

University of Toledo

**Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation
of Tenure and Promotion**

Endorsed by Faculty Senate April 24, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preamble

I. Principles of Guidelines.....page 1

II. Methods of Evaluation.....page 2

III. Categories of Evaluation.....page 5

 A. Teaching.....page 5

 B. Professional Activity (Research, Scholarship, and Creative
 Activity).....page 7

 C. Service.....page 10

IV. Timelines.....page 12

University of Toledo

Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation of Tenure and Promotion

PREAMBLE

Tenure and promotion play a vital role in sustaining a functional university community where students and faculty flourish, and the university advances its mission to improve the human condition for all members of society. These guidelines exist to promote the highest quality of excellence at the University of Toledo. The faculty and administration of the University of Toledo endorse the following guidelines for faculty evaluation of tenure and promotion.

I. PRINCIPLES

- **Relationship of these guidelines to College and Departmental elaborations.**¹ Colleges, departments, and programs should use these guidelines as a model for the composition of their own elaborations, incorporating relevant descriptions and language from this document where appropriate. At the same time, as individual unit elaborations progress from the college level down to specific departments or programs, they typically become increasingly specific, expanding on the expectations and standards that reflect their disciplinary concerns. In other words, individual unit elaborations should reflect the broad values and norms in these guidelines, but they should also define their own standards in greater detail. Individual unit elaborations may establish higher standards than those contained within these guidelines, but they may not set lower standards than those stated here. For instance, a college's elaborations may require a higher number of external letters in a tenure dossier than the number recommended in these guidelines, but they may not require a lower number. Similarly, if these university-level standards set a lower standard than the expectations established within a candidate's college or department/program elaborations, then the candidates must meet the higher standard set by their college and department/program. Unit elaborations that fit the best practices of that unit's discipline are consistent with these guidelines. See College and Departmental elaborations for additional information about individual unit expectations.
- **Relationship to Collective Bargaining Agreement.** These guidelines are to be used to assist in the development of guidelines and elaborations for departments and colleges. The intent of this document is not to conflict with the Collective Bargaining Agreement but to provide definitions and a common baseline standard for evaluating tenure and promotion. In

¹ The term elaborations in this document is used to define elaborations for bargaining unit faculty elaborations and/or faculty rules, regulations, and guidelines used for non-bargaining unit faculty.

the instance where this document conflicts with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the CBA shall prevail. Similarly, in the instance where this document conflicts with the College of Medicine and Life Science Faculty Rules and Regulations, the latter shall prevail.

- **Maintenance of the policy.** This document has been drafted by faculty and reviewed and endorsed by Faculty Senate. It will be housed in and administered by the Provost's office and is subject to the Provost's approval. Subsequent revisions of this document shall also be subject to the Provost's approval.

II. METHODS OF EVALUATION

A. Effectiveness in Academic Assignment

Academic Assignment is the specific role given to a faculty member to support the educational mission of the University of Toledo. It is the primary but not the only consideration in evaluating a faculty member's performance and is the essential condition for continuation and advancement within the university. Evaluators must consider all the three categories described in these guidelines - teaching, professional activity, and service - in relation to the candidate's academic assignment.

B. Written Evaluations

There are two types of written evaluations used in the tenure and promotion process at the University of Toledo: (1) letters of evaluation that come from a structured process of faculty review within the university, and (2) letters of evaluation from peers specializing in the candidate's field at other institutions. Both forms are essential, and neither can be substituted for the other, because they constitute related but importantly different perspectives on a candidate's work.

1. Internal Faculty Review

- **Definition.** Internal faculty review is an extensive process of evaluation completed by faculty individuals, committees, and administrators at the candidate's home institution. It follows deadlines set by the Academic Personnel Calendar published by the Provost's office. This process dictates that untenured members are evaluated annually, and post-tenure candidates receive a review every five years. Only tenured Associate or Professors can participate in the formal evaluation process for Assistant Professors (except in Colleges where specific elaborations also permit untenured Associate Professors or other Assistant Professors to participate in the evaluation of Assistant Professors). In cases where Associate Professors seek promotion to Professor, faculty reviewers must consist only of tenured, full Professors. But reviewers' disciplinary expertise also matters, and some smaller departments and programs may occasionally need to craft a committee that combines disciplinary expertise and attained rank across different members for the committee to perform a comprehensive and fair review. Such cases should occur only with prior written approval of the Provost when necessary, and the rationale should be documented in

writing. See College and Departmental elaborations for additional information about individual unit expectations for internal faculty review.

- **Process.** The following units participate in the faculty review process for promotion and tenure, with each unit giving consideration to reviewing the recommendations and findings of all preceding units. Faculty within these units must strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues, and each unit makes an independent, fair, and equitable recommendation and provides a written rationale for decisions. In judging a member's performance, each unit abides by the criteria in these guidelines and all approved college and departmental elaborations on those criteria. Prior to tenure, in the first and second probationary years only, the faculty member's performance will not be reviewed by the UCAP or the President unless the dean recommends non-renewal. In the third year through the final tenure review, the candidate's dossier will be evaluated by all the units listed below (in cases in which a candidate's College has such units; where that is not the case, the review will be conducted according to College specific procedures).
 - Department Personnel Committee
 - Department Chairperson
 - College Committee on Academic Personnel or equivalent
 - College Dean
 - University Committee on Academic Personnel (except in the College of Medicine and Life Sciences and excluding the first and second year unless the dean recommends non-renewal)
 - Provost
 - President (excluding the first and second year pre-tenure review unless the dean recommends non-renewal)
- **Purpose.** The purpose of regular faculty review at the University of Toledo is threefold: (1) to provide feedback to candidates about their development and progress in each of the three categories, (2) to provide mentoring regarding how best to advance both the candidate's goal of advancement in rank and tenure as well as the university's educational mission with respect to the candidate's academic assignment, and (3) to document and substantiate recommendations for tenure and promotion. All selected faculty evaluators are familiar with the candidate's home institution, academic assignment, and mission, meaning that they can evaluate the candidate with a valuable understanding of the shared context and culture. At the same time, the faculty review process includes evaluators well outside the candidate's home department and discipline and therefore subjects the candidate's performance to evaluation against broader professional standards. By facilitating and encouraging a high level of professional effectiveness, regular faculty review is essential to the maintenance and continual improvement in quality and integrity of a university's faculty.

2. External Reviews

- **Definition.** External reviews of a candidate's scholarly work (not teaching or service) are solicited for all tenure and promotion cases in a way that ensures the integrity of the evaluative process. An external review is an appraisal of a candidate's accomplishments and contributions to the field written by an evaluator specializing in the field at a peer institution

or better (such as a Tier 1 Research Extensive University). The external reviewer is an expert in the candidate's discipline but does not have a relationship of any significance with the candidate, otherwise known as an "arm's length" evaluator. An arm's length evaluator may have met a candidate at a conference, for example, but will not have had significant collaboration with the candidate. For an arm's length review, letters must not be solicited from mentors, former professors, members of a candidate's dissertation committee, former students, co-authors or individuals with whom the candidate has collaborated professionally, or individuals that have a personal relationship with the candidate. If the candidate's field is so narrow that external evaluators must be drawn from those with a close professional relationship, then the unit must include a justification that will appear in the candidate's dossier to explain the exception to this policy, and such exceptions should be rare. Colleges and departments should encourage external reviewers to describe their relationship with the candidate. All external reviewers should at least hold the rank for which the candidate is being considered.

- **Process.** The department chair asks the faculty candidate to suggest a list of potential external reviewers, and the chair also creates a separate list of names independently. The chair selects names from either list and solicits evaluations until the required number of letters has been reached. Chairs must contact the evaluators directly, not via support staff and never through the faculty candidate, who should not solicit external letters.
- **Purpose.** External evaluations are required for all tenure and promotion cases, and the relevant faculty committees use the letters to evaluate the candidate's performance, particularly with respect to scholarship. External reviewers offer an outside perspective on a candidate's effectiveness, providing a fair, objective, and independent assessment of the candidate's work and/or professional standing within a broader context. External reviewers place the candidate's work in relation to national or international standards, commenting on how the candidate's scholarship contributes to key questions or issues in the field. They typically discuss the quality of a candidate's publication(s) as well as the quality of a candidate's publication venue(s) (including whether the candidate has published with high caliber journals or strong presses or whether a particular publication appeared in a high caliber journal or a strong press). They may consider the relationship between quantity and quality of publications and usually offer an assessment of the candidate's conference venues and any other public presentations of the candidate's work. They may also comment on the candidate's potential for future scholarship. See College and Departmental elaborations for additional information about the role of external evaluations.
- **Recommended number.** Candidates for tenure and promotion should present a minimum of three letters of external evaluation. See College and Departmental elaborations for additional information about the required number of letters.

C. Evidence

- Candidates must provide evidence for their accomplishments, and Colleges and Departments are responsible for creating specific elaborations that tell candidates what kind of evidence to prioritize and how to document it. See College and Departmental elaborations for additional information.

III. CATEGORIES OF EVALUATION

A. Teaching

1. Definition of Teaching

- Teaching is defined as the occupation or work of a teacher. It is a complex and challenging discipline that demands integrity and commitment.
- For tenure-track and tenured faculty, teaching usually involves being responsible for instruction in their courses or assigned teaching duties as well as numerous responsibilities beyond the classroom. Faculty contribute to meeting the course needs of the respective curricula of the department, college, and university; engage in pedagogical practice and innovation; and assess student learning outcomes. They often serve as advisers and mentors in a variety of capacities, devoting considerable time to building meaningful and constructive relationships with students and directly supervising their research and scholarship in ways that advance their progress.
- Because it can be accomplished effectively in many ways, teaching should always be considered in context and evaluated using multiple sources of information.

2. Criteria for Evaluating Teaching

- **Assigned courses.** All candidates for tenure and promotion should demonstrate a record of teaching their assigned courses effectively.
- **Circumstances of a course.** As part of a comprehensive evaluation of a candidate's teaching record, evaluators should consider the circumstances of particular courses. For instance, they could take into account whether the course is undergraduate or graduate level or involves new preparation for the faculty member, as is often the case for pre-tenure faculty. They might also consider whether or not the course is required, experimental, designed for the General Education curriculum or for majors, a writing- or research-intensive course, a revision of a preexisting course, a newly developed course, an independent study, a team-taught course, a course using technological mediation, or a course involving the supervision of labs, clinics, or student productions in the arts.
- **Range of courses taught.** Evaluators should take into account the range of courses taught. For instance, candidates in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Sciences might teach a combination of General Education courses, both lower and upper-level courses within the undergraduate major, and graduate-level classes. Candidates in pre-professional programs might teach within the core, develop specialized electives, supervise practicums, or teach graduate courses.
- **Curriculum development.** All tenure-track and tenured faculty are required to maintain a high level of knowledge in their special field, and their course content should reflect

advances in their disciplines. To respond to disciplinary advances, teachers typically revise regularly taught courses to reflect the latest developments in the field. Curriculum development may extend beyond the content of a particular course. A particularly high degree of curricular innovation, for instance, may include creating relationships between curricular and co-curricular activities that enhance student learning, developing new classes that advance the overall vision of their department, college, and university, or leading the department when it comes to making significant curricular revisions to their current program. Curricular innovation may also take the form of contributing in a substantial way to the creation of new programs or to the development of new pathways toward degree completion.

- **Pedagogical practice and innovation.** Proficiency in commonly used modes of instruction as appropriate to the discipline is expected of all teachers. For instance, many disciplines require some combination of in-person lecturing, distance learning, clinical, laboratory, or practicum instruction, thesis and dissertation direction, advising, and mentoring. All teachers are also expected to respond to weaknesses or problems in their pedagogy with care and attention. If problems are identified through direct classroom observations or performance evaluations, candidates should show that they have taken action to address them, using whatever support is available and documenting their efforts to improve. Particularly effective teachers tend to be flexible and responsive, with a high degree of self-awareness. They can articulate their teaching philosophy in writing and often experiment with varied or new pedagogical approaches to find better ways for students to learn. They reflect critically upon their successes or failures, documenting what they have learned from their experiences as well as the positive results of their pedagogy on student learning.
- **Advising.** Faculty advisors fulfill a crucial purpose because of their disciplinary perspective, their teaching experience, and their membership within the department of a student's major. Typically, the purpose of faculty advising is not just to communicate what the requirements are but also to convey a professor's expertise in the discipline and intimate knowledge of the major, providing students with accurate information and clear but flexible recommendations regarding university, college, and major requirements. In addition, advisors often consult closely with other faculty to be able to communicate the department's pedagogical goals to students, along with the role of specific major requirements within the curriculum and their context within the broader discipline. Advisers frequently engage in a continuing discussion of a student's future, including graduate or professional school and career options, as well as discussing educational or career opportunities in fields both within and outside of the advisor's own discipline. Finally, advisors traditionally have sufficient awareness of university structures and policies to make immediate and helpful referrals regarding issues they might not be able to address themselves, such as scholarships or financial aid, counseling, Title VI and Title IX complaints, student conduct issues, and residential issues.
- **Mentorship.** Mentoring students can be both formal and informal, and evaluators should take into account evidence of mentorship both in relation to the candidate's teaching load (including student conference hours associated with classes) as well as outside of it. Mentorship can involve supervising the research, scholarship, and clinical experiences of

both undergraduates and graduate students. This supervision may include providing support to students with research activity, grant writing, conference presentations, publication as well as serving as the primary adviser on a student's thesis. Mentoring graduate students in particular involves a long-term commitment to advancing a student's career and professional goals, which means not only supporting the development of their professional skills but also helping them to transition into the professional networks that will further their development in the field.

- **Professionalism.** Teaching demands the highest commitment to ethical conduct and professional integrity. Teachers should demonstrate respect for students as individuals at all times and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. They avoid exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students.
- **Recognition or awards for teaching and advising.** Evaluators should take into account whether a teacher has been asked to mentor other teachers, has received local or national awards for teaching, or has otherwise been recognized for teaching or advising excellence.

B. Professional Activity (Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity)

1. Definition of Professional Activity (Research, Scholarship, Creative Activity)

- Professional activity is defined as a sustained program of study aimed to advance knowledge within a specific field. All tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute regularly to their disciplines or professional communities, engaging in an ethically responsible way with substantive intellectual problems or aesthetic and creative questions that move their field forward. Peer-reviewed publication and similar publications, as well as public release of work (such as juried exhibits and performances), are usually considered the most important expression of a faculty member's professional activity. Other activities that eventually lead to publication and/or other forms of professional recognition are also valuable. Such activities might include but are not limited to nationally competitive research grant awards, patents or copyrights from the United States and/or other governments, licensing of intellectual property, fellowships, and conference presentations. In some disciplines (e.g., biomedical research), peer-review grant funding is considered the pivotal form of professional recognition, while other disciplines may prioritize peer-reviewed activities that lead to commercialization. It is expected that colleges and departments identify and rank different types of professional activity to indicate what type of contributions they prioritize, but professional activity should always be tied to a scholarly research agenda or a defined artistic plan. All programs should strive for a degree of research excellence that reflects the mission of creating new knowledge and teaching methods for creating new knowledge at the highest level.

- These guidelines subdivide the category of professional activity into two main categories: (1) research and scholarly activity and (2) artistic activity. Depending on the discipline, it is important to recognize not only that these subgroups may overlap but also that they will vary according to discipline. It is expected that college and department elaborations will define their specific expectations more precisely and explicitly, setting standards for distinction that are appropriate to achieving excellence within their disciplines.
 - **Research and scholarly activity** usually involve work that depends on an understanding of current disciplinary theory or creates new disciplinary theory. Such work is based on peer-reviewed research. It may analyze, synthesize, interpret, evaluate, create, and propose original hypotheses and arguments about important issues and questions. It often explores, discovers, explains, or demonstrates knowledge. Research and scholarship are typically communicated in public, peer-reviewed venues such as books and journal articles, and such work might also be expressed in reviews or technical reports, grant proposals that have been positively accepted or reviewed, papers presented at scholarly and professional associations, works of journalism, patents, translations, activities for acquiring and maintaining professional certification, licensing, and continuing education, and so forth. Other examples can include the application of disciplinary expertise either inside or outside the university or the development and commercialization of university discoveries.
 - **Artistic achievement** emphasizes the expression of the human imagination. Faculty members might create original works of literature or the aural, visual, or performing arts, or they might direct, perform, or curate such works in an original and interpretative manner. Artistic achievement is usually communicated in public venues that are juried or offer the opportunity for review. A music recital, direction of a theatrical production or concert, juried art exhibition, or publication of a poetry chapbook or work of fiction would all be considered examples of public, artistic activities.

2. Criteria for Evaluating Professional Activity

- **External peer review.** Independent review by peers within a faculty member's disciplinary specialty is important. A faculty member's professional contributions should be evaluated by peers outside of the University of Toledo in a position to assess the quality and significance of the contributions.
- **Quality of press or venue.** Evaluators should take into account the reputation of the publication or performance venue, considering whether it is well regarded by peers and has a strong record of contribution to the field. High quality forums receive more credit toward tenure and promotion, and departments with graduate programs are expected to define standards for what counts as a particularly high quality venue for publication or performance. In some circumstances, and depending on the discipline, a university press will most likely hold its authors to higher standards than a commercial press. In other fields, the H-index (a measure of the number of highly cited journal articles) or the number of peer-reviewed articles in high impact journals may be used. A textbook may also be considered of scholarly value in some disciplines, particularly if there is documented

evidence that it has been widely adopted by peers in the field. Similarly, with artistic work, peer reviewers will comment on the reach of a particular performance venue or professional activity, and greater emphasis is placed on those that are juried, reviewed, or likely to have continuing influence within the discipline.

- **Quantity.** Research and scholarly activity for the sake of reaching a numerical quota is discouraged, but the regularity of publication should be taken into account. A pattern of steady, consistent, substantive work in high quality venues is preferable to either a high volume of work frequently put out in less prestigious venues or a record of infrequent, sporadic completion.
- **Authorship.** Evaluators should recognize disciplinary standards regarding the relative value of primary and/or senior (e.g., communicating or corresponding) co-authorship. In some disciplines, solo or primary authorship is preferred; in others, multi-authored work is standard and may, in some circumstances, reflect innovative cross-disciplinary collaboration. Many departments value student co-authorship.
- **Coherence.** A candidate's professional activity can take many forms and directions, and developing new projects is a key aspect of sustaining a vital research agenda. But a faculty member's research and scholarship profile should have some coherence and integration, with disparate connections explained. Faculty should show how the questions being considered relate to one another and are being tested effectively, and the work is meaningfully advancing knowledge in an important direction. In other words, the logic behind faculty professional activity should be clear, and output should not appear random or erratic.
- **Resources.** Evaluators are encouraged to take into account that availability of resources might affect the venue and form of some research activities when, for example, judging participation in regional conferences against international ones.
- **Interdisciplinary work and collaboration.** In some cases, scholars might be working in multiple disciplines, have a degree from a discipline different from that of their current department, or be collaborating with scholars in other disciplines. In such circumstances, colleges and departments are expected to define the expectations of professional activity very specifically, and the norms of one department's discipline should be balanced against the norms of the other department(s) involved. All faculty are responsible for demonstrating their specific contribution to their field, regardless of whether that contribution appears in single-author or co-authored forms.
- **Professionalism.** Research, scholarship, and artistic endeavor frequently involve interactions with colleagues both at a faculty member's home institution and within the various external professional networks to which they may belong. In such interactions, faculty, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, must always strive to be accurate, exercise appropriate restraint, and show respect for the opinions of others. They must acknowledge academic debts, avoid discriminating against or harassing colleagues, and respect and defend the free inquiry of associates.

C. Service

1. Definition of Service

Service is defined as faculty using their knowledge and skills to engage in specific activities that contribute to the advancement of the university, the discipline or profession, and community. The different categories of service identified here are not exhaustive and often overlap, but they have been separated into three subgroups both for ease of use and for greater recognition of the different possibilities inherent in this category.

- **Institutional service** consists of a faculty member's participation in the departmental, college, and university-level activities that contribute in a substantial way to the important work of the institution. Including but not limited to committees, boards, task forces, and other governing bodies, as well as various types of leadership roles, institutional service is essential to shared governance, because it is through this work that faculty members engage with decisions that affect the university on every level. All faculty should accept their share of faculty responsibilities in the academic governance of the university.
- **Professional service** consists of contributions to the advancement of a faculty member's discipline or profession. For instance, serving on a journal advisory board or the executive committee of a professional organization, organizing or running a conference, vetting manuscripts for publication, or clinical activities are all forms of professional service. This type of service helps disciplines and professions to flourish by creating and maintaining infrastructure for the activities of peers in the field. In turn, professional service also raises the profile of the faculty member's home institution.
- **Community service** is defined as faculty using their skills and professional expertise to benefit the knowledge, health, and well-being of their larger communities. This type of service work can occur either on campus or outside the university, and it can include engagement with regional, state, national, or global activities. Examples might include collaboration or mentorship with a student group, outreach to an organization that serves a public purpose, collaborating with schools, businesses, advocacy groups, community groups, or civic agencies, developing innovative solutions that address social, economic, or environmental challenges, or unpaid consulting work.
- Some faculty pursue community engaged teaching or community engaged research. Colleges and departments should define what community engaged teaching or research means to them, what their expectations and standards for it are, and whether such work should be assigned to the teaching, research, or service categories.

2. Criteria for Evaluating Service

- **Outcomes.** The outcome of a faculty member's service is a crucial factor in evaluating its effectiveness. Evaluators should consider whether the service rendered achieved a particular and meaningful result.
- **Effectiveness.** Service is more than a name on a roster. It is the active and meaningful participation to improve the university or its profile in the community or with peer institutions. Regular attendance and meeting all the expectations of the assigned role are expected.
- **Relation to rank and number of years served.** New faculty members typically start with localized departmental service and build their efforts over time. It is expected that institutional service will increase in the years after tenure, with faculty assuming a greater level of responsibility for providing academic leadership within the university as well as to the profession.
- **Leadership roles.** Evaluators are encouraged to consider whether a candidate was in a leadership position within the service role (e.g., committee chair) that requires more time and effort.
- **Balance and proportion.** Faculty members are encouraged to distribute their service efforts across multiple areas rather than to concentrate on just one form of service unless they have been assigned to an unusually demanding service role (e.g., president of Faculty Senate). It is also appropriate for departments to set different expectations regarding service proportions for pre-tenure faculty.
- **Duration.** Faculty members should be rewarded for continuity in their service roles and for committing to responsibilities that optimize their skill sets. At the same time, they should also be encouraged to explore new forms of service after a certain amount of time to promote fresh thinking. When it comes to institutional service in particular, stasis in service roles can sometimes undermine progress both for the individual and the institution.
- **Role of significant service.** Certain forms of service require an above average commitment (e.g., program, institute, or center director, or significant work for the faculty union). Such service should be recognized and valued for its importance to the institution.

IV. TIMELINES

- **Assistant to Associate.** For most of the colleges at the University of Toledo, the timeline for achieving both tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate is five years, with the tenure/promotion review occurring in the sixth year. (Please see “Exception to the Rule,” below, for Colleges not governed by the CBA.)
- **Associate to Professor.** Associate professors applying for full Professor typically present themselves for promotion a minimum of five years after their promotion to Associate, since it takes time to build the sustained record of research excellence or creative activity required by this rank, which can only be earned by faculty who are nationally recognized as advanced leaders in their field of specialization.
- **Exception to the rule.** Colleges not governed by the CBA should adhere to industry norms with respect to the timing of consideration for promotion and tenure. But it is expected that their standards conform to the standards for teaching, research, and service described in articles I through IV of these guidelines, and that all colleges adhere to the review process established here as well as to the deadlines for submitting materials published on the Academic Personnel Calendar.
- **Early promotion.** Candidates who apply for early promotion are evaluated using the same criteria that would be applied if the full duration of the probationary period had been used. All levels of committees and administrators should explain clearly in their recommendation why they feel that early promotion/tenure is warranted based on performance.
- **Advance notice.** Candidates for promotion shall declare their intent to seek promotion for the following fall semester **no later than the Monday of the last week in March.** This request shall
 - be made in writing,
 - include the candidate’s list of suggested names of external reviewers, and
 - be sent to the Department Chair and copied to the candidate’s Dean.