

Promotion & Tenure Guidelines

I. Departmental Procedure

II. Evaluation Criteria

Departmental Procedure

Tenure

1. An untenured faculty member becomes a candidate for tenure by entering the final year of the probationary period specified by the Board of Trustees.
2. At the beginning of Spring Semester, but no later than February 15, the Chair of the Department shall provide the Tenure Advisory Committee (TAC) with the names of the candidates to be considered for tenure in the following academic year.
3. Within ten days after receiving the candidate list, the Chair of the TAC shall:
 - a. inform all candidates that they will be entering the final year of their probationary period and will be reviewed for tenure;
 - b. request that each candidate begin assembling all relevant material, subject to the guidelines of the University and the College of Arts and Science (CAS), that the candidate wishes to present for review.
 - c. request each candidate to provide to the TAC, by March 1, a list of persons from which the candidate wishes the TAC to request letters of evaluation;
 - d. for each candidate, solicit several external letters of evaluation as detailed below.
4. The Chair of the TAC shall appoint a subcommittee for each candidate for tenure. The members of the subcommittee should be chosen from among those willing to serve on such a subcommittee and who are acceptable to the candidate. This subcommittee is subject to ratification by the TAC. If the candidate for tenure is being considered at the same time for promotion, the

subcommittee appointed for the promotion procedure shall serve in this capacity. The function of this subcommittee is to advise and assist the candidate in assembling material relevant to the candidate's tenure application. Candidates may submit any material, subject to the University and CAS guidelines, which they deem useful and beneficial. It is not intended that any valid documentation in the candidate's behalf be excluded.

5. The Chair of the TAC shall ask several scholars not associated with SIUE to evaluate professional achievements of a candidate for tenure. The Chair of TAC shall select some of the names from the list provided by the candidate, if the candidate chooses to provide such a list, and shall select some of the names independently. Evaluators should be persons whose documented scholarly activities are in the same general area as that of the candidate. If the candidate is being considered at the same time for promotion, the same set of evaluation letters may be used for both tenure and promotion, and the Chair of the Promotion Advisory Committee shall solicit the letters of evaluation.

6. To the extent possible, a candidate for tenure should submit all tenure material to the TAC by August 15. During the last two weeks of August the members of the TAC shall individually review the materials which have been submitted by the candidates for tenure. Shortly after September 1, the Chair of the Department shall meet with the TAC to discuss the candidate's qualifications. The discussion shall be followed by a secret-ballot vote by the TAC on the question of granting tenure to the candidate. Any faculty member voting "no" shall provide written justification for that vote. If the Chair of the Department disagrees with the result of TAC's vote, the Chair of the Department must present to the TAC, in writing with documentation, the reasons for his or her decision. The Chair's recommendation to the Dean shall include the result of the TAC's vote.

7. In the event of a decision not to recommend tenure either by the Chair of the Department or by the TAC, the candidate shall be so informed in writing by the Chair of the Department. The party or parties making a negative recommendation shall provide upon request a statement, oral or written at the candidate's option, of the reasons contributing to the decision. The candidate shall have an opportunity to request reconsideration by the Chair of the Department and the TAC.

Promotion

1. After the beginning of Spring Semester, but no later than February 15, the Chair of the Promotion Advisory Committee (PAC) shall request written notification from those members wishing to nominate themselves as candidates for promotion. Members shall be allowed one week to provide this notification. (Normally, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor occur at the same time.)
2. The Chair of the PAC shall convene the committee within ten days after the deadline for receipt of nominations mention above.
3. As soon as possible after the meeting described above, the Chair of the PAC shall:
 - a. request each candidate to begin assembling all relevant material, subject to the University and CAS guidelines, which the candidate wishes to present for review;
 - b. request each candidate to provide to the PAC, by March 1, a list of persons, if any, from whom the candidate wishes the PAC to request letters of evaluation. The candidate may designate specific areas of inquiry for specific individuals on the list.
 - c. request each candidate to notify the PAC whether he or she wishes a special peer evaluation of his or her teaching to be conducted and included in the promotion materials, as detailed below. (This is in addition to the regular peer evaluation of teaching.)
 - d. for each candidate, solicit several external letters of evaluation as detailed below.
4. The Chair of the PAC shall appoint a subcommittee for each candidate for promotion. The members of the subcommittee should be chosen from among those willing to serve on such a subcommittee and who are acceptable to the candidate. This subcommittee is subject to ratification by the PAC. Its

function is to advise and assist the candidate in assembling material relevant to the candidate's promotion case. Candidates may submit any material, subject to the University and CAS guidelines, which they deem useful and beneficial; it is not intended that any valid documentation in the candidate's behalf be excluded.

5. Candidates for promotion may at their option, request a peer evaluation of their teaching effectiveness. Upon receiving such a request, the Chair of the PAC and the candidate jointly will determine the details for conducting the evaluation (e.g., the identity of the evaluator, the classes to be evaluated, the use of videotape facilities, etc.). This evaluation is subject to the deadline in paragraph 6, below.
6. The Chair of the PAC shall ask several scholars not associated with SIUE to evaluate professional achievements of a candidate for promotion. The Chair of PAC shall select some of the names from the list provided by the candidate, if the candidate chooses to provide such a list, and shall select some of the names independently, after seeking suggestions from the tenured faculty of appropriate rank. Evaluators should be persons whose documented scholarly activities are in the same general area as that of the candidate, and should be of rank equivalent to or higher than the candidate's desired rank. To the extent possible, candidates for promotion should submit all promotion materials to the PAC by August 15.
7. A faculty member may withdraw his or her candidacy for promotion to Professor at any time by so notifying the PAC in writing.
8. During the last two weeks of August the members of the PAC shall individually review the promotion materials which have been submitted by the candidates for promotion. Shortly after September 1, the PAC will vote, by secret ballot, on the question of recommending promotion for each candidate. Any faculty member voting "no" shall provide written justification for that vote.
9. The Chair of the PAC will notify each candidate of the result of the above balloting. For those candidates whom the PAC has declined to recommend for promotion, the Chair of the PAC shall provide upon request a statement, oral or written at the candidate's option, of the reason for the decision.

Evaluation Criteria

A. General consideration

Evaluation of faculty performance shall primarily be based on demonstrated accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service to the University. However, for faculty retention or tenure, the evaluation should be carried out with a broadened perspective. The faculty member's accomplishments shall be evaluated in light of his or her actual and potential contributions to the Department and his or her compatibility with other members of the Department as it relates to the effective operation of the Department. Paragraphs B through D in the following are intended as standards for evaluating a faculty member's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service to the University in matters related to promotion, tenure, and retention of faculty members.

1. Accomplishments in teaching may be substantiated by student evaluations, peer evaluations, teaching portfolios, indications of high level of student achievement, relevant awards and recognition received, innovations, teaching grants, and other appropriate evidence. Research and publications devoted to teaching may, at the faculty member's option, be included as such evidence.
2. Accomplishments in scholarship will be substantiated by evidence of scholarly activity such as: publications in refereed journals; grants obtained; publication of monographs and textbooks; technical reports; papers presented at professional meetings; colloquium lectures; abstracts and reviews of papers and books; organizing research conferences; being on the editorial board of a professional journal or conference proceedings; and attracting external recognition and research invitations. Research and publications devoted to teaching may, at the faculty member's option, be included as such evidence; however, the same material may not be counted both for teaching and for scholarship.
3. Academic service is constructive participation in the development of research, pedagogical, or service programs at SIUE, service to the profession, and service to the community. It will normally be substantiated by clear

evidence of contributions such as statements from chairs of committees on which the candidate has served, and statements from other persons knowledgeable about the candidate's service on the committee or outside the framework of designated committees.

4. The Advisory Committee shall provide the candidate with a written explanation of the candidate's ratings.
5. It is not intended that any valid documentation on the candidate's behalf be excluded.

B. Performance standard in teaching

1. A rating of meritorious or higher in teaching is required for promotion or tenure. Any candidate with a rating of satisfactory in retention reviews after the first year will be required to develop a teaching improvement plan in consultation with the Department Chair.
2. Unsatisfactory performance is characterized by failing to meet the expectations for satisfactory performance as described below.
3. In order to qualify for a satisfactory rating, a faculty member shall meet the expectations specified in the Faculty Handbook. In the majority of the faculty member's courses, student evaluation scores on questions pertaining to relevant topics (such as instructor interest, clarity, receptiveness to questions, clear response to questions, and prompt return of assignments) must include more positive responses than negative, and the majority of peer evaluations should likewise be positive as regards such matters as preparation, organization, student involvement, effective use of class time, and appropriateness of level. Student complaints should be rare, and when they occur evidence should be provided that the concerns have been dealt with. The candidate's annual review ratings shall also be taken into account.
4. In order to qualify for a meritorious rating, a faculty member shall meet all the expectations for satisfactory performance. In addition, the faculty member shall show careful attention to course and material preparation, shall actively work with students, and shall develop good rapport with students. Evidence for the first may include any of the following: responses at least at the midrange of the scale on relevant questions in student and peer evaluations; contributions to curriculum development – e.g., contributions to the design of new courses or redesign of existing courses, involvement in special courses such as Interdisciplinary Studies courses, New Freshman

Seminars, and honors courses; and innovations in the use of technology in class, in particular the development of online courses. Evidence for the second and third may include such activities as involvement in Senior Projects (in particular, directing such projects) and in Master's theses (in particular, advising students in these), and other similar mentoring activities. The candidate's annual review ratings shall also be taken into account.

5. In order to qualify for an excellent rating, a faculty member shall meet all the expectations for meritorious performance. In addition, the faculty member shall inspire students with challenging and stimulating material and work enthusiastically with students. Evidence for this may include any of the following: exceptional student and peer evaluations as compared with faculty members teaching similar courses; consistent and frequent mentoring activities including the direction of Senior Projects or Masters' theses; and exceptional contributions to curriculum development – e.g., leading the way in proposing and designing new courses (in particular, special courses, as in paragraph 3) or redesigning existing courses, or writing or revising undergraduate textbooks or other major supporting material. The candidate's annual review ratings shall also be taken into account.

C. Performance standard in scholarship

Performance evaluation levels in Scholarship:

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

1. Unsatisfactory performance is characterized by failing to meet the expectations for satisfactory performance as described below.
2. In order to qualify for a satisfactory rating, a candidate must demonstrate a commitment to quality scholarship. Evidence of a commitment to scholarship may include accepted peer reviewed papers, participation in professional conferences, service on an editorial board, submission of external grant proposals, or other comparable scholarly activities. During the probationary period, the candidate shall have a majority of retention review ratings of at least satisfactory. In particular, the performance standards for scholarship require a minimum of one peer reviewed paper every three years. This translates into a minimum of two peer reviewed papers over the probationary period. The quality of the candidate's scholarship shall be judged by both the reviews of external scholars and by the reviews of the Tenure Advisory Committee.

3. In order to qualify for a meritorious rating, a candidate shall be engaged in consistent production of quality scholarship. Evidence of a consistent production of scholarship may include multiple accepted peer reviewed papers, receiving funding for an external grant, presentations at professional conferences, service on an editorial board, or other comparable scholarly activities. During the probationary period, the candidate shall have a majority of retention review ratings of at least meritorious. In particular, the performance standards for scholarship require a minimum of two peer reviewed papers every three years. This translates into a minimum of four peer reviewed papers over the probationary period. The quality of the candidate's scholarship, judged by both the reviews of external scholars and by the reviews of the Tenure Advisory Committee, shall be considered at a higher level than that of the satisfactory rating.

4. In order to qualify for an excellent rating, a candidate shall be engaged in a steady production of quality scholarship. Evidence of excellence in scholarship may include publications in prestigious peer-reviewed journals, publications with recognized significant impact, receiving funding for a major external grant, invitations to present research talks, and awards in recognition of scholarship. During the probationary period, the candidate shall have a majority of retention review ratings of excellent. In particular, the performance standards for scholarship require a minimum of three peer reviewed papers every three years. This translates into a minimum of six peer reviewed papers over the probationary period. The quality of the candidate's scholarship, judged by both the reviews of external scholars and by the reviews of the Tenure Advisory Committee, shall be considered at a higher level than that of the meritorious rating.

Performance evaluation levels in Scholarship:

Promotion to Professor

1. Unsatisfactory performance is characterized by failing to meet the expectations for satisfactory performance as described below.

2. In order to qualify for a satisfactory rating, a candidate must demonstrate a commitment to scholarship. Evidence of a commitment to scholarship may include accepted peer reviewed papers, participation in professional

conferences, service on an editorial board, submission of external grant proposals, or other comparable scholarly activities. The candidate's annual review ratings shall also be taken into account. The quality of the candidate's scholarship shall be judged by both the reviews of external scholars and by the reviews of the Promotion Advisory Committee.

3. In order to qualify for a meritorious rating, a candidate shall be engaged in consistent production of quality scholarship. Evidence of a consistent production of scholarship may include multiple accepted peer reviewed papers, receiving funding for an external grant, presentations at professional conferences, service on an editorial board, or other comparable scholarly activities. The candidate's annual review ratings shall also be taken into account. The quality of the candidate's scholarship, judged by both the reviews of external scholars and by the reviews of the Promotion Advisory Committee, shall be considered at a higher level than that of the satisfactory rating.
4. In order to qualify for an excellent rating, a candidate shall be engaged in a steady production of quality scholarship. Evidence of excellence in scholarship may include publications in prestigious peer-reviewed journals, publications with a large number of citations, receiving funding for a major external grant, invitations to present research talks, and awards in recognition of scholarship. The candidate's annual review ratings shall also be taken into account. The quality of the candidate's scholarship, judged by both the reviews of external scholars and by the reviews of the Promotion Advisory Committee, shall be considered at a higher level than that of the meritorious rating.

D. Performance standard in service

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

1. Unsatisfactory performance in service is characterized by failing to meet the satisfactory expectation described below.
2. To qualify for a rating of satisfactory, a faculty member shall average at least one a year of the following: active participation on committees as documented by the chair of the committee; participation in administrative activities related to the operation of the Department, the College, or the University as documented by the Department chair; participation in program reviews; active participation in University related public service (such as: Preview, Math Contest, etc.) or service to the profession. During the

probationary period, the candidate shall have a majority of retention review ratings of at least satisfactory.

3. To qualify for a rating of meritorious, a faculty member shall average, per year, at least two of the items listed for satisfactory rating or the following: active contributions to multiple committees; leadership in committee work; significant contributions to administrative activities; significant contributions to committees beyond the Department level; active involvement in a service role to the professional community; significant contributions to University recognized public service. During the probationary period, the candidate shall have a majority of retention review ratings of at least meritorious.
4. To qualify for a rating of excellent, a faculty member shall meet the expectations for meritorious performance and shall in addition meet at least one per year, on average, of the following: leadership in committees at the College or University level; high achievements in a service role to the professional community; exceptional contributions to University recognized public service. During the probationary period, the candidate shall have a majority of retention review ratings of excellent.

Promotion to

The evaluation process for promotion to Professor shall follow the same guidelines as those listed for promotion to Associate Professor except for the following:

1. Unsatisfactory performance is characterized by failing to meet the satisfactory expectation described below.
2. To qualify for a rating of satisfactory, a faculty member shall meet at least two per year, on average, of the activities listed for promotion to Associate Professor. The candidate's annual review ratings shall also be taken into account.
3. To qualify for a rating of meritorious, a faculty member shall meet the expectations for meritorious performance listed for promotion to Associate Professor and shall in addition meet at least one per year, on average, of the following: leadership in committees at the College or University level; high achievements in a service role to the professional community; exceptional contributions to University recognized public service. The candidate's annual review ratings shall also be taken into account.

4. To qualify for a rating of excellent, a faculty member shall meet the guidelines set forth for meritorious performance in item 3 and at least one additional item per year, on average, from the list. Candidates are expected to be involved in committees outside the department. The candidate's annual review ratings shall also be taken into account.