. The normal calendar for final reviews is:

Department reviews to colleges:	November 1
College reviews to university:	December 1
Final decisions to faculty:	April 30

CPMS 4.4 In planning, departments are encouraged to solicit external review letters by 1 May and to plan ahead in performing peer reviews of teaching.

4.5 Delay of the Continuing Faculty Status Reviews Professional development leaves taken during the first six years count as part of the six-year probationary period. By contrast, personal leaves (including leaves for illness or other significant extenuating circumstances) do not count as part of the six-year probationary period, and therefore delay the continuing faculty status reviews. Any eligible time off as defined by the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) will run concurrently with a

qualifying university leave (see [Faculty Leaves Policy](#)). A faculty member who is unable to work full-time should request a full-time or part-time personal leave. Extenuating personal or family circumstances may also justify postponing a review. During the probationary period, a faculty member may request a one-time, one-year delay in the schedule of rank and status reviews because of specific extenuating personal or family situations, such as, pregnancy, childbirth, special parenting needs, personal or family illness, or other similar personal or family circumstances without taking a personal leave if they are able to meet their normal full-time teaching or other professional assignments. Delays of continuing faculty status reviews are exceptional, and must be approved by the chair, the dean, and the academic vice president in writing before the rank and status review process begins.

CPMS 4.5 Delay of the Continuing Faculty Status Reviews An approved delay does not alter expectations for quality of teaching, scholarship, or citizenship. Furthermore, the candidate will not be expected to have published more or fewer papers, or to have submitted more or fewer proposals than if no delay were granted. If the delay was granted because of a personal leave, the candidate will not be expected to have taught more or fewer classes. Requests for external letters should make note of any extensions to the CFS clock.

5. Rank Advancement for Professorial Faculty

The three academic ranks for professorial faculty are assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. The minimum university requirements for these ranks are:

5.1 Assistant Professor

- A. Understanding of the importance of citizenship and willingness to engage in high quality citizenship.
- B. Definite promise of high quality teaching.
- C. Interest in and evidence of ability to produce high quality scholarship.
- D. The doctoral degree or other appropriate terminal degree, such as the Master of Fine Arts (MFA) degree. In exceptional cases, when a master's degree, professional experience, or other training is considered sufficient by similar institutions of higher education, such degree, experience, or training may suffice.

5.2 Associate Professor

- A. A sufficient record of high quality university citizenship.
- B. A sufficient record of high quality teaching.
- C. A sufficient record of high quality scholarship since appointment as an assistant professor.
- D. A minimum of six years in service as an assistant professor to demonstrate over time the faculty member's proficiency in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship. Therefore, the review for rank advancement will normally occur during the faculty member's sixth year of service as an assistant professor, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the six-year minimum.)

5.3 Professor

- A. An established record of high quality university citizenship.
- B. An established record of high quality teaching.
- C. An established record of high quality scholarship since becoming an associate professor.
- D. At least five years in service as an associate professor to demonstrate over time the faculty member's proficiency in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship. Therefore, the earliest that a review for rank advancement could occur is during the faculty member's fifth year of service as an associate professor, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the five-year minimum.)

CPMS 5.3 High quality scholarship implies that the candidate's research is making a significant impact on the field. It suggests that the candidate is playing a leading role in his/her research activities and has been the enabling author in several high quality publications. Success in securing external funding is a strong contributor to a record of high quality scholarship. While an assessment of what constitutes an established record of high quality scholarship is based partly on the number of high-quality publications, it need not be tightly tied to the rate of publication. Thus, promotion to professor depends primarily upon the body of work rather than the rate in which it was done. Department Rank and Status Documents will provide more specific guidelines as to how high quality teaching, scholarship, and citizenship will be assessed.

5.4 Calendar for Rank Advancement Reviews The normal calendar for rank advancement reviews is the same as for final continuing faculty status reviews. (See 4.4.) A nomination for rank advancement, even though it accompanies a nomination for continuing faculty status at the time of the sixth-year review, must be considered and evaluated as a separate proposition. All reviewing bodies must make a recommendation regarding rank advancement separate from the recommendation regarding continuing faculty status.

6. Professional Faculty

6.1 Definition of Professional Faculty Professional faculty are faculty who have specialized responsibilities. Professional faculty include teaching faculty, research faculty, clinical faculty, librarians, athletic professionals, and others. Professional faculty enjoy the same basic privileges as professorial faculty. They may receive continuing faculty status (except for athletic professionals, including trainers) and rank advancement. They may vote in departmental decisions regarding faculty appointments, continuing faculty status, rank advancement, and all other matters. They may serve as chairs or deans, on committees, and in other administrative assignments, and they are eligible for university awards.

CPMS 6.1.1 Although professional faculty members are hired with specific responsibilities and expectations that are tailored to department needs, these faculty members are department citizens and colleagues with full fellowship. All should have citizenship responsibilities and should be measured against the college citizenship expectation. Those who teach are held to at least the same expectations of high-quality

teaching as professorial faculty members. A professional faculty member's performance will also be measured against the responsibilities outlined in the position description approved by the academic vice president, and in the expectations document provided at the time of hire. If the initial statement of responsibilities is later amended or substantially changed, the changes should be approved by the dean and associate academic vice president. The amended or changed document will govern performance expectations from the date of final approval.

6.2 Creating a Professional Faculty Position To create a professional faculty position, the department and the dean must submit a written request to the academic vice president. The memorandum should justify the request and include a position description stating the specific responsibilities and expectations of the position and the ways in which performance will be evaluated. Transferring current faculty from one track to another should be done to meet university needs rather than to accommodate a faculty member who is not succeeding in his or her current track.

6.3 Evaluation of Professional Faculty This rank and status policy applies to professional faculty, except that athletic professionals are not eligible for continuing faculty status. Professional faculty are evaluated in citizenship and professional service. The department review committee should solicit review letters of a faculty member's citizenship and professional service from those who have closely observed those activities. Except in third-year reviews, external review letters should also be sought when a faculty member's citizenship or professional service has extended beyond the university. A sample letter to external reviewers is attached as Appendix E. The department review committee needs to obtain external review letters of scholarship only if scholarship is a primary area of the faculty member's professional service.

6.4 Citizenship The standards and assessment evidence for citizenship described in section 3.2 apply to professional faculty.

6.5 Professional Service Professional service encompasses work in the specific university assignments given to a professional faculty member. Specific expectations regarding a professional faculty member's assignments should be set forth in the position description or in the department or college rank and status policy, and should be included in the file prepared for the rank and status review. Faculty should be evaluated according to those expectations and the standards in this policy. While there are many types of assignments, some of the more common assignments and the related standards and assessment evidence are listed below:

6.5.1 Teaching Faculty The standards and assessment evidence for teaching described in section 3.3 apply to teaching faculty. They also apply to other professional faculty to the extent that their responsibilities include teaching.

6.5.2 Research Faculty The standards, criteria, and assessment evidence for scholarship described in section 3.4 apply to research faculty. They also apply to other professional faculty to the extent that their responsibilities include scholarship.

6.5.3 Clinical Faculty

CPMS6.5.3 This section was deleted (not applicable to our college).

6.5.4 Librarians

CPMS6.5.4 This section was deleted (not applicable to our college).

6.5.5 Athletic Professionals

CPMS6.5.5 This section was deleted (not applicable to our college).

6.6 Rank Advancement for Professional Faculty Academic ranks for professional faculty include:

- A. Assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, and teaching professor.
- B. Assistant research professor, associate research professor, and research professor.
- C. Assistant clinical professor, associate clinical professor, and clinical professor.
- D. Assistant librarian, associate librarian, and senior librarian.
- E. Assistant athletic professional, associate athletic professional, and athletic professional.

To hold these ranks, faculty must meet department, college, and university standards in citizenship and professional service. Any other rank designations must be approved by the academic vice president.

6.6.1 Assistant Professional (Assistant Teaching, Research, or Clinical Professor; Assistant Librarian; and Assistant Athletic Professional)

- A. Understanding of the importance of citizenship and willingness to engage in high quality citizenship.
- B. Definite promise of high quality professional service.
- C. An appropriate degree, such as a doctor's degree, a master's degree, or other degree as determined by the department. When appropriate, equivalent professional training or experience may be considered sufficient.

6.6.2 Associate Professional (Associate Teaching, Research, or Clinical Professor; Associate Librarian; and Associate Athletic Professional)

- 1. A sufficient record of high quality citizenship.
- 2. A sufficient record of high quality professional service.
- 3. An appropriate degree, such as a doctor's degree, a master's degree, or other degree as determined by the department. When appropriate, equivalent professional training or experience may be considered sufficient.
- 4. A minimum of six years in service as an assistant professional that demonstrates over time the faculty member's proficiency in citizenship and professional service. Therefore, the review for promotion to associate professional will normally occur during the faculty member's sixth year of service as an assistant professional, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following academic year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the six-year minimum.)

6.6.3 Full Professional (Teaching, Research or Clinical Professor; Senior Librarian; and Athletic Professional)

- A. An established record of high quality citizenship.
- B. An established record of high quality professional service.
- C. An appropriate degree, such as a doctor's degree, a master's degree, or other degree as determined by the department. When appropriate, equivalent professional training or experience may be considered sufficient.
- D. A minimum of five years in service as an associate professional to demonstrate over time the faculty member's proficiency in citizenship and professional service. Therefore, the review for promotion to full professional will normally occur during the faculty member's fifth year of service as an associate professional, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following academic year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the five-year minimum.)

7. Procedures for Continuing Faculty Status and Rank Advancement Reviews

7.1 Overview Initial and final continuing faculty status reviews and rank advancement reviews include evaluations at the department, college, and university levels. Essentially the same procedures apply to initial and final continuing faculty status and rank advancement reviews, except that external review letters of scholarship are not required in initial (third-year) reviews. Faculty preparing for third- and final reviews are solely responsible for their preparation, including preparation of their files. Failure of others to communicate with or to assist the faculty member being reviewed is not an excuse for lack of preparation or grounds for requesting an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation.

7.2 Materials to include in the File The faculty member is responsible for developing a file that is professional and complete as defined in this document. Materials to include in the file for professorial faculty are described in sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 (citizenship); 3.3.2 and 7.9.4 (teaching); and 3.4.4.2 and 7.3 (scholarship); and are summarized in Appendix A. Materials to include in the file for professional faculty are described in sections 6.3 (evaluation of professional faculty); 3.2.2, 3.2.3, and 6.4 (citizenship); 6.5 (professional service); 3.3.2 and 6.5.1 (teaching faculty); 3.4.4.2, 6.5.2, and 7.3 (research faculty); 6.5.3.2 (clinical faculty); 6.5.4.2 (librarians); and 6.5.5.2 (athletic professionals); and are summarized in Appendix B. A copy of the file prepared for the third-year review should be retained by the department and made available if requested for review during the sixth-year review.

CPMS 7.2.1 The Rank and Status File The file should be concise but complete. Files that contain grammatical or spelling errors or that contain lengthy, inefficient descriptions may leave reviewers more critical than files that are direct and to-the-point. Rank and status files should be organized as outlined below, with the six numbered sections separated by tabbed dividers.

- 0. Nomination Form¹
- 1) Curriculum Vitae
 - a) College summary spreadsheet¹
 - b) Curriculum Vitae¹
- 2) Reports

- a) Dean's report ³
 - b) College review committee's report ³
 - c) Department chair's report ²
 - d) Report of department vote ²
 - e) Department review committee's report ²
- 3) Personal Statement/Expectations
- a) Faculty member's self assessment of citizenship, teaching, scholarship, and mentoring.¹
 - b) Department rank and status expectations document¹
 - c) Chair's expectations, as stated in hire letter (strike the salary information), stewardship reviews, etc. ¹
 - d) University letter(s) from previous review(s) ¹
- 4) Citizenship
- a) A description of committee assignments and other citizenship activities inside the university¹.
 - b) A description of citizenship activities in the profession¹.
 - c) A description of other citizenship activities¹.
 - d) Review letters of citizenship activities².
 - e) Other evidences of an attitude of citizenship^{1,2}
- 5) Teaching
- a) A list of courses taught by semester, with enrollment numbers (identify new courses developed). ¹
 - b) A list of students supervised, including undergraduate and graduate (indicate whether you were the committee chair or a committee member). ¹
 - c) A description of other teaching activities, including evaluations and materials from other institutions if applicable. ¹
 - d) A few illustrative copies of syllabi, handouts, assignments, examinations, etc.¹
 - e) A description of steps taken to evaluate and improve teaching. ¹
 - f) A description of products of high quality teaching and mentoring. ¹
 - g) Student ratings and a typescript of student comments since last promotion.²
 - h) At least two peer evaluations of teaching. ²
 - i) A list of teaching awards. ¹
 - j) [optional] Other evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness¹
 - k) [optional] Students letters, solicited or unsolicited, but not addressed to the candidate. If solicited, also include a copy of the solicitation letter.²
- 6) Scholarship (For professional teaching faculty who have no formal "research" expectation, this section should discuss the professional development plan and its execution.)
- a) A list of all scholarly and creative works in the form of an annotated bibliography that explains venue quality and includes an attribution statement (role the candidate played in authorship, percentage of contribution the candidate made to the research and publication, role of student authors, etc.)¹
 - b) The three best examples of scholarship and a brief explanation why they were selected, their significance and potential impact. (All other scholarship will be available for review in the department office). ¹
 - c) List of internal and external grant proposals for research or creative works (include both funded and unfunded), and statements of attribution. ¹
 - d) A list of awards or recognition for scholarship. ¹

- e) List of colleague and student collaborators¹
- f) At least three external review letters of scholarship.²
- g) Explanation of how the external reviewers were chosen, a description of their credentials, and a description of any personal relationship they may have with the candidate.² (Not required for 3rd year review)
- h) Copy of letter sent to solicit reviews.² (Not required for 3rd year reviews.)
- i) [optional] Letters from internal reviewers, either solicited or unsolicited, but not addressed to the candidate. If solicited, also include a copy of the solicitation letter.²
- j) Copy of waiver letter signed by candidate.¹

¹Prepared by candidate

²Prepared by department chair and/or department rank and status committee

³Prepared by college rank and status committee or dean

7.3 Examples of Scholarship Only the best three examples of scholarship will be included in the file. The faculty member will include a brief explanation why they were selected. The faculty member will make available in the department office copies of all other written scholarship and evidence of all other creative work to be considered in the review. This work will be sent to subsequent review levels only if requested.

7.4 Size of the File The faculty member should be selective about what to include in the file, because the file itself is an indication of professional maturity. A concise file that emphasizes the best evidence is more persuasive than a file cluttered with documents. Personal letters from students to the faculty member should not be included. Plastic page protectors should be avoided (copies of certificates should be used instead of originals). Generally, with the exception of books submitted as examples of scholarship, the file should fit in a two-inch binder.

7.5 Additional Information Reviewers at any level may request, receive, or obtain additional information from the faculty member or others. If the college or university review committee adds documents to the file that materially affect the committee's recommendation, it is recommended that the documents be shared with the dean, the department chair, and the college and department review committees so that they can consider whether to change their recommendations. Such additions include but are not limited to documents indicating the acceptance of additional publications, additional student evaluations, and late-arriving external review letters. Documents that strengthen the file need not be shared with prior review levels that made positive recommendations, and documents that weaken the file need not be shared with prior review levels that made negative recommendations, since those documents would not change the recommendations.

7.6 Allegations of Violations of University Policy If reviewers believe that a candidate may have violated university policy, the reviewers will advise the faculty member of the specific allegations, and give him or her an opportunity to respond in writing. The allegations and the response will be included in the file.

7.7 Confidential Information In some cases, the candidate or reviewers may feel that certain information is sensitive or confidential and should not be shared broadly. Sometimes the problem may be resolved by including the information in the file in a redacted form which preserves confidentiality. Generally, the decision of what to include in the file should allow as many reviewers as possible to see the information

on a need to know basis, while still maintaining confidentiality. In all cases the information will be shared with the department chair, the dean, the associate academic vice president for faculty, the academic vice president, and the president. If questions arise, reviewers should contact the associate academic vice president for faculty who will determine a course of action that takes these needs into account.

7.8 Departmental and Disciplinary Perspective Because the department is most familiar with the faculty member's performance and the standards in the department and the discipline, the reports of the department review committee and the department chair should specifically address the faculty member's performance in light of departmental and disciplinary standards to help guide reviewers at the college and university levels. Reviewers at the college and university levels should give appropriate deference to the department's perspective, although they should also conduct their own independent evaluation. College and university level reviews should reflect the perspective of the college and university at large.

7.9 Department Review

7.9.1 Department Review Committee The department review committee is composed of at least three faculty members, all of whom have continuing faculty status. The department chair appoints the committee and the committee chair.

7.9.2 Waiver The department review committee chair will request the faculty member to sign a waiver of access to reviews solicited from students, faculty, external peers, and others. The signed waiver letter should be included in the faculty member's file. (See Appendix C.)

7.9.3 Review Letters of Citizenship Activities The department review committee may solicit review letters evaluating a faculty member's citizenship activities from those who have closely observed these activities. Review letters should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the service. (See 3.2.3.)

7.9.4 Student Evaluations of Teaching In initial and final continuing faculty status reviews, the department review committee will include in the file a report of all student evaluations for each class taught and a compilation of all student comments from all classes. Similarly, in rank advancement reviews, the file will include all student evaluations conducted during the past several years and a typescript of all student comments from those classes. Trends in ratings as well as the types of classes (e.g., large or small, undergraduate or graduate) should be considered. The department review committee may also solicit written or oral comments from a representative sample of students. (See 3.3.2.B.)

7.9.5 Peer Evaluations of Teaching The department review committee will obtain written peer evaluations of teaching and include them in the file. (See 3.3.2.C.)

7.9.6 External Reviews of Scholarship In final continuing faculty status and rank advancement reviews, the department review committee will obtain external reviews of the body of the faculty member's scholarship from at least three faculty members at well regarded academic institutions who have achieved reputations in the relevant field. The faculty member may recommend reviewers, but the department review

committee and the department chair are responsible for selecting the reviewers. Generally, reviewers should hold equal or higher rank to that being sought, and they should be persons whose personal association with the candidate would not be expected to bias the reviews. The committee report will describe how the reviewers were selected, the reasons they were chosen, their stature in the field, and any relationship they may have with the faculty member. The committee will send the reviewers the faculty member's curriculum vitae, information about the faculty member's teaching assignment, samples of scholarship from the file, and a summary of the university and department standards for assessing scholarship. Appendix D is a sample letter to external reviewers. For professional faculty, the department review committee needs to obtain external review letters of scholarship only if scholarship is a primary area of the faculty member's professional service. Department chairs and department review committees should allow adequate time for selecting and contacting potential reviewers, conveying materials, and receiving review letters.

CPMS 7.9.6 The university document stipulates that the external reviewers are to be "faculty members at well regarded academic institutions." In rare cases, an external reviewer at a non-academic institution may be invited. Such an individual should have a very strong scholarship record and greater length of service than the candidate. Departments should be careful in checking for conflicts of interest or close relationships between candidate and reviewer. The stature in the field of those reviewers should be documented in Section 6g by summarizing such things as publication and citation records, awards, and contributions to the field. Departments are encouraged to solicit these letters by 1 May.

7.9.7 Review Letters of Citizenship and Professional Service for Professional Faculty For professional faculty, the department review committee should solicit review letters of a faculty member's citizenship and professional service from those who have closely observed those activities. Except in third-year reviews, external review letters should be sought when a faculty member's citizenship or professional service has extended beyond the university. (See 6.3.) A sample letter to external reviewers is attached as Appendix E.

7.9.8 Department Review Committee's Vote and Report After evaluating the faculty member's performance, the department review committee will, by majority vote, recommend to grant or deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. The committee will write a report to the department chair evaluating the faculty member's citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty), and reporting the committee's vote. A minority report may also be included in the file.

7.9.9 Availability of Committee Report and File Before the department vote, the committee report and the file will be available to all continuing faculty status faculty and all continuing faculty status track faculty in the department except the faculty member being reviewed. Exceptions to this provision, allowing a department to restrict access to the file, or to parts of the file, must be approved by the dean and the academic vice president. The contents of the file and all recommendation letters are strictly confidential. Faculty may not make copies of documents in the file, and faculty should not discuss the contents of the file except in appropriate settings with other department faculty members.

7.9.10 Department Vote The department review committee will report its evaluation and recommendations to the department. The committee will make its presentation in a meeting open to all continuing faculty status faculty. It is strongly recommended that departments invite to this meeting all continuing faculty status track faculty in the department except the faculty member being reviewed, since this process broadens the discussion, helps communicate expectations, and assists faculty who will be evaluated in the future. Restrictions on the attendance of continuing faculty status track faculty must be approved by the dean and the academic vice president. Only faculty with continuing faculty status may vote in initial and final continuing faculty status decisions, and only faculty with equal or higher rank to that being sought may vote in rank advancement decisions. The voting will be by secret ballot and by majority vote of faculty eligible to vote. The department chair will report the vote in the file. The department discussions are strictly confidential. Only the department chair should inform the candidate of the status of the person's file following the department vote.

7.9.11 Department Chair's Report After the department vote, the department chair will write an independent evaluation of the faculty member's citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and include it in the file. The report will also assess the faculty member's progress in addressing concerns raised in past annual and rank and status reviews. The chair will then forward the file to the college committee.

7.9.12 Informing the Faculty Member of a Negative Recommendation If the department committee, the department faculty or the department chair recommends to deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, the department chair will inform the faculty member, and explain the reasons for the recommendation, in order to allow the faculty member to withdraw the application. The withdrawal of an application for candidacy or continuing faculty status constitutes notice of resignation from the university at the end of the contract year. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere. If the faculty member elects not to withdraw the application, it will be forwarded to the college review committee.

7.9.13 Colleges without Departments In colleges without departments, the college review committee and the dean will perform the department review committee's and the department chair's functions described in this policy.

7.10 College Review

7.10.1 College Review Committee The college review committee is composed of at least three faculty members, all of whom have continuing faculty status. The dean appoints the committee and the committee chair.

7.10.2 College Review Committee's Vote and Report The college review committee will recommend by majority vote to grant or deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. The committee will write an independent report evaluating the faculty member's citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty), and reporting the committee's vote. A minority report may also be included in the file.

7.10.3 Dean's Report After the college review committee's vote, the dean will write an independent evaluation of the faculty member's citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and include it in the file. The dean will then forward the file to the appropriate Faculty Council on Rank and Status.

7.10.4 Informing the Faculty Member of a Negative Recommendation If the college committee or the dean recommends to deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, the department chair and the dean or an associate dean will inform the faculty member, and explain the reasons for the recommendation, in order to allow the faculty member to withdraw the application. The withdrawal of an application for candidacy or continuing faculty status constitutes notice of resignation from the university at the end of the contract year. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere. If the faculty member elects not to withdraw the application, it will be forwarded to the appropriate Faculty Council on Rank and Status.

7.11 University Review

7.11.1 Professorial and Professional Faculty Councils on Rank and Status The Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status is composed of eight professorial faculty members, all of whom have continuing faculty status. It reviews the applications of professorial faculty. A quorum consists of six of the eight members. The Professional Faculty Council on Rank and Status is composed of six professional faculty members, all of whom have continuing faculty status. It reviews the applications of professional faculty. A quorum consists of four of the six members. The associate academic vice president for faculty serves ex officio as chair of each council, voting only in case of tie votes. The academic vice president appoints each council and the vice-chair of each council.

7.11.2 Faculty Council's Vote The Faculty Council will recommend, by majority vote, to grant or deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, and will forward its recommendations to the academic vice president.

7.11.3 Recommendations that Differ from College Recommendations If the Faculty Council's recommendation differs from that of the dean or the college review committee, the Faculty Council may ask the dean for clarification or for additional information for the purpose of further consideration. The Faculty Council will then forward its recommendation to the academic vice president.

7.11.4 Academic Vice President's Recommendation After considering the Faculty Council's recommendation, the academic vice president will make an independent recommendation to the university president. This recommendation, informed by the recommendations produced by the department, college, and university level review bodies, is the university's official recommendation to the president. If the academic vice president's recommendation is against candidacy for continuing faculty status, the granting of continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, the candidate will be informed of the recommendation by means of a letter prepared and delivered to him or her by the associate academic vice president for faculty. The letter will state the recommendation, and summarize the reasons upon which the recommendation is based. Upon receipt of the letter recommending denial

of continuing faculty status, candidacy for continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, the candidate may withdraw his or her application, request an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation as specified in Section 8, or allow the recommendation to go forward for the president's final decision without comment. Withdrawal of an application for continuing faculty status or candidacy for continuing faculty status constitutes resigning employment at the university at the end of the current contract period (See Section 7.10.4).

7.11.5 President's Decision The president, after receiving the recommendation of the academic vice president and the results of any independent examination (See section 8), has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to decide whether to grant candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. The president also has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to determine whether the relevant standards have been met and whether the university will need the faculty member's particular contributions on a continuing basis. All determinations in the Rank and Status process other than the president's decision are only recommendations. The president will give the faculty member written notice of the decision. Copies of the letter will be sent to the academic vice president, the associate academic vice president for faculty, the dean and the department chair.

8. Independent Examination of Academic Vice President

8.1 Filing a Request for an Independent Examination A faculty member may request an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation to deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. A recommendation to delay a review for continuing faculty status or candidacy for continuing faculty status cannot receive an independent examination; however, a second recommendation to delay the same proposed action may be examined. A request for an independent examination may be based on either or both of two grounds: 1) that, given the information available in the file, the academic vice president's recommendation was unreasonable, or 2) that a substantial procedural error occurred in the rank and status process (see section 8.9). To request an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation, the faculty member must, within ten calendar days after receiving the letter stating the academic vice president's decision, deliver written notice to the academic vice president of the request. The faculty member may select from the faculty an advocate to assist in the preparation and presentation of the materials to be presented to the examining panel.

8.2 Examining Panel The president will appoint an examining panel composed of two members of the Academic Vice President's Council (but not the associate academic vice president for faculty) and three faculty members who have continuing faculty status. The president will designate one of the members of the Academic Vice President's Council to chair the panel. The faculty members of the examining panel will be drawn from a pool of faculty nominated by their college deans as potential panel members. The faculty pool will be refreshed as needed as members accept other assignments or leave the university. Any member of the pool may serve on one or more examining panels during an academic year.

8.3 Copy of the File The associate academic vice president for faculty will give the faculty member and the university representative a copy of the file. The academic vice president shall appoint a faculty member or administrator to serve as university representative to prepare and present the university's response to the case presented in the independent examination. The names and other identifying elements will be removed from the review letters of citizenship, teaching, scholarship, and professional service. Other information which the associate academic vice president for faculty determines in his or her discretion to be confidential may be provided in summarized form with identifying elements removed, provided that the information fairly reflects the substance of the confidential matters.

8.4 Confidentiality The information provided to the faculty member and the university representative will be held strictly confidential and will not be disclosed except as follows:

- A. The Faculty member may share the information with the faculty member's advocate, and the university representative may share the information with such university employees as are reasonably necessary in preparing a case for the independent examination.
- B. If the faculty member or the university representative determines that information must be disclosed to witnesses to adequately present the case or the response, the faculty member or the university representative will request permission from the chair of the panel. The number of witnesses should be kept to a minimum. Witnesses will submit their testimony only in writing. Violations of confidentiality may be considered in the independent examination and may be dealt with as the panel deems appropriate.

8.5 The Faculty Member's Statement Within 30 calendar days after receiving the file, the faculty member will provide a written statement to the chair of the panel and university representative stating his or her case. The statement will:

- A. Outline all claims on which the request for the independent examination is based.
- B. Outline all arguments and information that the faculty member wishes to be considered.
- C. List all witnesses whose statements are to be included in the independent examination.
- D. Include copies of all documents (except those already in the file) included in the independent examination.

8.6 Response Statement Within 30 calendar days after receiving the faculty member's statement, the university representative will provide a written response statement to the chair of the panel and the faculty member. The statement will:

- A. Outline all responses to the claims on which the case for requesting for the independent examination is based.
- B. Outline all arguments and information upon which the recommendation of the academic vice president was based.
- C. List all witnesses whose statements are to be included in the independent examination.
- D. Include copies of all documents included in the response to the faculty

member's case.

8.7 Examination Meeting The chair of the panel will provide to each member of the panel the complete rank and status file and the documents prepared by the faculty member and by the university representative. Only members of the panel will attend the meeting. The faculty member and the university representative will be invited to appear at the hearing to answer questions from the panel and to clarify the case they each prepared. The faculty member's advocate may attend during the faculty member's appearance before the panel. The faculty member will decide whether he or she, or the advocate, will take the lead in answering questions and clarifying for the panel. The amount of time allotted to the questions and clarifications will be limited, balanced for each side, and determined by the chair of the panel. Any exceptions to this process will be granted at the discretion of the chair of the panel. The panel's recommendation will be rendered on the basis of the documents provided and the case as clarified (See 8.9).

8.8 Additional Information At the discretion of the chair the panel may request, receive, or obtain additional information from any source, including information not considered by other reviewers (See Section 7.5).

8.9 Presumptions The panel will examine the academic vice president's recommendation with the following presumptions:

- A. In considering the substantive merits of the case, the panel will presume that the academic vice president's recommendation is reasonable and justifiable. Therefore, the faculty member has the burden of persuasion to demonstrate that the academic vice president's recommendation is without reasonable basis in light of all the information presented in the rank and status process.
- B. Within this policy and the independent examination, a procedural error is defined as a violation of this policy and the procedures it specifies. A procedural error occurs when a procedure required by policy is either not carried out, or is not carried out according to policy and is of such a severe nature as to cause substantial prejudice and deny a fair review. Intrusions into the process by persons external to the process may also constitute procedural errors. Disagreement about a decision or evaluation resulting from a procedure does not constitute grounds for claims of procedural error. If the case for requesting an independent examination is based on a claim of procedural error, the faculty member has the burden of persuasion to demonstrate that:
 1. A procedural error occurred.
 2. Because of the procedural error the faculty member suffered substantial prejudice and was denied a fair review.
 3. Upon full consideration of the case, including any information that was excluded because of a procedural error, the granting of candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement would be warranted.

8.10 Examining Panel's Recommendation After considering the faculty member's case and the university's response, the panel will recommend by majority vote that the academic vice president's recommendation be sustained or reversed. The panel may make other recommendations regarding the case. Within 10 calendar days of the meeting the panel will give its recommendation and its reasons in writing to the president, the academic vice president, the associate academic vice president for

faculty, the faculty member, and the university representative, the dean, and the department chair.

8.11 President's Decision After receiving the panel's recommendation, the president will decide whether to grant or deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, or to delay the review. The president has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to make the decision. The president also has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to determine whether the relevant standards have been met and whether the university will need the faculty member's particular contributions on a continuing basis. All determinations in the Rank and Status process other than the president's decision are only recommendations. The president will give the faculty member written notice of the decision. Copies of the letter will be sent to the academic vice president, the associate academic vice president for faculty, the dean and the department chair.

8.12 Exhaustion of Remedies and Waiver of Claims A faculty member may not initiate civil litigation or civil administrative remedies against the university or its employees, agents, officers, or trustees until all the remedies provided by these procedures have been exhausted. Failure to pursue an independent examination within the stated deadlines or to exhaust the remedies provided by these procedures will constitute a waiver of the faculty member's right to pursue any claim arising out of the university's actions in the matter, unless the right to pursue a statutory claim is preserved by law.