

COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS  
ELABORATIONS ON THE CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION  
*Endorsed by NSM Faculty in April 2016*

In accordance with 9.1.1.4 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), the following is a series of specific elaborations on the evaluative criteria and the processes for tenure and/or promotion in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics. These elaborations have drawn on criteria that have been historically applied in the College, particularly as reflected in the so-called Brady/Manheim document (1980; revised 1991), on commonalities in practice reflected in a number of departmental bylaws, and on the report "Good Practice in Tenure Evaluation" (2000), a joint project of the American Council on Education, the American Association of University Professors, and the United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group. (See [www.acenet.edu/bookstore](http://www.acenet.edu/bookstore).) In accordance with 9.1.1.5 of the CBA, departments also shall establish specific departmental elaborations on the criteria and on college elaborations; such elaborations must be approved as per 9.1.1.5.

**Evaluation Criteria for Teaching, Professional Activity, and Service**

Section 9.1.1 of the CBA establishes the criteria by which a candidate's teaching, professional activity, and service are to be evaluated for tenure and/or promotion. Because of the diversity of disciplines and sub-fields within the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, any elaborations on these criteria in the context of specific disciplinary practices or criteria are best done at the departmental level and shall be reflected in each new faculty member's initial Statement of Expectations. (See below for the elaborations on the Statement of Expectations.) The College, however, does adhere to certain guiding principles in teaching, professional activity, and service as follows.

*Teaching Effectiveness*

The College is committed to maintaining high standards of teaching effectiveness. Clear standards of evaluation shall be established by every department in terms it believes appropriate to its discipline(s) and in keeping with the CBA and these elaborations for evaluation of teaching. Such standards should include guidelines for summative and formative evaluation of teaching, with the latter explicitly intended to assist faculty members in improving their teaching. In demonstrating teaching effectiveness, candidates for tenure and/or promotion should use some form of student evaluation for regularly scheduled courses - this excludes independent studies and the direction of Honors or other thesis work - that they teach in-load in the academic years during the probationary period (or, for Associate Professors, since their last promotion). Any form used must offer students an opportunity for written comments. The process, furthermore, shall protect the anonymity of the student. Departments shall periodically review, and, if warranted, revise or redesign their student evaluation forms and procedures. In addition to student evaluations, candidates for tenure and/or promotion should use at least one other approach to demonstrate teaching effectiveness - e.g., peer evaluation, teaching portfolios, or student observer programs or reports. Faculty peers and students best evaluate teaching excellence at the department level, but knowledgeable persons in related fields may supplement such evaluations. In their evaluations of the candidate, departments (DPCs and chairs) shall provide a context for the analysis of the instruments employed, e.g., a tabulation of department-wide student evaluation results or a summary of comments included in student evaluations or in peer evaluations. Documented student outcomes should also be considered.

Over the years, research has established that effective college teaching has a number of common characteristics or "best practices." These standards of effective teaching are summarized in a 1995 Report of the University Teaching Evaluation Committee (see <http://teachlearn.utoledo.edu/UTEC%20Report.htm>). The College suggests that departments consult this report in developing departmental standards for evaluating teaching effectiveness. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion must present a record that demonstrates successful teaching. This record must include student evaluations for courses taught and at least one other source of evidence, as determined by the department. A candidate may choose to include additional sources of evidence.

A dynamic and adaptive approach to curriculum and instructional methods is also a necessary component of ongoing teaching excellence in the College. At a minimum, instructional materials shall be continually updated to reflect new advances in the relevant science. Additionally, leadership in expanding and improving the curriculum to adapt to new scientific advances, new demand from students, and new workplace opportunities will contribute favorably toward a candidate's record of leadership in teaching, as will assertive implementation of new and innovative teaching methods. Examples include (but are not limited to) new course or program development, development of Professional Science Master's degree or undergraduate-to-graduate (or professional) pipeline programs, and implementation of novel instructional formats and tools.

#### *Professional Activity*

In the College Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Professional Activity is usually, though not invariably, identified with the publication of research in peer-refereed scholarly journals and/or book chapters and by its formal presentation at meetings of international, national, or regional scholarly associations. These presentations, however, will not compensate for a lack of publication. The receipt of internally or externally funded research grants also is a mark of professional activity. The significance of grant funding in support of the professional activity record depends on the size, duration, and source of the grant relative to norms within the discipline or sub-field, as well as the role played by the individual (i.e. highest significance is recognized for principal investigators, but substantial significance may be recognized for co-investigators playing major roles in collaborative projects; an individual's role should be clearly described and documented in the case of co-investigator grants). In addition to scientific research grants, the receipt of science education or outreach grants and publication in peer-reviewed science pedagogy journals contributes to the professional activity record, as does the receipt of grants in support of interdisciplinary collaborations (such as art-science collaborations). Grants in support of professional activity should yield completed work that is published or publicly presented. Thus, the receipt of grants cannot substitute for publication, presentation, or exhibition. The College recognizes, furthermore, that in certain fields professional activity can include various forms of public engagement or involvement related to one's field of expertise, including developing community-oriented projects, workshops, and presentations, and the securing of grants for, or contracts or consultancies with community organizations, institutions, or agencies. Although such activity is an extension of scholarly expertise, work that is published or publicly exhibited is of primary importance for tenure and/or promotion decisions. In certain cases involving research of an applied nature, it is understood that an individual's professional activity may not lead to a peer-refereed published article or book chapter but rather to an original accomplishment that may be protected as intellectual property in the form of patents and/or trade secrets, forming the basis of future research commercialization efforts.

A record of professional activity should by no means be measured in terms of quantity alone, but the quantity certainly plays a role in establishing a body of such activity. Candidates for tenure

and/or promotion are expected to develop a clearly documented record of a body of professional activity. (See Statement of Expectations.) Quality of professional activity shall be given strong consideration, and those closest to the fields are in the best position to evaluate it. Criteria that can usually be applied to published research include the quality and reputation of the journal or publishing venue; whether or not a rigorous procedure for refereeing submitted research is conducted; and a critical review of how the published work has been received by peers within and outside the University. This review should include written evaluations by experts on the candidate's professional activities, judging their overall contribution to the field of study. (See External Referees.) Research formally accepted for publication but not yet in print should be accepted as supporting an individual's record (since backlogs of many months are common), as long as proper verification of acceptance can be attested to and an attempt is made to evaluate it as if published. Similarly, research grant applications that receive favorable scores and reviews but are not awarded due to lack of available funding should also contribute to supporting an individual's professional activity record, since, depending on the discipline, funding success for a given project may often require multiple submissions, progressively integrating the feedback from reviewers and mentoring University faculty members as part of ongoing research program development.

In the area of knowledge-based public engagement, evaluative criteria comparable to that for published research shall be employed. In many cases, reviews of such activity by peers within and experts outside the University offer a sound means for judging quality, importance, or relevance. The impact and importance of the activities for the community and region should also be taken into account. Departments, however, shall establish written evaluative criteria for such creative or community-oriented activity. The criteria shall reflect a rigor comparable to the standards applied to published research.

#### *Institutional, Professional, and Community Service*

Faculty members considered for tenure and/or promotion to Associate and full Professor are expected to have served on a range of various committees - departmental, College, and/or University - during their probationary appointment (or, for Associate Professors, since their last promotion). In addition, faculty members often will have rendered community or professional service related or relevant to their field of expertise. Additionally, community outreach activities designed to address significant community, regional, or national issues, to provide general STEM educational experiences to the public, to enhance the profile of the University within the community, and to promote recruitment at the undergraduate and graduate levels are encouraged, and will contribute to an individual's record of leadership in service. Community service that is not related to a faculty member's scholarly expertise is not relevant to the tenure and/or promotion application, and thus will not be considered. If institutional, professional, or community service is to be considered as a significant factor for promotion, the case should be clearly presented and documented by the candidate and his/her department.

#### **Criteria for Promotion in Academic Rank**

Section 8.3 of the CBA establishes minimum criteria for various academic ranks from Instructor through Professor. Following are the College's elaborations on promotion in academic rank.

##### *To Assistant Professor*

All faculty members hired at the rank of Assistant Professor must hold an appropriate terminal degree. However, there are at present tenured members of the faculty who do not hold an

appropriate terminal degree and hold the rank of Instructor. If such a tenured Instructor earns a terminal degree, on the recommendation of his/her department, he/she can be considered for promotion to Assistant Professor following the procedures for promotion outlined in the CBA.

#### *To Associate Professor*

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor usually is coupled with recommendation for tenure. There can be instances, however, where a faculty member is initially appointed at the rank of Associate Professor, but without tenure. Advancement to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure requires a record of demonstrated accomplishment in teaching, professional activity, and service, as well as a strong indication of continued future productivity in these areas. The faculty member must present a dossier showing evidence of success in each of the three areas, having achieved a level of competence above that required at the rank of Assistant Professor. Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is based solely on the accomplishments cited above and is not related to years spent at the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor without tenure. (See Longevity.) Within the College, promotion to Associate Professor with tenure should follow a probationary period of professional growth and accomplishment sufficient to provide the basis for sound judgment. (The CBA 8.1.2 states that this probationary period shall be no longer than six years, but could be less. See 8.1.4-8.1.5.)

#### *To Professor*

A Professor should be considered a senior member of the university community. This rank represents one of the highest recognitions the University can bestow upon an individual. It should not be expected that every faculty member will eventually reach this rank. (See Longevity.) A necessary condition to be promoted to the rank of full professor is that the faculty member should have made substantial contributions to her/his disciplinary field, including a significant body of peer-reviewed publications. Evidence of notable contributions in the areas of teaching and service to the College, the University, his/her profession, and/or the community also will contribute to the promotion decision, as will evidence of leadership in these areas (as defined above under Evaluation Criteria). The level of accomplishment in teaching, professional activity, and service must be substantially higher than that expected of candidates for promotion to Associate Professor at the time the promotion to Professor is sought. There should be confidence in continued performance at a high level. Promotion to this rank will normally follow a period of time sufficient to allow the College and the department to recognize and evaluate performance and contributions. (The CBA 9.2.2.2 states that all tenured faculty members below the rank of Professor shall be considered for promotion not less than once every five years.)

#### *Appointments Without an Earned Terminal Degree*

The CBA 8.3.4 and 8.3.5 allow for persons without an appropriate earned terminal degree, but with "a record of achievement" in a field, to be appointed or promoted to the Associate Professor or Professor rank. The College acknowledges the possibility of such an appointment or promotion, although it is likely to be uncommon. An individual recommended for such an appointment shall meet the standards or criteria for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor described above.

#### *Longevity*

While certain periods at specific ranks may be identified as typical before consideration for promotion, time in rank is not in and of itself a criterion. Longevity provides time for the

establishment of a record of accomplishment. Obviously, some individuals require more time than others to achieve a record meriting promotion. A department of the College may decide in a particular case that even after many years of service an individual does not meet its standards for the next higher rank. Alternately, a department also may decide that an individual has met its standards in a shorter time than is usually expected.

## **STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS**

**(See also APPENDIX 1: Statement of Expectations - A Sample Statement)**

During the first semester of employment in the College, every tenure-track faculty member shall be given a clear explanation via a Statement of Expectations of the requirements for renewal, tenure, and/or promotion, including criteria specific to his/her department, College, or discipline. The Statement of Expectations shall be compliant with the CBA and with any elaborations on the CBA and be specifically tailored to the individual faculty member under review for tenure. Departmental bylaws, constitutions, or other faculty governance and personnel documents at the departmental level shall include a description of and a template for such a Statement of Expectations. The statement shall serve as a vehicle for informing a faculty member of the department-specific interpretations of the CBA requirements for tenure and of the timetable for tenure evaluation. Development of the Statement of Expectations should begin as a consultation between the incoming faculty member, the department chair, and the chair of the DPC. The statement should explain in clear terms the priorities and expectations for that individual given the various criteria noted in Section 9.1.1 of the CBA and the College's elaborations thereupon, as well as any special considerations included in the individual's offer letter at the time of hiring. If useful, further elaborations specific to the discipline also may be incorporated into this statement. Once the faculty member has examined the statement and has sought clarifications and changes, if necessary, it must be approved and signed by the faculty member, the department chair, and the chair of the DPC, and forwarded to the Dean of Natural Sciences and Mathematics for approval.

The Dean shall ensure that the expectations are consistent with College guidelines and the CBA. The Dean also shall ensure that the overall expectations across the College are consistently fair, accepting some variability arising from the diversity of disciplines within the College. Once approved, the Statement of Expectations shall be part of a faculty member's professional dossier for renewal, tenure, and/or promotion review and shall set the expectations for the standard by which the faculty member's professional development is measured. The department chair shall annually review the Statement of Expectations with the faculty member in the context of his/her workload agreement and Annual Report of Professional Activity (ARPA); if necessary, the statement may be modified by mutual consent of the faculty member and chair in accordance with any changes of expectations. The Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC) and the Dean must approve and sign such changes.

In general, candidates for tenure should be more concerned with quality than quantity of teaching and professional activity, but should recognize that the quantity of peer-valued productivity certainly plays a role in establishing a body of professional accomplishment. Candidates should also be aware of the distinction between the criteria for annual departmental merit evaluations and the criteria for renewal, tenure, and/or promotion. The first process of evaluation focuses on the annual accomplishments of the candidate, whereas the second takes a broader, cumulative, and critical view of teaching, professional activity, and service across that faculty member's career. In addition to an evaluation for merit, candidates should expect annual, written renewal evaluations that provide clear feedback on progress toward tenure and/or promotion as feedback on concerns regarding such progress. (See Dossier File Materials.)

The Statement of Expectations shall provide a framework for such evaluation as follows:

### *Teaching*

The Statement of Expectations may include references to the following elements of evaluation of teaching-related activities (see CBA 9.1.1.1):

- Areas and curricular levels of teaching specialty
- Teaching load
- Engagement with the departmental assessment plan
- Preparation of syllabi and curriculum
- New course or program development and advancing departmental mission
- Use of various forms of teaching evaluation, including student evaluations
- Community and outreach work related to teaching courses, seminars, or workshops
- Independent study, thesis, and dissertation supervision
- Advising, mentoring, and field placement
- Level of students taught, i.e., undergraduate and/or graduate

### *Professional Activity*

The Statements of Expectations may include references to the following elements of evaluation of professional activity (see CBA 9.1.1.2):

- Identification of journals specific to the discipline and to the specialty area
- Evidence of a body of scholarly, peer-reviewed work
- Applied research
- Evidence of acceptance and publication of manuscripts
- Presented papers and pre-publication activities
- External and internal research grants and awards
- Book reviews
- Scholarly public engagement within one's field of professional expertise in securing grants and contracts for, or consultancies with various community organizations, institutions, or agencies
- Editorships or reporters to professional publications
- Graduate faculty membership

### *Service*

The Statements of Expectations may include references to the following elements of evaluation of service (see CBA 9.1.1.3):

- Committee service at the department, College, and University levels
- Service to disciplinary organizations
- Service to community organizations, institutions, or agencies that draws on one's field of professional expertise
- Professional organizational or agency service at the regional, national, or international level
- Service as a referee for a professional or scholarly publication or granting agency

### **Dossier File Materials**

Ideally in any tenure and/or promotion case, the letter of offer, Statement of Expectations, and curriculum vitae (CV) should provide the primary evidence for the merits of the case. The candidate's own statements about goals and accomplishments in teaching, professional activity,

and service are meant to show some self-awareness of how the candidate sees him- or herself contributing to the mission and programs of the department, College, and University. All pre-tenure evaluations will be written to document satisfactory progress or lack thereof toward meeting the expectations for tenure and/or promotion. Beyond that, the materials provided in the dossier should testify to the claims made in the CV and should provide information that will help reviewing bodies understand what is being claimed in the CV and grasp the relative quality and significance of the candidate's professional record. A candidate is advised not to produce a large dossier of supporting materials so as to try to compensate for a relatively weak professional record as evident in the CV. Elaborating on the CBA 9.2.3.2, in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, the dossier should contain the following documents in the order indicated.

1. Letter of Offer
2. The original Statement of Expectations and any modifications thereof during the course of the probationary period
3. An up-to-date curriculum vitae
4. Candidate's Statements that address his/her progress and achievements in relation to the Statement of Expectations, and how his/her activities in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service have contributed to the mission and programs of the department, College, University, and the profession.
5. All annual workload agreements from the probationary period
6. All ARPAs from the probationary period
7. All merit evaluations from the probationary period, including the recommendations of the DPC, the department chair, and the Dean
8. All renewal ("progress toward tenure") evaluations from the probationary period, including the recommendations of the DPC, department chair, CCAP, Dean, and UCAP
9. Documentation in support of teaching activities, such as:
  - a. Course syllabi or outlines for each distinct course one has taught
  - b. A full (not selected) set of student course evaluations (and a copy of the evaluation form) for courses taught during the probationary period (NOTE: The DPC shall provide a summary interpretation of such student course evaluations.)
  - c. Other forms of teaching evaluation (e.g., peer evaluation, teaching portfolio, student observer reports)
  - d. A list of supervision activities for individual undergraduate and graduate students (for example: independent study courses; clinical supervision; senior, master's, or doctoral thesis supervision)
  - e. A statement that summarizes academic advising responsibilities or activities and involvement with student learning outcomes assessment
  - f. Documentation of any teaching-related professional development activities (e.g., workshops or conferences on improving teaching, new teaching methods, etc., in which the candidate has participated).

NOTE: This part of the file shall not include course handouts, notes, assignment pages, quizzes, tests, PowerPoint or other forms of class note presentation, samples of student work, student testimonials (besides those included on student course evaluation forms), or any other materials besides syllabi and evaluations. The candidate should put all such materials in a separate, clearly organized 3-ring binder, and should include this binder as a supplement to the dossier file proper.

10. Documentation in support of professional activity, such as:
  - a. Off-prints or photocopies of published materials together with a brief note stating whether each publishing venue employs peer review or not, and blind refereeing

or not; whether the material was invited or openly submitted; and any other information that indicates the relative quality and character of the venue. Here one could also include citations to one's own work in the published work or in the course syllabi of others, reviews of one's own work in scholarly literature, requests for reprints, and other such indications of the acceptance of one's work by one's peers. The status of materials not yet published, but submitted, accepted, or under contract for publication must be documented with an appropriate letter from the publisher. **An explanation of the meaning of the order of authors' names in publications should be provided as necessary.**

- b. A list of other professional presentations, including such things as scholarly papers and other professional conference activities or public engagement projects. For each item listed, the candidate should provide information indicating the nature (e.g., keynote address, competitively selected conference paper, poster presentation, commentary on another's presentation, invited presentation) and the relative quality (as recognized by one's peers or experts in the field) of the presentation or involvement. The candidate may put all supplemental materials (e.g., copies of the paper presented, copies of event program) in a clearly organized 3-ring binder, and state that such materials are available for review on request by any reviewing body or party.
- c. Evidence of scholarly journal editing.
- d. A list of grant applications indicating funding source, funding requested, particular aspects of the application, funding granted (or current status of the application), and candidate's role as principal investigator or as co-principal investigator. The candidate may put all grant application materials in a clearly organized 3-ring binder, and state that such materials are available for review if any reviewing body wishes to examine them.
- e. In all cases, the candidate should distinguish clearly among items published, accepted, submitted, and in progress.

11. Documentation in support of service activities such as:

- a. A list of departmental, College, and University committee and service assignments, together with some brief indication of one's responsibilities and time commitment for such service.
- b. A list of non-university service that enlisted one's professional expertise, together with brief information indicating one's responsibilities and time commitment for such service.
- c. Evidence of peer refereeing (e.g., of manuscripts for publication, grant applications, or conference presentations) and of jury or judging activities (e.g., for exhibits and performances).

The candidate may put all other service-related materials (e.g., brochures produced, committee meeting schedules, documents produced, letters of recognition by committee chairs or others for one's service) in a separate, clearly organized 3-ring binder, and include this binder as a supplement to the dossier file proper.

The dossier is a record of activity and accomplishment in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service as defined in the CBA or in these elaborations. Commendations, personal endorsements, or character references that do not have a direct bearing on teaching, professional activity, or service should not be included in the dossier.

Personnel decisions on renewal, tenure, and/or promotion shall be based solely on the documented evidence in the dossier. Members of DPCs and of CCAP shall not consider informal or unsolicited opinions, rumors, or innuendoes in the decision process.

#### Department and College Personnel Committees

The CBA states (9.2.1) that “each department shall have a Personnel Committee comprised of at least three (3) tenured members of that department elected by the bargaining unit members in that department in accordance with the procedures of that department.”

In the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, for the purposes of evaluation for advancement from untenured Assistant or Associate Professor to tenured Associate Professor, it is suggested that a vote of all tenured member of the department be taken. The vote is in addition to the DPC vote; only tenured members of the department who are not members of the DPC by who are eligible to vote according to the department’s procedures and according to the CBA 9.2.3.5 may vote. The DPC will conduct the vote in its advisory role to the department chair, and the results of the vote may be incorporated into the chair’s advancement recommendation.

The CBA states (9.2.1) that “each college shall have a Personnel Committee comprised of tenured members of the college elected by the bargaining unit members in that college in accordance with the published by-laws of that college.” In the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, the College Committee on Academic Personnel (CCAP) is governed by the Bylaws of the College Committee on Academic Personnel.

#### External Referees for Tenure and/or Promotion Cases

In all tenure and/or promotion cases, the candidate’s professional activity must be evaluated in writing by at least three external referees. Individual departments may require a higher number of external referees if specified in their departmental elaborations. The process of selecting these referees will be as follows:

1. The candidate for tenure and/or promotion will provide a list of 3-5 referees to the chair of the department by mid-semester of the spring term prior to the tenure review. The referees must hold the same or higher academic rank, or its professional equivalent, as that sought by the candidate. Preferably, the referees shall be in the candidate’s area(s) of specialization. To avoid possible conflicts of interest clouding the credibility of the letters, none of these referees shall be the candidate’s dissertation advisor, major research/project collaborator, or frequent co-author. In some disciplines, large-scale collaborations (e.g. those requiring many types of data or expertise) may result in “collaborators” or “co-authors” who do not actually know each other. This possibility must be allowed for, but the relationship must be clearly explained. The list shall provide a brief explanation of the relationship between the candidate and each referee.
2. The chair together with the faculty eligible to vote on the tenure and/or promotion case will produce a list of 3-5 referees by mid-semester of the spring term prior to the tenure review. The referees must hold the same or higher academic rank, or its professional

- equivalent, as that sought by the candidate. Ideally, the referees should be in the candidate's area(s) of specialization and either from peer/aspirational institutions, or be requested to evaluate the candidate in the context of peer/aspirational institutions. To avoid possible conflicts of interest clouding the credibility of the letters, none of these referees shall be the candidate's dissertation advisor, major research/project collaborator, or frequent co-author. In some disciplines, large-scale collaborations (e.g. those requiring many types of data or expertise) may result in "collaborators" or "co-authors" who do not actually know each other. This possibility must be allowed for, but the relationship must be clearly explained. The candidate is permitted to identify referees with potential conflicts of interest before letters are solicited, and document the reasons for the conflict.
3. The chair or DPC will then compile a single list of 6-10 referees, equally balanced between the candidate's and the department's suggestions. The chair will obtain no fewer than the minimum number of referee's reports.
  4. Departments need to specify in their bylaws how much of the dossier will be transmitted to a referee. It is recommended that the materials transmitted minimally include the Statement of Expectations, a CV, and documentation in support of professional activity. These materials shall be transmitted to the referee as soon as possible. The referees will be asked to submit their reports on professional activity by the middle of August, in order to meet the review timelines specified by the UT Faculty Personnel Calendar set by the Provost. Referees will be asked to evaluate the quality and significance of the candidate's professional activity only. Referees should be asked how long and in what capacity they have known the candidate. Referees also should limit their comments to the candidate in question and should not indicate or be asked whether or not the candidate would receive tenure and/or promotion in their respective institution. All referees should be provided with a copy of the relevant portions of the CBA relating to tenure and/or promotion, as well as the relevant portions of the departmental bylaws on tenure and/or promotion to assist them in gaining some institutional context for framing their judgments. Referees should be informed that Ohio is an open records state. Confidentiality of reports cannot be guaranteed, but a candidate will see a report only if he/she requests it.
  5. All referees' reports submitted in time to be considered at the departmental level shall become part of the tenure and/or promotion dossier to be forwarded to each subsequent level of review. The department chair and the DPC share the responsibility for obtaining all referees' reports and including them in the dossier.

**APPENDIX 1**  
**STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS**  
**A Sample Statement**  
**Professor Untenured**  
**Assistant Professor of Natural Sciences and Mathematics Discipline**

This statement clarifies the expectations for satisfactory progress towards tenure, and for tenure itself; for Professor Untenured. This statement does not establish new requirements beyond those that are enumerated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), the College's elaborations thereupon, and in the bylaws of Professor Untenured's Department. Rather, it allows all parties to understand the standards in the three areas of teaching, professional activity, and service to which the Department will hold the candidate when he/she applies for renewals and tenure.

In evaluating him/her for renewals, the Department expects to see documented progress in

meeting the standards to which Professor Untenured will eventually be held for tenure. Such progress should be predictive of a favorable tenure decision in due course. In keeping with the CBA's requirements, the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) and Department Chairperson will undertake annual independent written evaluations of the candidate that will identify any deficiencies in his/her progress to that point.

**TEACHING.** Professor Untenured will regularly teach courses in the program(s) in a Natural Sciences and Mathematics Department and courses related to the College's interdisciplinary program in another related area, as agreed upon at the time of hire, and as assigned to him/her by his/her Department Chairperson, who will consult with him/her in making such assignments. The teaching load will be in keeping with the teaching load usually assigned to research-active faculty in the department/a graduate department. In addition, Professor Untenured's evaluation in the area of teaching will take into consideration any advising and field placement responsibilities that emerge as part of his/her role in the Another Related Area program. The Department expects Professor Untenured regularly to document the effectiveness of his/her teaching during the probationary period via evaluations of all of his/her regularly scheduled in load courses during the academic year (i.e., all courses excluding independent studies and direction of Honors and other thesis work). Each year, Professor Untenured shall submit evaluations of his/her teaching, including student evaluations of teaching, as part of his/her annual review. The Department also regards such activities as the development of new courses that add to the Department's or Another Related Area's curricula or engagement in student learning outcomes assessment as evidence of a commitment to teaching.

**PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY.** The Department expects Professor Untenured to continue his/her research and publication program already established in (sub-disciplinary area of expertise). Professor Untenured must publish a significant portion of his/her research in refereed journals of national (or international) prominence or recognized refereed scholarly or commercial presses. The Department expects that by the end of his/her probationary period, he/she will, at minimum, have published (or have accepted for publication) a few substantial articles or a book. All of Professor Untenured's publications shall count toward fulfilling these expectations.

**1, Publications.** Both the acceptance and publication of articles and books indicating original scholarship will be taken as evidence of the quality of a tenure candidate's work. Thus, a signed, written agreement from a scholarly refereed journal or press to publish a completed article, completed book, or edited volume is considered, for the purposes of evaluation, to be the equivalent of publication of that article, book, or volume.

**2. Presented Papers and Grants.** Candidates for tenure may also have presented their original work at international, national, and regional conferences. The Department understands international conferences to be those that attract a large number of scholars from outside the U. S. Regional conferences attract participants from a defined area of the U.S. Giving a paper before such groups is a sign of both scholarly promise and accomplishment. Such presentation provides pre-publication feedback as well as exposure in one's disciplinary community.

Being awarded an outside research grant is also evidence of scholarly standing and of the value of the proposed inquiry.

**3. Other Forms of Professional Activity.** Supplemental forms of professional activity include publishing book reviews and scholarly journal editing. While the Department recognizes these activities as meritorious, they are not to be considered a substitute for the production and publication of refereed work by the candidate.

**SERVICE.** For the purposes of evaluation for tenure, "service" shall be defined as the contribution a candidate makes to his/her department, College, University, profession, and discipline. In addition, "service" may also include those contributions a candidate makes to the community in his/her role as a teacher and scholar. The Department expects Professor Untenured to serve on committees within the department as assigned by the Chairperson and in his/her role in Another Related Area program as necessary. He/she also is expected to demonstrate a commitment to service in the College and University. Active participation as a professional in local and regional communities, and beyond, is similarly expected of Professor Untenured. The Department does not weigh volunteer activities relating to politics or charity in a tenure decision.

The undersigned have read and agreed upon the points in this document.

---

Professor Chairperson (Date)  
Chair, Rank and Discipline  
A Natural Sciences and Mathematics Department

---

Professor Candidate (Date)  
Current Rank

---

Professor DPC Chair (Date)  
Chair, Department Personnel Committee  
Professor Dean of Natural Sciences and Mathematics

---

Dean, College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (Date)