

## TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICY

(approved 8/27/2010; rev 5/08/2013)

Below are the procedures and standards regarding Tenure and Promotion for the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Music, the School of Business Administration and the duPont Ball Library at Stetson University (hereafter referred to in this document as “University” procedure and standards). Each of the Schools, Divisions of the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Library articulates in writing the University standards for excellence in scholarship/creative activity. These articulations adhere to the professional standards and/or tenets of the respective disciplines within the School/Division/Library as consistent with the University standards.

### **Section I. Procedures for Pre-tenure Review and Application and Review for Tenure, and Promotion**

See *University Policies and Procedures* for related policies including faculty appointments, the Faculty Parental Leave Policy, the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), and faculty administrative appointments.

#### *Pre-tenure Appointment Status*

Tenure-track appointments are one-year terminal appointments prior to the award of tenure. Pre-tenure reviews may be conducted at any time deemed appropriate by the Chair, Dean, and/or Provost, but typically are conducted in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years of pre-tenure service.

#### *Time in Rank Required for Tenure*

Time in rank is considered a necessary condition for tenure. Unless otherwise stated in the initial letter of appointment, a faculty member will not be considered for tenure before his/her sixth year of service in faculty rank. Tenure will be granted to faculty members who meet the standards required as outlined in section II. Successful applicants will be awarded tenure at the start of their seventh year of service. The maximum time that may be served as a tenure-track member of the faculty without the award of tenure shall be six years, provided, however, that a terminal contract for a seventh year will be proffered if tenure is not awarded. This six-year period must be continuous full-time teaching at Stetson University with these exceptions: enactment of the Faculty Parental Leave Policy, leaves taken under the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA), or credit for up to three years of prior professional experience as defined in the initial letter of appointment for the tenure-track position.

#### *Tenure Review for Administrators*

Administrators granted tenure as part of the appointment must submit an abbreviated portfolio to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for review with a complete curriculum vitae and written responses to questions provided by the Committee. As part of its review, the Committee will make a recommendation regarding appropriate academic rank, given Stetson’s standards for promotion, to the Provost and/or President.

#### *Tenure Review for Faculty Appointed at Rank of Associate or Full Professor*

If a faculty member is initially appointed at the rank of associate or full professor, a plan and timetable for tenure (and pre-tenure review, if applicable) must be established, in writing, at time of hire. The plan must identify the specific standards by which the candidate will be evaluated for tenure. Unless articulated otherwise in the plan, candidates will be expected to meet the standards in place at time of hire for the rank they hold.

### *Credit for Scholarly or Creative Work Completed Prior to Appointment at Stetson*

Unless specified otherwise in writing at time of hire, scholarly or creative work completed or published prior to appointment at Stetson will not be used to evaluate whether or not the candidate has met standards for tenure and promotion. Work completed during any years for which a candidate is given credit towards tenure will be included in tenure and promotion evaluations. While previously published work might serve as a component of the evidence put forth for standards of evolution or rigor, and while research begun elsewhere (for example, as a post-doc) might be pursued further at Stetson, candidates must also develop clear evidence of ongoing productivity and quality after appointment at Stetson, demonstrating that their scholarship or creative work has progressed well beyond graduate-level work.

### *Time in Rank Required for Promotion to Professor*

Time in rank is an important consideration for promotion decisions. Promotion does not result solely, however, from time in rank and faculty members are encouraged to apply only after every standard for promotion has been met or exceeded. Unless otherwise stated in the initial letter of appointment, a faculty member will be granted the rank of Associate Professor at the time of tenure. Unless otherwise stated in the initial letter of appointment, a faculty member may apply for promotion to Professor during the sixth year of service at the Associate Professor rank; promotion to Professor will be granted to faculty members who meet or exceed the standards required for the rank of Professor as outlined in section II.

### *Faculty Participation in Pre-Tenure Review and Promotion and Tenure Decisions*

A successful promotion and tenure system requires faculty participation. Tenured disciplinary colleagues are thus expected to provide candid, thorough, and critical evaluations of candidates, in writing, with explicit reference to each of the standards as articulated in the policy and to the evidence presented in the candidate's portfolio.

In the unusual circumstance of an untenured candidate who is serving as Department Chair, the Dean will coordinate the promotion process. Similarly, in the event of a candidate for promotion to Professor who is serving as Department Chair, the Dean will coordinate the promotion process.

### *Appointment of ad hoc Faculty for Department-level Evaluation*

Small departments. For faculty members in departments of fewer than four tenured faculty members, the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair and the candidate, will appoint at least two tenured faculty members in related disciplines external to that department who will serve as ad hoc department members for evaluation purposes. Committees with ad-hoc members must include a total of at least five tenured faculty members. For pre-tenure faculty, appointment of ad hoc faculty should be determined no later than the end of the first year of appointment, and should continue through all stages of the candidate's tenure process.

Interdisciplinary or joint appointments. For faculty members whose work is interdisciplinary, and for those who have joint appointments, the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair and the candidate, must designate the primary and secondary departments, and must appoint at least two tenured faculty members from the secondary department to serve as ad hoc department members for evaluation purposes. For pre-tenure faculty, appointment of primary and secondary departments should occur at the time of hire, appointment of ad hoc faculty should be determined no later than the end of the first year of appointment, and appointments should continue through all stages of the candidate's tenure process.

## **Procedure for Pre-tenure Review**

Pre-tenure reviews may be conducted at any time deemed appropriate by the Chair, Dean, and/or Provost, but typically are conducted in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years of pre-tenure service. Department Chairs will conduct pre-tenure reviews as described below. The candidate should take steps to see that the process is completed and that all written responses indicated below have been received. In the unusual event of an untenured candidate who is serving as Department Chair, the Dean or Associate Dean will conduct the pre-tenure reviews.

Written recommendations from all evaluators must include a candid, thorough, and critical evaluation of the candidate's effectiveness and accomplishments in the areas of teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative activity, and service, with explicit reference to how they relate to each of the tenure and promotion standards and the degree to which (supported explicitly by the evidence) the candidate is meeting them.

A timeline for the pre-tenure review process will be announced at the beginning of the academic year by the Office of Academic Affairs.

1. The Department Chair will coordinate peer observation(s) of teaching for all pre-tenure tenure-track faculty. There should be a minimum of one peer observation per semester. Over the pre-tenure period, peer observations should be conducted across a representative sample of courses taught by the candidate, and should be distributed across different peer observers. Peer observers will be selected from among the tenured members of the department (and ad hoc department members for small departments or faculty with interdisciplinary or joint appointments). The candidate should provide each peer observer with relevant course materials one week prior to the scheduled observation. A follow-up conversation about the observation should occur within one week following the observation. Peer observers should write a report, to be given to the candidate, within two weeks following the observation. The report becomes a part of the candidate's portfolio. Peer observation reports should include a descriptive account of the observed teaching/learning sample, candid critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (with reference to University standards for teaching, as appropriate), and constructive suggestions for improvement. The candidate has the option to respond to peer observation reports. Peer observation reports and the candidate's responses, if applicable, will be included in the FAR.
2. The candidate must prepare a portfolio and submit it to the Department Chair by the date specified in the University calendar. Portfolios should include:
  - a. Documentation of University standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and divisional interpretations of the standards in effect at time of hire
  - b. Curriculum Vitae
  - c. Quantitative reports and all written student comments from student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught during the pre-tenure period at Stetson University
  - d. Written and signed peer observation reports by colleagues, as defined in Step 1
  - e. Faculty Annual Reports (FARs)
    - i. Each FAR should include a thoughtful, critical assessment of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service/leadership. The candidate should address: 1) teaching/librarianship with references to strengths and areas

in need of improvement as noted in student and peer evaluations of teaching/librarianship, 2) his/her scholarship within the context of the discipline, and 3) service in terms of individual contributions.

- f. Department Chair responses to the FARs (required) and the candidate's responses (if applicable)
    - i. In the case of a candidate who serves as Department Chair, the Dean must provide a written response to his/her FAR each year the candidate serves as Chair.
    - ii. Department Chairs should respond in writing to the FAR by the date indicated on the University calendar.
    - iii. The Dean should ensure that Department Chairs respond in writing to the FAR for each faculty member in the department. The Dean should ensure that Department Chairs' responses to FARs make clear the candidate's progress toward tenure and/or promotion.
  - g. Thoughtful, introspective narratives (no more than 3-4 pages each) on teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service/leadership that put the candidate's work in the context of the discipline. The candidate is encouraged to elaborate on work that intersects these roles/categories. The candidate must describe his or her specific contribution to any co-authored work or publication.
  - h. Copies of all pertinent research/scholarship/creative activity material.
  - i. Documented evidence of service/leadership (department, College/School, University, professional, and civic engagement), noting the candidate's level of contribution to each service activity.
  - j. Other evidence to make the strongest case for meeting University standards for tenure and promotion.
3. By the date specified on the University calendar, the candidate must present the completed portfolio to the Department Chair, who will then circulate it among tenured members of the Department (and ad hoc department members for small departments or faculty with interdisciplinary or joint appointments; see page 2). The Chair will coordinate at least one meeting of the tenured members of the department (and ad hoc department members, if any) to discuss the candidate's progress toward meeting the standards for promotion and tenure. Additional meetings will be scheduled as needed (e.g., a meeting before writing evaluations and a second meeting afterwards to prepare for the summary letter if appropriate). The Chair will mandate written, signed letters of evaluation from each tenured colleague and ad hoc department members, if any (these letters will not be shared with the candidate), with explicit reference to each of the University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence.
  4. Department Chairs will prepare a written summary of the departmental colleague letters, to include the Chair's own evaluation of the candidate, that makes explicit reference to each of the University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence. To ensure confidentiality, this summary letter is not shared with other members of the Department. The Department Chair will share this letter with the candidate; the candidate will have a minimum of three business days and a maximum of five business days to respond in writing, if desired, before the Department Chair forwards the portfolio, the Pre-tenure Review summary letter, and the

candidate's response (if applicable), along with the letters written by tenured departmental colleagues and ad hoc department members, if any, that are not to be shared with the candidate, to the Dean for a written response. The Department Chair's summary letter, which must be shared with the candidate, must culminate in one of the following recommendations to the Dean:

- a. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment
  - b. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment and recommend another review during the next year to address areas of weakness
  - c. Discontinue the candidate's tenure-track appointment and issue a one-year terminal contract
5. The letters written by tenured colleagues and any ad hoc department members, which are not shared with the candidate, are maintained by the Dean and added to the portfolio when the candidate applies for tenure and promotion by the Dean before the portfolio is forwarded to College/School/Library Tenure and Promotion Committee.
6. The Dean will respond to the candidate's Pre-tenure Review in writing by the date indicated on the University calendar. Particular attention should be paid to the Department Chair's evaluation of the candidate to ensure that it is a candid, thorough, and critical review that explicitly refers to the standards for tenure and promotion and pertinent evidence. In the Fourth-Year Review, a clear assessment must be made of the candidate's potential for success in the tenure and promotion process. If any questions emerge about the candidate's potential for success in the tenure and promotion process, the Dean should discuss the Pre-tenure Review with the Department Chair and the Provost. The Dean will share this written response, with explicit reference to the University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence, with the candidate and allow the candidate a minimum of three business days and a maximum of five business days to respond in writing, if desired, before the Dean forwards the portfolio and the Pre-tenure Review response letter, and the candidate's response (if applicable) to the Provost. The Dean's written response to the Pre-tenure Review, which must be shared with the candidate, must culminate in one of the following recommendations to the Provost:
- a. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment
  - b. Renew the candidate's tenure-track appointment and issue a review in the following year to address areas of weakness
  - c. Discontinue the candidate's tenure-track appointment and issue a one-year terminal appointment
7. The Provost, in consultation with the Dean and Chair, will meet with candidates whose pre-tenure reviews reflect deficiencies in the areas of teaching and/or scholarship and/or service.
8. The Provost will inform the candidate in writing of the personnel decision(s) resulting from the pre-tenure reviews by the date indicated on the University calendar.
9. The Provost will retain the confidential letters of recommendation for candidates whose tenure-track contracts are terminated as a result of pre-tenure review. For candidates whose tenure-track contracts are renewed, these confidential letters will be returned to the Dean.

## **Procedure for Application and Review for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor or Promotion to Professor**

The faculty member may discuss the opportunities for tenure and/or promotion with the Department Chair and/or Dean at any time.

Periodically, the University will sponsor informational workshops providing specific details about the tenure and promotion process and procedure.

A timeline for the tenure and promotion process will be announced at the beginning of the academic year by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Written recommendations from all evaluators will be structured into sections: teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service/leadership. In each section, evaluator will provide a candid, thorough, and critical evaluation of the candidate's effectiveness and accomplishments in each area, and the degree to which (supported explicitly by the evidence provided by the candidate) the candidate is meeting standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor. Evaluator letters must contain explicit reference to each of the University and divisional standards. Evaluator letters will culminate in one of the following recommendations:

- a. Recommendation to award tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Professor
- b. Recommendation to deny tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and issue a one-year terminal appointment
- c. Recommendation to deny promotion to Professor

In the unusual circumstance of an untenured candidate who is serving as Department Chair, the Dean will coordinate the tenure and promotion process. Similarly, in the event of a candidate for promotion to Professor who is serving as Department Chair, the Dean will coordinate the promotion process.

The candidate may withdraw his/her application at any point in the process. While candidates applying for promotion to Professor may reapply at a later date, applicants for tenure and promotion may not.

The candidate is responsible for making his/her own best case in support of a positive tenure and/or promotion decision.

1. The Department Chair will coordinate peer observation(s) of teaching for all pre-tenure tenure-track faculty. There should be a minimum of one peer observation per semester. Over the pre-tenure period, peer observations should be conducted across a representative sample of courses taught by the candidate, and should be distributed across different peer observers. Peer observers will be selected from among the tenured members of the department (and ad hoc department members for small departments or faculty with interdisciplinary or joint appointments). The candidate should provide each peer observer with relevant course materials one week prior to the scheduled observation. A follow-up conversation about the observation should occur within one week following the observation. Peer observers should write a report, to be given to the candidate, within two weeks following the observation. The report becomes a part of the candidate's portfolio. Peer observation reports should include a descriptive account of the observed teaching/learning sample, candid critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (with reference to University standards for teaching, as appropriate), and constructive suggestions for improvement. The candidate has the option to respond to peer observation reports. Peer observation reports and the candidate's responses, if applicable, will be included in the FAR.

In order for the candidate to have adequate time to reflect on feedback from peer observations, effective Fall 2014, the minimum of three peer observations must be completed during semesters that precede the application for promotion. At least two of these peer observations must occur during different semesters. The Department Chair will coordinate peer observation(s) of teaching. Peer observations should be conducted across a representative sample of courses taught by the candidate, and should be distributed across different peer observers. Peer observers will be selected from among the tenured members of the department (and ad hoc department for small departments). The candidate should provide peer observers with relevant course materials one week prior to the scheduled observation. A follow-up conversation about the observation should occur within one week following the observation. Peer observers should write a report, to be given to the candidate, within two weeks following the observation. The report becomes a part of the candidate's portfolio. Peer observation reports should include a descriptive account of the observed teaching/learning sample, candid critical analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (with reference to University standards for teaching, as appropriate), and constructive suggestions for improvement. The candidate has the opportunity to respond to peer observation reports. Peer observation reports and the candidate's responses, if applicable, will be included in the FAR.

2. Upon initial employment, the candidate must begin collecting, selecting, and compiling supporting documentation for his/her application portfolios. Portfolios must include the following *since the date of employment or date of last promotion*:
  - a. Divisional interpretations of the standards for scholarship/creative activity. For candidates applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the divisional interpretations of standards for scholarship and creative activity that were in effect at time of initial appointment should be included.
  - b. Curriculum Vitae
  - c. Quantitative reports and all written comments from student evaluations of teaching for all courses taught at Stetson University
  - d. Written peer evaluations of teaching based on classroom observations as described in Step 1.
  - e. Faculty Activity Reports (FAR). Each FAR should include a thoughtful, critical assessment of teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and service/leadership. The candidate should address: 1) teaching/ librarianship with references to strengths and areas in need of improvement as noted in student and peer evaluations of teaching/librarianship, 2) his/her scholarship within the context of the discipline, and 3) service in terms of individual contributions.
  - f. Department Chair responses to the FARs (required) and the candidate's responses (if applicable)
    - i. In the case of a candidate who serves as Department Chair, the Dean must provide a written response to his/her FAR each year the candidate serves as Chair.
    - ii. Department Chairs should respond in writing to the FAR before the end of the Spring semester.
    - iii. The Dean should ensure that Department Chairs respond in writing to the FAR for each faculty member in the department. The Dean should ensure that Department Chairs' responses to FARs make clear the candidate's progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

- g. Pre-tenure Reviews (applicants for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor only). The documents listed below are maintained by the Dean after each pre-tenure review and are added to the Portfolio by the Dean before the Portfolio is forwarded to the College/School/Library tenure and promotion committee.
    - i. Department Chair's summary letter
    - ii. Dean's summary letter
    - iii. Responses from the candidate (if applicable)
  - h. Thoughtful, introspective narratives (no more than 3-4 pages each) on teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service/leadership that put the candidate's work in the context of the discipline. The candidate is encouraged to elaborate on work that intersects these roles/categories. The candidate must describe his or her specific contribution to any co-authored work or publication.
  - i. Copies of all pertinent research/scholarship/creative activity material.
  - j. The candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor is required to submit to the Department Chair the names of three to five faculty or professionals with relevant disciplinary expertise to Stetson University that may serve as potential reviewers for the scholarship portion of the portfolio, whose letters will not be shared with the candidate. The date by which the names must be submitted will be published annually in the P/T Calendar. The candidate should recommend potential external reviewers with whom he/she has no personal or professional ties that could compromise the review. The Department Chair will select one or two external reviewers from the submitted list of names to comment on the candidate's contributions to the discipline. For candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Professor, external review of the scholarship portion of the portfolio is required. Normally, two reviews will be sought.
  - k. Documented evidence of service/leadership (department, University, professional, and civic engagement), noting the candidate's level of contribution to each service activity.
  - l. Other evidence to make the strongest case for achievement of the University standards for tenure and/or promotion.
3. By the date specified on the University calendar, the candidate must submit the completed portfolio to the Department Chair, who will then circulate it among tenured members of the Department (and ad hoc department members for small departments or faculty with interdisciplinary or joint appointments). The Department Chair will coordinate at least one meeting to discuss the candidate's progress towards meeting the standards for promotion and tenure. (Additional meetings may be coordinated as necessary).
  4. Letters from other members of the University community, attesting to knowledge of the candidate's work outside the Department, should be submitted to the Department Chair and shared with Department colleagues. Such letters are added to the confidential section of the portfolio and are not shared with the candidate.
  5. The Department Chair will request written, signed letters of evaluation with explicit reference to each of the University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence from tenured members of the Department (and ad hoc department members for small departments or faculty with interdisciplinary or joint appointments). Letters from tenured colleagues will not be shared with the candidate.



6. The Department Chair will prepare a written summary recommendation of the departmental colleague letters that will include the Chair's own evaluation of the candidate with explicit reference to each of the University and divisional standards and pertinent evidence. To ensure confidentiality, this summary letter is not shared with other members of the Department. The Chair's written summary recommendation will not be shared with the candidate.

Department Chairs have the option of writing a supplementary letter that will not be shared with the candidate.

7. The Department Chair's summary recommendation letter, the Chair's optional letter (if applicable), and the department colleague letters—none of which will be shared with the candidate—will be added to the portfolio and forwarded to the Dean. The Dean will add to the portfolio letters written by tenured departmental colleagues (and ad hoc department members for small departments or faculty with interdisciplinary or joint appointments) during the pre-tenure reviews that have been maintained in the Dean's Office. The portfolio, with requisite letters, will then be forwarded to the College/School/Library Promotion and Tenure Committee for a written recommendation.
8. The College/School/Library Promotion and Tenure Committee's written recommendation will be added to the portfolio, which will then be forwarded to the Dean for written recommendation.
9. The Dean will share the College/School/Library recommendation letter and the Dean's recommendation with the candidate. The candidate must have a minimum of three business days and a maximum of five business days to respond in writing, if desired. The candidate's written factual correction (if applicable) should accompany the recommendation letter to the next step in the process. The candidate may respond to correct a factual error; however, no new material may be submitted. Written response is not an appeal. The Dean has the option of meeting with the candidate to discuss his/her candidacy.
10. The Dean's written recommendation will be added to the portfolio, along with the candidate's written factual correction, if applicable, which will then be forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee for written recommendation.
11. The Provost will meet with the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and review their application of University standards prior to the written recommendation of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee to ensure consistency.
12. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee will forward its written recommendation to the Provost.
13. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendation letter will be shared with the candidate.
14. At this point, the Provost, in consultation with the Dean and Chair, will meet with candidates who are not recommended for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or for promotion to Professor due to deficiencies in the areas of teaching and/or scholarship and/or service.
15. The Provost will review all recommendations and the candidate's response (if applicable), make his/her recommendation, and forward his/her recommendation in writing to the President.
16. The University Promotion and Tenure Committee's and Provost's recommendations will be forwarded to the President along with the candidate's portfolio. The President will review all recommendations and the candidate's response (if applicable) and makes the final administrative decision which will be communicated in writing to the candidate.

## **Section II: Standards and Evidence**

### **Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

The granting of tenure ensures the academic freedom that is essential to the search for truth and attainment of excellence which are central to the University's mission to provide an excellent education within a creative community where learning and values meet, and to foster in students the qualities that will prepare them to reach their full potential as informed citizens of local communities and the world and to meet lifelong intellectual, ethical, and career challenges. In recognizing a candidate's potential long-term value to the institution, the granting of tenure is one of the most important personnel decisions made by the University. Tenure will be granted to faculty members whose potential for effective, long-term performance and achievement in serving the University's mission and whose demonstrated professional conduct and high personal and professional integrity warrant the institution's reciprocal long-term commitment.

For candidates hired at the rank of Assistant Professor, tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will be awarded simultaneously. Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will be granted only to those candidates who meet or exceed the standards specified below.

For candidates applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the divisional articulation of standards for scholarship and creative activity that were in effect at time of initial appointment should be included and should accompany the portfolio at all stages of evaluation.

For candidates hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, any alternate timetable for tenure must be specified in writing in the initial letter of appointment (refer to relevant sections of the policies and procedures).

### **Teaching/Librarianship**

Because Stetson University considers itself to be an institution centered on powerful student engagement and learning, teaching/librarianship effectiveness is considered an essential element for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The effective teacher will inspire and challenge students realizing significant disciplinary and liberal learning. The effective librarian will acquire, organize, and disseminate the appropriate resources required to support the teaching and learning mission of the University, and will provide effective research assistance and research methods instruction for those resources. Candidates must provide evidence of effective teaching/librarianship and demonstrate the likelihood of continued effectiveness throughout his/her Stetson career.

#### *Standards for teaching/librarianship effectiveness*

- **Command of Subject Matter:** Across the University, command of subject matter is considered essential. The candidate must demonstrate competency in his/her discipline, must be able to integrate scholarship into the classroom (for teaching faculty), and must maintain currency in the chosen field.
- **Organization:** The candidate must demonstrate that he/she has an organized plan for each course, has clearly defined learning outcomes/objectives and appropriate assessment mechanisms, and clearly communicates expectations to students. The librarian candidate must demonstrate the ability to organize and disseminate physical and electronic information resources effectively.

- **Rigor:** The candidate must demonstrate high standards of teaching as applied to course design, implementation, student evaluation, and assessment of student learning outcomes. The candidate must ensure sufficiently challenging course content. The librarian candidate must demonstrate that all appropriate professional standards are met in the development of physical and electronic collections that serve the curricular needs of the University. In addition, the librarian candidate must demonstrate high standards of research assistance, research methods instruction, the dissemination of information, and the development of the information fluency of students.
- **Evolution:** The candidate must demonstrate growth as a teacher, achieving a sustained record of teaching effectiveness. The candidate is expected to develop and master a repertoire of teaching techniques that facilitate effective student learning, and is also expected to address and improve techniques that are not as successful. The candidate will be expected to develop new courses and/or enrich existing courses as the discipline evolves. The librarian candidate must demonstrate growth as a librarian. The librarian candidate is expected to maintain current professional standards for collection development, research assistance, and research methods instruction, and must demonstrate the use of evolving technology to organize and disseminate information effectively.
- **Engagement:** The candidate must be an involved teacher both in the classroom and beyond, encouraging the intellectual engagement and development of each student. As teacher/scholars, the candidate must involve students in scholarly and/or creative activities and/or participate in teaching-related student activities. Effective advising, mentoring, and availability to students as well as timely and quality feedback to students are important components of teaching engagement and effectiveness. The librarian candidate is expected to be informed of the current curriculum in order to meet the evolving information needs of the University community, and to stay involved in professional development to ensure competency in advancements in resources, research and instruction techniques, and technology.

*Evidence of teaching/librarianship effectiveness*

Multiple forms of evidence must be provided to support and evaluate teaching effectiveness. The candidate may provide any evidence that demonstrates the standards for teaching/librarianship effectiveness have been met. Letters from current students may not be provided as evidence.

The following evidence is required of all candidates:

- Quantitative reports and all written student comments from student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (required for candidates with teaching responsibilities) for all courses taught during the pre-tenure period at Stetson University
- FARs
- Department Chair's and Dean's responses to FARs
- Pre-tenure reviews (maintained by the Dean and added to the portfolio when it is forwarded to the College/School Promotion & Tenure Committee)
  - Department Chair's summary letter and recommendations
  - Response from the candidate, if applicable
  - Dean's recommendations and response from the candidate, if applicable

- Written and signed peer observation reports by tenured departmental colleagues (required for candidates with teaching responsibilities).
- Syllabi from all courses taught during the pre-tenure period at Stetson University
- Classroom observations of teaching by tenured departmental colleagues and, if applicable, members of ad hoc committee at pre-tenure reviews (required for candidates with teaching responsibilities)

The following evidence is optional. However, the list is neither completely inclusive nor exclusive, and the School/Library/Division may list additional items of evidence and/or assign some evidence more weight than others.

- Unit or divisional comparative reports of teaching evaluations from the Office of Institutional Research
- External non-confidential letters from non-Stetson faculty and professionals who have observed the candidate's teaching and engagement with students and can provide professional comment on teaching and learning effectiveness
- Documentation of scholarly/creative activities with students, including resulting publications, conference papers, and other outcomes
- Study of curricular, mentoring, and pedagogical issues, sharing the information with others (e.g., presentations, documents, publications), and applying results to curriculum revision, pedagogy innovations, and/or advising and mentoring.
- Professional development activities to enhance teaching effectiveness
- New course development
- Significant course revisions/redesigns
- Engagement in student learning outcomes assessment (at program, departmental, College/School, and/or University level) and incorporating findings in curriculum revision
- Contributions to the General Education Program and liberal learning
- Contributions to University curricular development, interdisciplinary programs, and/or collaborative learning projects
- Evidence of innovative use of technology that enhances teaching effectiveness
- Evidence of innovative use of engaged pedagogies and high-impact learning practices
- Teaching-related awards
- Teaching-related grants / grant proposals (e.g., curriculum development, teaching innovation)
- Documentation of alumni/ae success related to their Stetson University experience
- Documentation of effective advising/mentoring

#### Scholarly and Creative Activities

Because of its vital role in keeping faculty members abreast of new trends and ideas, and in establishing and maintaining the University's national reputation, active engagement in scholarship and/or creative activities that support the University's mission of excellence in teaching and learning is essential for

achieving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Stetson University recognizes all forms of scholarship that meet the standards described below and adhere to the tenets of the candidate's discipline. For tenure and promotion to the Associate level, the candidate must demonstrate that she/he is actively and consistently contributing to the discipline, is producing high quality work, and is highly likely to continue doing so.

#### *Standards for effectiveness in scholarly and creative activities*

- **Rigor:** To reach its potential, scholarship/creative activity must be shared and tested publicly. Thus, across the University, peer review is considered the hallmark of academic rigor and the primary indicator of high quality academic and creative pursuits. Thus, the candidate must provide evidence that scholarly and/or creative activities have been subjected to the peer review process in a manner appropriate to the discipline and form of scholarship/creative activity.
- **Engagement:** The candidate must demonstrate active participation with and contribution to her/his discipline, and/or interdisciplinary activities that emphasize the candidate's disciplinary strengths. As a teacher-scholar, the candidate must demonstrate the influence of scholarship on classroom instruction/curriculum development/librarianship and/or the involvement of students in research/creative activities.
- **Evolution:** Scholarly and creative activities must reflect the incorporation of current practices within the discipline and demonstrate that the candidate is developing his or her own line of scholarship since arriving at Stetson.
- **Consistency:** The candidate must demonstrate commitment to the discipline by providing evidence of continued participation in scholarly or creative activities. Though quality of scholarship and creative activity is more significant than quantity, candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate an involvement in *ongoing* scholarly and/or creative work and the ability to complete and communicate high quality work. Generally speaking, consistency is demonstrated by some form of scholarly contribution and/or creative expression every year. However, it is recognized that there are sometimes legitimate reasons for periods of inactivity with regards to scholarly or creative activities. These should be explained in the narrative. It is possible, for instance, to stop the tenure clock for a year under Stetson's parental leave policy. In such cases, there is no expectation that faculty will present an extra year's scholarship or creative activity.

#### *Evidence of effectiveness in scholarly and creative activities*

The form of scholarship varies by discipline and those who react to scholarly/creative activities critically will also vary. Thus, the candidate may provide any evidence that demonstrates that the standards for effectiveness in scholarly and creative activities have been met. In order to be considered, scholarly and/or creative activities must be primarily completed since the time of initial employment at Stetson. Works in progress (*e.g.*, under review, under contract, submitted for publication) will not be considered as publications but may be provided as evidence of ongoing scholarly and/or creative activities. The candidate should be mindful that evaluators may not be familiar with terminology, professional associations, journals, acronyms, certifications, and other language of a particular field. Thus, providing evaluators an understanding of one's professional competence and achievements is critical. The candidate must describe his or her specific contribution to any co-authored work.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to consult the relevant disciplinary articulation of the university standards for scholarship, which will be posted on the Academic Affairs website. While an academic unit may articulate a minimum level of scholarly or creative production using numbers, no specific number of scholarly or creative products is, in itself, a guarantee of tenure and promotion. Scholarly and creative products are also evaluated for quality, and candidates must meet standards in the areas of teaching (or librarianship) and service as well.

The following evidence is required of all candidates:

- FARs
- Responses to FARs
- Pre-tenure reviews (maintained by the Dean and added to the portfolio when it is forwarded to the College/School Promotion & Tenure Committee)
  - Chair's summary letter and recommendations
  - Responses from the candidate, if applicable
  - Dean's recommendations and responses from the candidate, if applicable
- External peer reviewed publications, exhibitions, shows, or performances. Include annotations that describe publication/scholarly outlets and individual contributions to collaborative work  
Conference presentations/participation

The following evidence is optional. However, the list is neither completely inclusive nor exclusive, and the School/Library/Division may list additional items of evidence and/or assign some evidence more weight than others.

- Peer reviewed publications (books, journal articles, textbooks, essays, poems, book reviews, accepted/in press publications). Include annotations that describe publication outlets and individual contributions to collaborative work
- Peer reviewed publications (books, journal articles, textbooks, essays, poems, book reviews, accepted/in press publications) with student co-authors. Include annotations that describe publication outlets and individual contributions to collaborative work
- Conference presentations/participation with student co-authors
- Performances, exhibitions, shows and productions
- Grants/Grant proposals
- Scholarly/professional service to one's discipline (e.g., reviewing/refereeing grant applications or journal articles)
- Awards for scholarship/creative activity

### Service

Service is expected of all faculty members at the University and includes a broad range of activities supplemental to teaching and research. Through active participation in service, faculty members share in the essential work of maintaining and enhancing the teaching and research mission of the institution.

While participation in University life is expected, new faculty members must achieve a balance between service to the University, teaching expectations, and developing a scholarly and/or creative program.

Thus, service contributions for newly hired faculty should ideally involve a period of moderate and willing participation mainly at the departmental level followed by limited opportunities to participate in endeavors with a broader scope.

#### *Standards for Service*

- **Campus Engagement:** The candidate must willingly and effectively participate in service activities. Service responsibilities should be limited initially and should, after a reasonable period, evolve into activities that support the Departmental/School/College/Library/University mission to a greater extent.
- **Civic Engagement:** While not required, community service contributions included as evidence for tenure and promotion should bear a relationship to the candidate's field of expertise and the mission of the University. Civic engagement that is noted in portfolios should be integrated with teaching and scholarship.

#### *Evidence for Service*

The candidate may provide any evidence that demonstrates that service has been performed and has been effective.

The following evidence is required of all candidates:

- FARs
- Pre-tenure reviews (maintained by the Dean and added to the portfolio when it is forwarded to the College/School Promotion & Tenure Committee)
  - Chair's summary letter and recommendations
  - Responses from the candidate, if applicable
  - Dean's recommendations and responses from the candidate, if applicable

The following evidence is optional. However, the list is neither completely inclusive nor exclusive, and the School/Library/Division may list additional items of evidence and/or assign some evidence more weight than others.

- Committee chair evaluations of committee work
- Committee reports
- Letters from faculty or professionals external to Stetson University who have interacted with the candidate in the context of professional service and who can comment on the effectiveness of the candidate's service involvement/provision.

#### **Standards for Promotion to Professor**

Promotion to Professor is the highest distinction the University can bestow on an individual and is not earned solely by time in rank. Although candidates may apply for promotion during the sixth year of service at the Associate level, candidates are encouraged to apply only after they can demonstrate that every standard has been met or exceeded. Candidates may seek promotion to Professor with less than six years of time in rank only if an alternative timetable was specified in writing in the initial letter of appointment.

#### Teaching/Librarianship

Excellence in teaching/librarianship is considered an essential element for promotion to Professor. The

successful candidate for promotion will demonstrate not only substantial accomplishments in teaching since the award of promotion to Associate, but that his/her teaching has matured and expertise in pedagogy has developed. The effective teacher will inspire and challenge students, realizing significant disciplinary and liberal learning. The effective librarian will demonstrate that he/she has mastered the skills to acquire, organize, and disseminate the appropriate resources required to support the teaching mission of the University, and that he/she provides effective research assistance and research methods instruction for those resources. Candidates must provide evidence of continued effective teaching/librarianship as evidenced by multiple sources of documentation since promotion to Associate Professor.

#### *Standards for teaching/librarianship effectiveness*

The candidate is required to demonstrate continued **Command of Subject Matter, Organization, Rigor, and Engagement** as outlined as standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, promotion to Professor requires the following demonstrated standards:

- **Maturity:** The candidate must demonstrate a level of expertise in his/her teaching that is informed by years of teaching experience and growth as a teacher/scholar. The candidate must demonstrate a consistent level of teaching effectiveness enhanced by improved and innovative teaching techniques and currency in his/her discipline. The librarian candidate must demonstrate a level of maturity and expertise in his/her position that is informed by years of experience and growth as a librarian. The librarian candidate must demonstrate a consistent level of effectiveness enhanced by improved and innovative use of evolving professional standards and technology.
- **Impact:** The candidate must demonstrate that his/her classroom teaching and engagement in the teaching process has had a positive effect on students and junior colleagues. Direct evidence of learning outcomes including alumni success is especially encouraged. The librarian candidate must demonstrate that his/her expertise has had a positive effect on the development of the library and its utility to users, as well as a positive effect on junior colleagues.

#### *Evidence of teaching/librarianship effectiveness*

Multiple forms of evidence must be provided to support and evaluate teaching effectiveness. The candidate may provide any evidence that demonstrates the standards for teaching/librarianship effectiveness have been met (letters from current students may not be provided as evidence). In most cases, evidence should be provided for the time period since the last promotion. Evidence that demonstrates particular achievements over the entire Stetson career, however, may also be presented.

The following evidence is required of all candidates:

- Quantitative reports and all written student comments from student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (required for candidates with teaching responsibilities) for all courses taught since promotion to Associate Professor
- FARs
- Department Chair's and Dean's responses to FARs
- Written and signed peer observation reports by tenured departmental colleagues (required for candidates with teaching responsibilities)
- Syllabi from all courses taught since promotion to Associate Professor



The following evidence is optional. However, the list is neither completely inclusive nor exclusive, and the School/Library/Division may list additional items of evidence and/or assign some evidence more weight than others.

- Unit or divisional comparative reports of teaching evaluations from the Office of Institutional Research
- External non-confidential letters from non-Stetson faculty and professionals who have observed the candidate's teaching and engagement with students and can provide professional comment on teaching and learning effectiveness
- Documentation of scholarly/creative activities with students, including resulting publications, conference papers, and other outcomes
- Study of curricular, mentoring, and pedagogical issues, sharing the information with others (e.g., presentations, documents, publications), and applying results to curriculum revision, pedagogy innovations, and/or advising and mentoring.
- Professional development activities to enhance teaching effectiveness
- New course development
- Engagement in student learning outcomes assessment (at program, departmental, College/School, and/or University level) and incorporating findings in curriculum revision
- Documentation of student success and direct evidence of learning outcomes facilitated by the candidate: GEAC guidelines, senior exit interviews, self-administered assessment, alumni/ae success, etc.
- Contributions to the General Education Program and liberal learning
- Contributions to University curricular development, interdisciplinary programs, and/or collaborative learning projects
- Significant course revisions/redesigns
- Evidence of innovative use of technology that enhances teaching effectiveness
- Evidence of innovative use of engaged pedagogies and high-impact learning practices
- Teaching-related awards
- Teaching-related grants / grant proposals (e.g., curriculum development, teaching innovation)
- Documentation of mentoring junior faculty

### Scholarly and Creative Activities

#### *Standards for excellence in scholarly and creative activities*

The candidate is required to demonstrate continued **Rigor and Engagement** as outlined in the standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, promotion to Professor requires the following demonstrated standards:

- **Maturity:** The candidate must demonstrate intellectual growth in scholarly and creative activities since tenure/promotion to Associate Professor and over time.
- **Development of expertise:** Scholarly and creative activities must have sufficient focus that

demonstrates that the candidate has distinguished herself/himself by becoming an expert in some aspect(s) of her/his field and making meaningful contributions to the field.

- **Recognition:** The candidate must demonstrate that her/his contributions to the discipline have been acknowledged as significant by peers/peer review and/or prestigious organizations.
- **Consistency:** While it is recognized that there are often legitimate reasons for periods of inactivity with regards to scholarly or creative activities, the ability to meet other standards (e.g., maturity and development of expertise) requires consistent scholarly or creative output. Thus, significant gaps in productivity should be addressed in the narrative, and the candidate must demonstrate that she/he has a lifetime record of scholarly or creative achievement that is highly likely to continue. Thus, sufficient time must elapse following periods of inactivity to demonstrate a solid resumption of activity that is highly likely to continue beyond promotion.

#### *Evidence of excellence in scholarly and creative activities*

The candidate may provide any evidence that demonstrates that the standards for excellence in scholarly and creative activities have been met. While scholarly activity and accomplishment that has been completed since tenure/promotion to Associate Professor should be emphasized, the candidate may include evidence of longer-term accomplishment that effectively shows the scholarly rigor, engagement, development of expertise, consistency, maturity, and recognition required for achievement of promotion to Professor – e.g., long-term projects begun before promotion to Associate Professor and completed since then. The candidate should be mindful that evaluators may not be familiar with terminology, professional associations, journals, acronyms, certifications, and other language of a particular field. Thus, providing evaluators an understanding of one's professional competence and achievements is critical. The candidate must describe his or her specific contribution to any co-authored work.

Candidates are strongly encouraged to consult the relevant disciplinary articulation of the university standards for scholarship, which will be posted on the Academic Affairs website. While an academic unit may articulate a minimum level of scholarly or creative production using numbers, no specific amount of scholarly or creative products is, in itself, a guarantee of tenure and promotion. Scholarly and creative products are also evaluated for quality, and candidates must meet standards in the areas of teaching (or librarianship) and leadership as well. The following evidence is required of all candidates:

- FARs
- Responses to FARs
- External peer reviewed publications, exhibitions, shows, or performances. Include annotations that describe publication/scholarly outlets and individual contributions to collaborative work.
- Conference presentations/participation
- Letter(s) from external reviewer(s) that are not to be shared with the candidate, as per the process defined in Section I (confidential letter to be included in the candidate portfolio by the Department Chair after the candidate submits the portfolio).

The following evidence is optional. However, the list is neither completely inclusive nor exclusive, and the School/Library/Division may list additional items of evidence and/or assign some evidence more weight than others.

- Peer reviewed publications (books, journal articles, textbooks, essays, poems, book reviews, accepted/in press publications). Include annotations that describe publication outlets and

individual contributions to collaborative work

- Peer reviewed publications (books, journal articles, textbooks, essays, poems, book reviews, accepted/in press publications) with student co-authors. Include annotations that describe publication outlets and individual contributions to collaborative work
- Conference presentations/participation with student co-authors
- Performances, exhibitions, shows and productions
- Grants/grant proposals
- Awards for scholarship/creative activity
- Fellowships
- Invitations to conferences based on expertise
- Invitations to publish/present/preside/exhibit/consult based on expertise
- Scholarly/professional service in one's discipline (e.g., as reader, editor, editorial committee member, grant reviewer/evaluator)
- Mentoring successful students and alumni

## Leadership

### *Standards for Leadership*

The candidate is required to demonstrate continued **Campus Engagement** as outlined in the standards for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. In addition to continuing to meet standards of service necessary for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate for promotion to Professor must also demonstrate leadership. Leadership will be demonstrated by increasing engagement at the School/College/Library and University level, impact across the University, and maturity.

- **Engagement:** The candidate must demonstrate that the breadth of service contributions has expanded from that expected of an Assistant Professor to broader areas of focus, importance, and effectiveness across the University.
- **Impact:** The candidate must demonstrate significant participation in service activities that have a positive effect on University life.
- **Maturity:** The candidate must demonstrate the ability to complete complex service tasks successfully, to communicate across disciplines, and to work with faculty and administrators effectively.

### *Evidence of Effective Leadership*

The candidate may provide any evidence that demonstrates that effective leadership has been performed.

The following evidence is required of all candidates:

- Chair evaluations of committee work
- FARs
- Departmental chair evaluations

The following evidence is optional. However, the list is neither completely inclusive nor exclusive, and the School/Library/Division may list additional items of evidence and/or assign some evidence more weight than others.

- Committee reports
- Letters from:
  - Colleagues
  - Administrators
  - Committee members
  - Faculty or professionals external to Stetson University who have interacted with the candidate in the context of professional service and who can comment on the effectiveness of the candidate's service involvement/provision
- Leadership in scholarly/professional organization
- Service-learning and other community-engaged learning
- Administrative service (e.g., Department Chair/program director)
- Documentation of successful student recruitment/advising
- Letters from alumni/ae that describe mentoring
- Documentation of continuing education for professional certifications/licensure
- Mentoring junior faculty