

College of Arts and Sciences

Faculty Evaluation Policies

Introduction

Faculty performance evaluations are a frequent occurrence for probationary tenure-track faculty. This document is intended to serve as a guide to aid in understanding these evaluations.

The basis for all performance evaluations is the document *College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Criteria*. These criteria describe Excellent, Meritorious, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory levels of performance in the evaluation categories of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. (Individual departments have also elaborated on these criteria, providing greater specificity related to each discipline.) The various faculty performance evaluations are annual review, retention review, midpoint review, tenure review, and promotion review. Only annual review examines performance over a single year; all other reviews are cumulative (normally from the point of hiring). Retention reviews and midpoint reviews for tenure track faculty are preliminary steps leading to the tenure decision and, as such, are part of the overall tenure process. All reviews judge performance in all three categories (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service), and use consistent evaluation labels (Excellent, Meritorious, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory).

In reviews leading to the tenure decision (retention, midpoint and tenure reviews), the candidate also must be judged to have satisfactory potential for continuing contributions to the unit, College and University, which includes the collegial role, as stated in Board of Trustees policies (Article VI, Section 2):

As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas they show due respect for the opinion of others. They acknowledge academic debts and strive to be objective in the professional judgment of colleagues. They accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of the institution.

Within the College of Arts and Sciences a significant consideration in the evaluation of teaching (and to a lesser extent service, and scholarly and creative activity) is a faculty member's record and documentation reflecting efforts to foster the *College of Arts and Sciences Desired Characteristics and Capabilities of Graduates*. Candidates are specifically asked to address these efforts in midpoint, tenure, and promotion reviews.

In addition to the evaluation criteria, each type of evaluation has a procedure which includes a set of steps (review levels) with dates, and a format for presenting materials for review. This document provides an overview of each type of review, and includes relevant CAS policies in the appendices. Applicable University policies-*SIUE Tenure Policy and Guidelines*, and *SIUE Promotion Policy and Guidelines*-are to be found on the *SIUE Faculty Handbook* website, www.siu.edu/PROVOST/FHB/.

Annual Review

Purpose: Annual review serves to create a record of accomplishment for the previous calendar year, to generate constructive feedback, and to provide the basis for annual merit salary increases. Since all evaluation reviews use the same labels, and judge the same categories, the results of annual reviews form the basis for cumulative reviews, which should result in significant linkage and consistency among the various reviews.

Procedure and Format: The overall process is detailed in the *CAS Faculty Performance and Salary Increase Plan*. The evaluation period is a calendar year and the process is a cycle. At the beginning of an evaluation period and in consultation with the Chair, individuals select goals and a percentage of effort assignment for teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. At the end of the evaluation period, they document results and accomplishments in all areas, using the departmental faculty activity report format. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide a complete record. Faculty are evaluated relative to their individual goals, their percentage of effort assignment, and department and College criteria; evaluation includes both peer review and chair review. Normally the process is concluded by the third week in March. A copy of the evaluation is provided to the individual and sent to the Dean.

Goals for individual faculty should be chosen based upon University, College and departmental goals. They are mutually agreed upon with the Department Chair and should reflect a balance of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Ideally, goals are cast in terms of measurable objectives, a deadline for completion, the level of support needed, and an agreed upon method for measuring results.

The percentage of effort assignment should mirror these goals. The normal range of the percentage of effort is 50-80% in teaching, reflecting the strongest commitment to this area; 10-40% in scholarly and creative activity, and 10-40% in service. As faculty members select percentages, they should consider how the pattern over several years will affect their ability to demonstrate sufficient accomplishments in all three areas for tenure and promotion.

Retention Review

Purpose: Retention review serves to examine the cumulative record of progress toward tenure in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service for tenure track faculty. It also serves as the basis to fulfill the requirement of notice of retention or non-renewal.

Procedure and Format: The first two retention reviews occur at times other than annual reviews since they must meet separate deadlines. Retention notice is given to a faculty member by January 15 (providing four months notice) in the first year, and by September 15 (providing eight months notice) in the second year. Thereafter, retention and annual reviews occur at the same time. A chart *Review Schedule for Tenure Track Faculty* is included and helps clarify the timing of the various reviews. Department papers describe the process, which must include the advice of the tenured faculty. A copy of the retention review and recommendation is provided to the faculty member and sent to the Dean. See also the *CAS Retention Review Policy*.

Midpoint Review

Purpose: Midpoint evaluation of tenure track faculty is a systematic evaluation of progress toward tenure in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. It is intended to be comprehensive, yet early enough for the candidate to have opportunity to focus on any areas which may need strengthening. It provides judgment at additional levels of review beyond the department, provides experience in the preparation of a tenure dossier, and serves as the retention review for that year.

Procedure and Format: The steps are outlined in *CAS policy on Midpoint Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty*. The candidate's dossier is reviewed by tenured department faculty, the Department Chair, the CAS Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, the Dean and the Provost. An abbreviated dossier is prepared according to the format in *CAS Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers*.

Tenure Review

Purpose: Tenure review provides a systematic evaluation of accomplishments in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service, as well as potential for continuing contributions to the unit, College and University, in order to determine whether an individual will be awarded a tenured appointment. A tenured appointment signifies the permanent holding of an academic position of employment as governed by Board and University policies.

Procedure and Format: The steps are outlined in the *CAS Promotion and Tenure Procedures*. The candidate's dossier is reviewed by the tenured department faculty, the Department Chair, the CAS Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee, the Dean, the Provost, and the Chancellor. Tenure is conferred by the Board of Trustees. The dossier is prepared according to the *CAS Promotion and Tenure Dossier Guidelines*.

Recommendations for tenure (and retention) shall be based on the candidate's documented accomplishments and contributions in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service to the University and community, as well as on the candidate's potential for continuing contributions to the unit, College and University. To achieve tenure a candidate must be judged according to University, College and department criteria to be at least Meritorious in teaching, at least Meritorious in either service or in scholarly and creative activity, and at least Satisfactory in the other. The candidate also must be judged to have satisfactory potential for continuing contributions to the unit, College and University.

Promotion Review

Purpose: Promotion review determines whether a faculty member has sufficient accomplishments in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service to warrant promotion to the next rank.

The ultimate purpose of the process of promotion in academic rank is to encourage faculty members to achieve their highest potential and to foster their development in teaching, scholarly

and creative activity, and service to the University and the community. Promotion in academic rank signifies that a faculty member has demonstrated accomplishments in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service, and demonstrates the confidence the University has in a faculty member's potential for increasing accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Procedure and Format: The steps are outlined in *CAS Promotion and Tenure Procedures*. They are the same steps as for tenure review (except approval by the Board of Trustees is not required). The dossier is prepared according to the *CAS Promotion and Tenure Dossier Guidelines*. As with tenure, a candidate must be judged according to University, College and department criteria to be at least Meritorious in teaching, at least Meritorious in either service or scholarly and creative activity, and at least Satisfactory in the other. The cumulative record since the previous promotion is the basis for judgment.

Appendices

CAS Desired Characteristics and Capabilities of Graduates

CAS Review Schedule for Tenure Track Faculty

CAS Promotion and Tenure Criteria

CAS Faculty Performance Evaluation and Salary Increase Plan

CAS Retention Review Policy

CAS Policy on Midpoint Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty

CAS Promotion and Tenure Procedures

CAS Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers

CAS Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty Holding Joint Appointment

College of Arts and Sciences



Desired Characteristics and Capabilities of Graduates

The College of Arts and Sciences of Southern Illinois University Edwardsville is committed to ensuring that its graduates acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to function as educated individuals, life-long learners, and responsible citizens. To these ends, the College fosters the development of the following characteristics and capabilities:

Communication: Organize and express ideas clearly and appropriately; master standard use of written and oral communication; appreciate alternative forms of expression, including art, dance, music and literature; distinguish between the medium and the message; listen, observe, interpret, and understand others.

Critical Thinking: Employ independent, objective, and rigorous reasoning; identify and integrate the elements of a task or problem; seek, organize, assimilate, synthesize, and use information; maintain a healthy skepticism; recognize the value of creativity, the limits of reason and the legitimacy of intuition.

Problem Framing and Solving: Appreciate the complexity of problems; go beyond conventional assumptions; understand parts of systems as well as the whole; recognize patterns and generalize; search and test solutions using analytical and intuitive skills; evaluate and monitor outcomes; work effectively and creatively in diverse groups.

Knowledge: Master basic facts, concepts, and literature of the arts and sciences; acquire knowledge of diverse ethical traditions and contemporary issues; develop competence in the use of technology, instrumentation, and research methods; develop expertise in a major; understand the evolution and trends of that major; acquire knowledge of career opportunities.

Integration and Application of Knowledge: Recognize and value the interconnectedness of knowledge; learn creatively from practice and experience; apply knowledge in innovative ways; appreciate, use, and promote multidisciplinary and culturally diverse perspectives; foster connections wherein knowledge serves as a bridge to new levels of understanding and insight.

Self Development: Assess personal strengths, weaknesses, and potential; develop individual goals and persevere to achieve them; build self confidence and motivation; identify and respect diverse backgrounds and viewpoints; deal effectively with change; recognize and tolerate ambiguity; develop a well-considered personal ethic that includes responsibility for actions; assume responsibility for decisions and their results.

Citizenship: Participate in the local, national, and global community; be sensitive to the welfare of others; appreciate democratic values; acquire a sense of personal and collective responsibility for the social and natural environment.

Life-long Learning: Maintain a sense of curiosity; appreciate and master the process of learning; recognize that learning is a means of fulfillment and success in one's personal and professional life.

CAS Review Schedule for Tenure Track Faculty

Year:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Begin 1 st retention review	2 nd Retention Review & Recommendation Due Sep. 1 to CAS (notification by 15 th)				Dossier for Tenure	TENURE
	1 st Retention Review & Recommendation Due Jan. 2 to CAS (notification by 15 th) AND Annual Review Due 3 rd week in March	3 rd Retention Review & Recommendation (notification by 5/15) AND Annual Review Due 3 rd week in March	Midpoint Review for Tenure Track Faculty (serves as 4 th Retention Review & Recommendation): Leave Dep. 2/15 Leave CAS Com. 3/7 Leave Dean 4/1 Final Notice 5/15 AND Annual Review Due 3 rd week in March	Annual Review including 5 th Retention Review & Recommendation Due 3 rd week in March	Annual Review including 6 th Retention Review & Recommendation Due 3 rd week in March	Annual Review Tenure Decision	

College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Criteria

A. Criteria for the Evaluation and Recognition of the Teaching Activities of Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences

Preamble

As stated in the *Desired Characteristics and Capabilities of Graduates* statement, the College of Arts and Sciences of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville is committed to ensuring that its graduates acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to function as educated individuals, life-long learners, and responsible citizens. Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences contribute to this mission through excellence in teaching. This excellence is achieved through such activities as: the University's general education program, programs and courses for undergraduate majors within the College of Arts and Sciences, and programs and courses in graduate education and those which support professional development.

For most faculty members, classroom and laboratory instruction and such associated activities as student assessment, curriculum development, and student advisement constitute their most important and time-consuming activities. The centrality of teaching in the University's mission, and its concomitant place in faculty activity, demands that the evaluation of teaching be the major component in the assessment of any faculty members performance. Consequently, skilled and effective teachers should be well rewarded and faculty members should be encouraged and provided support in the development and improvement of teaching skills.

Section I: Role of the Department

The College of Arts and Sciences recognizes the central role of the departments in the evaluation of teaching conducted by their faculty. This departmental evaluation shall reward current achievement and shall provide the faculty with feedback to help develop their talents. The pedagogy and methodologies employed to achieve excellent teaching vary greatly among disciplines and individuals within each discipline. Therefore, it is within the department that these matters are best addressed. The responsibility for setting general guidelines and for establishing and maintaining standards of teaching excellence rests with the College of Arts and Sciences. It is the responsibility of each department or unit to develop its own specific evaluation criteria and performance standards, based upon the framework set forth by the College.

Section II: Evaluating Performance

Teaching is the most central activity in which professors routinely engage, and should be an essential consideration in all matters of tenure, promotion and salary. Attributes which characterize excellent teaching can, and often do, vary from professor to professor, topic to topic, and discipline to discipline. Nevertheless, the evaluation of teaching, while challenging, is an essential activity for individuals and units within the College.

To guide departments in developing criteria for faculty assessment, the College of Arts and Sciences provides a partial list of behaviors, characteristics, attitudes, and activities that are common among outstanding teachers, along with a list of tools that may be used to identify and document these qualities. Each department should use these listings to develop criteria which are most central to excellent teaching within their discipline, and which indicators are most appropriate for documenting progress and success in achieving those characteristics. Chairs will then work with individual faculty members to determine which characteristics and indicators are most appropriate for the evaluation of the individual faculty member. All evaluations must include at least one student-generated, one peer-generated, and one self-generated method. Finally, these criteria shall be used in conjunction with the Performance Evaluation Process as detailed in the University Faculty Performance Evaluation and Salary Increase plan. In accordance with this policy, these criteria shall be used for both evaluation and to establish goals and indicators for future development as teachers.

Behaviors and Characteristics, Attitudes, and Activities of Outstanding Teachers

- Knowledge of subject material
- Enthusiasm for teaching
- Ability to communicate subject effectively
- Belief in the potential of students and in their ability to learn
- Fostering understanding of the connection between course material and students' future goals (employment, career, personal, and educational)
- Ability to show how subject matter relates to the formation of a well-educated individual
- Fostering student growth and achievement in oral communication, writing and critical thinking
- Ability to cross disciplinary lines and acquaint students with the connections among disciplines
- Willingness to seek and use pedagogy which, in given circumstances, most enhances learning
- Promoting active learning and a participatory classroom with engagement, dialogue, and feedback
- Commitment to one's own development as a teacher and a learner; openness to learning to improve
- Humanness and a sensitivity to the diverse views and backgrounds of students
- Incorporation of multiculturalism in teaching whenever applicable
- Promoting mutual respect among students and faculty
- Being accessible and approachable for appropriate student consultations
- Setting high standards for student work and supporting students in their endeavors
- Providing prompt and appropriate evaluation of student work
- Giving attention to ancillary instructional support activities (e.g., selecting texts, recording grades, etc.)
- Preparation and organization

Some Key Indicators for Documenting Teaching Excellence

- Self evaluation
- Peer ratings (by colleagues, peers, chairs, etc.)
- Teaching portfolio (see Attachment A for what may be included in a teaching portfolio. Some of the elements may overlap with those listed below)
- Student ratings (by students, exiting seniors, alumni, etc.)
- Directing student work (senior assignment projects, graduate theses, honor students, special topics courses, etc.)
- Indications of high level of student achievement (student work recognized, accepted to conferences, published, etc.)
- Supervising internships/practicums/student teaching, etc.
- Good departmental citizenship (such as teaching service courses)
- Participation in co-curricular academic activities (advisement of student organizations, participation in conversation hours and electronic bulletin boards, etc.)
- Relevant awards and recognition received
- Innovations (new teaching methods, the design of new courses, addition of topical readings, etc.)
- Publications, papers presented, and other creative activities (books, articles, software, musical compositions, paintings, performances of creative work, etc.)
- Research directed toward curricular activities
- Support obtained (grants, release time, student help, travel, equipment)
- Participation in academic conferences
- Participation in relevant external service activities (consultantships, membership in professional organizations, participation in professional conferences, etc.)
- Any other appropriate evidence of teaching excellence

Section III: Performance Evaluation Levels

Departments are to establish evaluation criteria and procedures in the four performance evaluation levels (*Unsatisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, *Meritorious*, and *Excellent*) that are consistent with the following guidelines:

Satisfactory Performance

To qualify for a rating of *Satisfactory*, faculty members shall 1) meet the minimum expectations of University faculty in carrying out their teaching assignments, as listed in the Faculty Handbook*, and 2) provide evidence of reasonable and timely advancement toward the attainment of the goals established in the annual meeting called for by the Performance Evaluation Process.

Meritorious Performance

To qualify for a rating of *Meritorious*, faculty members shall meet all of the expectations for *Satisfactory* performance. In addition, faculty members shall 1)

meet most or all of the goals agreed upon in the annual meeting as called for by the Performance Evaluation Process, 2) meet the overall performance expectations for teaching in their respective department and/or equivalent unit, and 3) provide a variety of significant evidence documenting their teaching performance.

An overall rating of *Meritorious* in teaching is the minimum evaluation required for tenure. This overall evaluation must be the average of ratings for the years of untenured service that both reflects a quantitative average of Meritorious performance and demonstrates consistent effort in the *Meritorious* range during the most recent years of employment.

Excellent Performance

To qualify for a rating of *Excellent*, faculty members shall meet all of the expectations for *Meritorious* performance. In addition to the above, faculty members shall be recognized for their 1) distinguished success in achieving most or all of the goals agreed upon in the annual meeting as called for by the Performance Evaluation Process, 2) distinguished success in meeting and/or surpassing most of the overall performance expectations for teaching in their respective department and/or equivalent unit, and 3) provision of a variety of significant evidence documenting excellence in teaching and recognized by the department and or equivalent unit for its outstanding quality.

Unsatisfactory Performance

Faculty members who fail to meet all of the expectations for a rating of Satisfactory performance shall receive a rating of *Unsatisfactory*. In the view of the College, no faculty member should perform at, and as a consequence be judged as, *Unsatisfactory* with regard to teaching. In the few instances where a rating of *Unsatisfactory* is warranted, steps should be taken by the College, the department, and the individual(s) involved to resolve what is considered to be a serious shortcoming.

*See attachment B

B. Criteria for the Evaluation and Recognition of the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities of the Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences

Preamble

Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences share the University's commitment to scholarship, summarized in the following passage from the *University Policies and Guidelines Concerning Research*:

Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville offers, as one of its primary functions, programs in applied and basic research. The University is a community of scholars striving to advance human knowledge in an atmosphere of open inquiry and free expression. All faculty members are expected to participate in research activities. Furthermore, such activity is expected to proceed with regard both for the truth and the well-being of all living creatures who might serve as objects of study or who might benefit from the results of research. Recognition of individual scholars who have demonstrated meritorious work is essential at all University levels.

I: Role of the Department

The College of Arts and Sciences recognizes the central role of the departments in evaluating the research, scholarship, and creative activities conducted by their faculty. The purpose of the evaluation is to reward achievement and provide faculty with feedback to aid in the development of their talents. The department is the most appropriate level at which to develop criteria and an evaluation procedure for assessing these activities, and is in the best position to determine the quality and relevance of the scholarly activity. It is the responsibility of each department to develop specific criteria and standards consistent with the general guidelines of the College of Arts and Sciences described below.

II: Evaluating Performance

The College of Arts and Sciences recognizes the diversity of talents among its faculty. Research, scholarly activities, and creative activities, include basic and applied research, integration of knowledge through interdisciplinary scholarship, as well as the creative activities in literature and the performing arts. All of these related activities are included under the umbrella of scholarship, according to the following description.

Scholarship is the documented and demonstrated dissemination of information that is grounded in research or creative activity. As such, information is made available to peers or peer groups for evaluation, either through the presentation of information at professional conferences, publication in journals, books, or some similar forum.

Evidence of activities in scholarship may be in the form of presentation of papers at conferences, publication of articles in journals, publication of books, textbooks, book chapters; grant proposals and contracts (funded and unfunded), performances, productions and exhibits, and appropriate consulting arrangements, and in the supervision of theses and research projects of students. In order for activities in scholarship to be considered in performance reviews, faculty members are expected to provide documentation of both achievements and works in progress.

Section III: Performance Evaluation Levels

Departments are to establish evaluation criteria and procedures in the four evaluation levels (*Unsatisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, *Meritorious*, and *Excellent*) that are consistent with the following guidelines:

Satisfactory Performance

In order to qualify for a rating of *Satisfactory* a faculty member should be engaged in significant scholarship. This would include papers accepted for publication and/or presentation but not given, research in progress, grant and contract proposals in progress, research for articles and books in progress, supervision of student research, or some other demonstrable examples of participation in research and creative activities. Each department is responsible for evaluating the quality of the work in progress to determine if a Satisfactory rating is justified. Work in progress must ultimately result in the production of a presentation, exhibit, publication, grant, or contract. Failure to generate results within an amount of time deemed reasonable by the department requires the department to withhold credit for work in progress in future evaluations until results are generated.

Meritorious Performance

In order to qualify for a rating of *Meritorious* a faculty member should meet the expectations for *Satisfactory* performance. In addition, faculty members should have demonstrated a level of achievement. Evidence of achievement includes presentation of papers, submission or publication of articles, submission or award of grant or contract proposals, submission of proposals for book or book chapters, completion of works of artistic expression (paintings, sculpture, poetry, literature, etc.), acting as an editorial board member for a journal, reviewing articles for publication or presentation, or by serving as a proposal reviewer for external agencies. In determining criteria for the *Meritorious* rating, departments should consider both the quality of the achievement as well as the number of documented achievements.

Excellent Performance

In order to qualify for a rating of *Excellent* a faculty member should meet the expectations for *Meritorious* performance. In addition to the above, faculty members should have demonstrated high levels of achievement. Evidence of high achievement includes publication in peer reviewed journals of the highest quality, selective paper presentations at international or national conferences, book publication, funded major grants and/or contracts, major performances and exhibits. In determining criteria for the *Excellent* rating, departments should consider both the quality of the achievement as well as the number of documented achievements.

Unsatisfactory Performance

Faculty members qualify for an *Unsatisfactory* rating if they do not have evidence of work in progress in scholarship. Faculty who fail to meet expectations in scholarship (i.e. failure to produce results from work in progress, failure to complete assigned dissertation within a specified time period, etc.) will also qualify for a rating of *Unsatisfactory*.

C. Criteria for the Evaluation and Recognition of the Service Activities of Faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences

Preamble

As stated in the Faculty Handbook, a major goal of the university is to "develop a faculty with a reputation for providing the highest quality educational opportunity, scholarship, and service." With regard to service, the university expects each member of the faculty to be "a committed citizen of his or her department and School," providing "evidence of service to the University, to the public, and/or to the profession."

The College of Arts and Sciences expects all members of its faculty to demonstrate good citizenship through demonstrated service to the University, the College, the department, the profession, and/or the larger community of which the University is a part. The College considers service to be a vital part of each faculty member's role. The following sections provide guidelines for the evaluation of service within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Section I: Role of the Department

Primary responsibility for evaluation of faculty service rests with the department. Each department, through its chair and collective faculty is responsible for further defining the meaning of service, the criteria for its measurement, and the standards for evaluation of its faculty within the framework established by the College. The department may, at its discretion, identify, evaluate and assign value to service activities not identified in the College policies but which are unique to a particular profession, discipline, and/or department. In such cases, it is the responsibility of the department to justify or document the rationale for assigning value to and granting its evaluation of faculty within each rank, including faculty on full-time term appointments.

Section II: Evaluating Performance

In establishing standards for the evaluation of service, the College of Arts and Sciences affirms the importance of these activities. In establishing departmental procedures for evaluating service, each unit must take into account increasing expectations with faculty rank and length of service. Departmental procedures must also differentiate among activities as a function of their location (departmental, college, university, and profession), time commitment and quality of service, as well as the level of responsibility (Committee chair, subcommittee chair, etc.) within each activity.

In relating College expectations in the area of service to faculty rank, departments may develop evaluation criteria appropriate to faculty rank according to the following guidelines:

Assistant Professor: The primary responsibilities of an Assistant Professor within the College are to perform the duties of teaching and research in support of classroom instruction and professional development. An Assistant Professor is expected to perform service primarily within the department. Faculty at this rank may be expected to begin assuming leadership roles within departmental committees and subcommittees as they acquire experience. Expectations and assignments to service at the College and University levels may be, at the discretion of the department and faculty member, delayed or minimized until promotion and rank in tenure is achieved.

Associate Professor: Faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor are expected to fully participate in departmental service activities and assume appropriate leadership roles within the unit. Faculty at this rank are also expected to broaden the scope of their service activities to include service to the College and/or the University and Community.

Professor: Faculty at the rank of Professor are expected to participate in service at the College and/or University levels and assume leadership roles within the department, the College, and/or the University and Community.

Partial Listing of Service Activities

To guide departments in developing criteria for faculty assessment, the College of Arts & Sciences provides a partial list of activities that may be recognized in the area of service:

- Participation in department committees
- Advising students within the department
- Service as Department Chair or academic program director
- Participation in College Committees
- Advising students in College-recognized student groups
- Service on College-level task forces
- Service as Dean, Associate Dean, or other College-level administrative position
- Participation in University governance
- Membership and participation of Graduate School Committees (Programs, Educational Research & Policies, University Research & Development Committee, Research & Projects Advisory Board, etc.)

- Participation in University-wide committees
- Participation in the Faculty Senate or Graduate Council
- Service on University-level task forces
- Advising students in University-recognized student groups
- Service as a University administrator or director
- Activities in professional organizations
- Advising or assisting civic organizations in support of the University Mission
- Public outreach and community activities in support of the University Mission
- Activities in support of the advancement of one's profession

Section III: Performance Evaluation Levels

Departments are to establish evaluation criteria and procedures in the four performance evaluation levels (*Unsatisfactory*, *Satisfactory*, *Meritorious*, and *Excellent* that are consistent with the following guidelines:

Satisfactory Performance

To qualify for a rating of *Satisfactory*, a member of the faculty must perform service that meets the minimum expectations of the department with regard to faculty rank and experience. For the rank of Assistant Professor, minimum expectations should include participation in departmental committees. Minimum expectations for faculty of higher rank should exceed this level and should reflect broader participation appropriate to rank as described in Section II.

Meritorious Performance

To qualify for a rating of *Meritorious*, a member of the faculty must perform service that significantly exceeds the minimum expectations with regard to faculty rank and experience. To qualify for this rating, faculty members above the rank of Assistant Professor are expected to contribute to service beyond the departmental level, or exhibit extraordinary service to the department.

Excellent Performance

To qualify for a rating of *Excellent*, a member of the faculty must perform an extraordinary level of service. This category should be reserved for faculty members whose service contribution is markedly superior to that described as *Meritorious*. While quantity of service must be considered, the qualitative distinction of participating in a leadership capacity is the more relevant criteria for evaluation.

Unsatisfactory Performance

Faculty members who fail to meet all of the criteria for a rating of *Satisfactory* performance shall receive a rating of *Unsatisfactory*. In the view of the College, no faculty member should perform at, and as a consequence be judged as, *Unsatisfactory* with regard to service. In the few instances where a rating of *Unsatisfactory* is warranted, steps should be taken by the College, the department, and the individual(s) involved to resolve what is considered to be a serious shortcoming.

CAS Faculty Approved on May 2, 1997

Attachment A

What Goes Into A Teaching Portfolio?

1. Examples of good student work.
2. Comments on running an internship program.
3. Evidence of effect of course on student career choice.
4. Evidence of help given to students in securing employment or enrolling in advanced degree programs.
5. Evidence of help given to colleagues on improving teaching.
6. Information on availability to students (policies, hours).
7. Information on innovative methods used in your classes.
8. Evidence of steps taken to evaluate and improve your teaching.
9. Participation in seminars, workshops, meetings designed to improve teaching.
10. Preparation of a textbook or other instructional materials.
11. Comments on successful out-of-class meetings with students.
12. Other teaching activities: speaking engagements, conducting workshops, etc.
13. A general statement of teaching philosophy and how you have used it to improve your teaching.
14. Course handouts and syllabi
15. Students' written feedback on your teaching

Attachment B

From the 1996 S. I. U. E. Faculty Handbook:

The following is a list of minimum expectations of University faculty in carrying out their teaching assignments. These expectations broadly define normal faculty behavior in a fair and open teaching/learning environment.

1. To inform students early in the term, by means of syllabi or other written statements, of planned course coverage, required textbooks, and an approximate schedule of assignments.
2. To inform students early in the term, by means of syllabi or other written statements, of the grading policy to be used, including a description of the relative weight to be assigned to different activities and of attendance requirements, if any.
3. To announce and adhere to a schedule of office hours which permits and encourages students to meet with the instructor in his/her office and to be available for special conferences as needed.
4. To attend promptly and fully each class meeting; to obtain permission from the chair in advance when class must be missed (except in the cases of emergency); and when possible to provide and alternate instructor who has been given directions concerning planned class activities.
5. Not to reschedule class meetings without the permission of the dean or chair and the consent of the students enrolled. Not to reschedule final examinations without the permission of the dean, the Provost, and the consent of the students enrolled.
6. To return student work promptly except when announcement has been made to the class that work will not be returned (although such work should be available for student examination) and to retain any unreturned student work for at least one term.
7. To provide student at his/her request with appropriate and helpful written and/or oral explanations for assigned grades and other evaluated work.
8. To provide teaching and learning experiences that are free of favoritism, prejudice, discrimination, or harassment.
9. To remain abreast of new developments in the subject field and to incorporate this new knowledge in course instruction.
10. To assist in instructional support activities such as curriculum development, textbook selection, course revisions and acquisition of publications and other library activities.
11. Not to become involved in amorous or sexual relationships with any student for whom the instructor currently has any teaching responsibility, including counseling and advising, supervision of independent studies, research, theses, and dissertation.

Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville
College of Arts and Sciences
Faculty Performance Evaluation and Salary Increase Plan

I. Assumptions of the Plan

A. A faculty member shall be evaluated in the three categories of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service; teaching should be given the greatest emphasis.

B. A faculty member's performance in each of the three evaluation categories shall be differentiated by four levels: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious, and Excellent. Specific criteria for these categories shall be developed by each department consistent with the general criteria established by the College.

C. The evaluation process must be collegial, participatory, and equitable, and must involve an elected peer review committee and the unit chair or director. Further, it must be based on written procedures and performance expectations for faculty members approved by a majority vote of each department or unit, and consistent with University and College standards, and the standards for each discipline. Each department shall define the manner in which full-time term faculty shall be included in this process.

D. A faculty member's evaluation shall consider department standards and specific individual goals which have been mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the unit chair or director. Both the negotiation of goal setting, based on department and College goals, and the subsequent evaluation should recognize the individual's strengths and access to the unit's resources. The evaluation process should reward performance in each evaluation category.

E. A faculty member's total evaluation must be communicated confidentially to that person orally and in writing by the chair.

F. Overall, salary increases should parallel performance; further, a portion of each person's salary increase should be attributed specifically to performance in each of the three evaluation categories.

G. Given that salary increases based solely on block or per capita amounts may disproportionately favor individuals on the lower end of the salary scale, and salary increases based solely on percentage of base salaries may disproportionately favor individuals on the upper end of the salary scale, this plan uses a mix of both, with half of the funds distributed each way.

H. This plan does not address salary increase funds necessary to reward promotions or to correct inequities. Funds for such increases must come from other sources. Additional elements of an overall compensation plan include a) periodic, systematic salary equity reviews, b) promotion increments sufficient to counterbalance salary compression and c) competitive beginning salaries. The College will immediately and regularly carry-out studies to address these topics.

I. It should also be recognized that there are other incentives and ways of recognizing contributions in addition to salary increases. The College should seek to provide a variety of these.

J. This plan may be reviewed after three years. The review may be initiated by the Dean or the CAS Faculty Personnel Committee.

II. Performance Evaluation Process

Performance evaluation includes an assessment of the extent to which individual and collective goals have been accomplished. Individual goals should be developed after departments have set their collective goals in relation to the College and University mission. The SIUE Vision, Values and Challenges; the CAS Planning for 2007 document; and the CAS Desired Characteristics and Capabilities of Graduates statement all serve as the framework for development of department and individual goals.

A. The evaluation period is the calendar year. At the beginning of each evaluation period the faculty member and chair will engage in a goal-setting discussion. If a tenured faculty member so chooses, the goal-setting discussion can be scheduled once every three years. Individuals set goals in consultation with the chair.

B. Also at the beginning of each evaluation period the chair will discuss assignments with each faculty member and a mutually agreeable percentage of effort will be assigned for that faculty member in each of the three categories of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. For tenured and tenure-track faculty, one of the following combinations of percentage of effort is chosen:

Percentage of Effort Assignments

Teaching %	Scholarly Activity %	Service %
50	12.5	37.5
50	25	25
50	37.5	12.5
62.5	12.5	25
62.5	18.75	18.75
62.5	25	12.5
75	12.5	12.5

Also, for faculty with a 4-course teaching load, the following is available:

87.5

6.25

6.25

Under special circumstances, such as absence due to sabbatical leave for all or part of the evaluation period, faculty members may request an alternative set of percentages, subject to approval of the chair and Dean. For full-time term faculty who are to be included, the percentages will be determined by the chair with the approval of the Dean. Once the evaluation period has begun, the percentage of effort assignments will normally not be changed. However, under certain unanticipated circumstances (such as the receipt of a major grant or significant change in teaching assignment) an adjustment may be made to a faculty member's percentage assignment. Such changes may only be made with the mutual consent of the faculty member, the chair, and the Dean.

[Alternate II B.] Alternatively in place of II B. above, a department may elect to use a more flexible approach to percentage of assignments. If so, that department must also use the calculation approach in Alternate III A.

At the beginning of the evaluation period, the chair will discuss assignments with each faculty member and a mutually agreeable percentage of effort will be assigned for that faculty member in each of the three categories of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Allowable ranges for these categories are as follows:

Teaching: 50-80%

Scholarly and Creative Activity: 10-40%

Service: 10-40%

C. The annual evaluation of each faculty member shall be conducted during the spring semester in accordance with established and adopted departmental procedures and criteria, which shall have been approved by the Dean of the College as stipulated in the College's operating papers.

D. Each faculty member shall provide appropriate materials to the department chair for use by chair and the department's peer review committee in evaluating the faculty member's performance in each of the three categories of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. A faculty activity report (or faculty profile) and student input shall be provided as part of these materials; it is the faculty member's responsibility to furnish a complete record of evaluation materials. The evaluation of the chair in the role of faculty shall be performed in accordance with departmental operating papers.

E. Each faculty member shall be evaluated as having performed at one of the performance levels Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious, or Excellent in each of the three categories of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

F. The performance evaluation of faculty who have split assignments shall be coordinated among all units involved.

G. Evaluation recommendations of the faculty from the chair are forwarded to the Dean for review and approval.

III. Salary Increase Calculation

Following completion of the performance evaluation process, salary increases will be computed according to the steps below. Half of the departmental allocation will be distributed to individual faculty according to a dollar amount for each merit point accrued (fixed increment portion), and the second half of the departmental allocation will be distributed to individual faculty according to a percentage of that individual's monthly base salary for each merit point accrued (percentage increment portion). Both portions of the distribution are based on merit points.

A. Individual faculty accrue merit points according to the assigned percentages of effort in each evaluation category and the evaluation outcome for that category. Only the point values listed below are accrued. The maximum is 16.

Percentage of effort assigned to a category:	Merit points awarded:			
	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Meritorious	Excellent
6.25	0	0.5	0.75	1
12.5	0	1	1.5	2
18.75	0	1.5	2.25	3
25	0	2	3	4
37.5	0	3	4.5	6
50	0	4	6	8
62.5	0	5	7.5	10
75	0	6	9	12
87.5	0	7	10.5	14

[Alternate III A.] Individual faculty accrue merit points according to the assigned percentages of effort in each evaluation category and the evaluation outcome for that category. Each evaluation outcome is assigned a merit weight:

<i>evaluation outcome:</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>E</i>
<i>merit weight:</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>2</i>

The total number of merit points for an individual is calculated by adding together the percentage multiplied by the merit weight for each evaluation category:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Number of merit points} = & \text{teaching percentage} \times \text{teaching merit weight} \\
 & + \text{scholarship percentage} \times \text{scholarship merit weight} \\
 & + \text{service percentage} \times \text{service merit weight}
 \end{aligned}$$

B. Fixed Increment Portion: For the first half of the distribution the dollar value of each merit point in the department is determined by dividing the total number of points for all faculty into the total departmental allocation for this half. The portion of each faculty member's merit salary increase is equal to the number of merit points accrued by that faculty member multiplied by the dollar value of each merit point.

C. Percentage Increment Portion: For the second half of the distribution the calculation is set up using each faculty member's monthly base salary multiplied by the number of merit points accrued. These are summed for all faculty in the department and the result is divided into the total allocation for this half. This provides the merit factor per faculty member to distribute this portion on a percentage basis. The portion of each faculty member's merit salary increase is equal to the merit factor per faculty member multiplied by that person's monthly salary base and number of merit points accrued.

D. The total merit salary increase for each faculty member is the sum of the two portions from B. and C. above.

E. The pool of merit salary dollars available to each department shall be determined as follows:

1. The majority of the salary increase funds available to the College shall be allocated directly to departments for merit increases.
 - a. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the department funds shall be distributed to departments based on the salary base of those faculty who qualify for a merit raise (i.e., on a percentage basis for faculty who have accrued merit points in at least one category of evaluation).
 - b. The remaining 25% of these funds shall be distributed to departments equally on a per capita basis (i.e., a fixed dollar amount times the number of faculty who qualify for a merit raise).

2. A small amount of funds will be used for College merit as described in Section F below. The source of these funds will depend upon the amount of the state allocation relative to the Consumer Price Index: College merit funds may come only from the portion of the state allocation above the CPI; remaining College merit funds would come from other sources, e.g. lapsed salaries. No more than the equivalent of 10% of the state allocation for faculty salary increases may be used for College merit.

F. College Merit:

College merit is one of many efforts to build a College culture and worldview; to encourage faculty to become citizens of the College, and support the College and University mission. It is a mechanism that permits the Dean to reward faculty who extend beyond their department responsibilities and support the College and University mission, giving a balance between the department role and autonomy, and the College and collective role.

College merit is intended to provide incentive and recognition to those individuals who further the mission of the College, specifically to those who foster the CAS Desired Characteristics and Capabilities of Graduates. The goal is to recognize a fairly large number of faculty through modest College merit amounts.

Activities which faculty wish to have identified as contributions to CAS should be listed separately on the annual activity report. Department chairs and peer review committees can both be responsible for nominations. Department chairs will forward all nominations to the Dean by the end of March each year. The names of individuals receiving College merit and their accomplishments will be provided to the faculty each year.

Criteria for College merit salary increases are proposed in collaboration and reviewed yearly with the Salary subcommittee serving as a faculty advisory committee. Significant changes in criteria will be provided to faculty prior to the evaluation period in which they would take effect. The criteria will always address the goal of fostering the CAS Desired Characteristics and Capabilities of Graduates. Examples which encompass teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service include: teaching of interdisciplinary courses, and University 112; collaboration among departments and units; bridges to professional schools; writing across the curriculum; facilities and renovation grants; multiple discipline grants; leadership beyond the department; community outreach; service to other disciplines; development of new interdisciplinary courses; formal interdisciplinary research, scholarship, and grants.

CAS Faculty Approval on March 28, 1997

College of Arts and Sciences

Retention Review Policy

Retention reviews are to be conducted at the departmental level in accordance with College and University policy. General guidelines for such reviews follow.

1. Retention recommendations from the Department Chair are due in the Dean's office two weeks before the notification date stipulated in the faculty member's contract. For faculty whose initial appointment begins on August 16, the first retention notification date is January 15 of the first year of appointment; the second notification date is September 15 of the second year of appointment. Thereafter, faculty members are given twelve months' notice of non-renewal.
2. The departmental retention review process is detailed in departmental operating papers. This process must include the advice of the department's tenured faculty.
3. The period to be included in the retention review is, in general, cumulative. Retention recommendation memoranda will include an evaluation of the faculty member's performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. Each of these three areas will be evaluated as either Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Meritorious or Excellent.
4. The retention recommendation is sent to the Dean, with a copy to the faculty member.

CAS October 1998

College of Arts and Sciences

Policy on Midpoint Evaluation of Tenure Track Faculty

In conformance with University policy, each tenure track faculty member will be provided with a midpoint evaluation to provide systematic evaluation of progress toward tenure. The review will take place during the spring of the third year after initial appointment to the tenure track. The procedure is as follows:

1. Chairs forward to the Dean's office a list of faculty undergoing midpoint review by November 1.
2. Each faculty member prepares a dossier according to the format in *CAS Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers*. The dossier is provided to the department by mid-January.
3. The Department reviews the dossier by the same process it uses for tenure reviews. The review must include the advice of the tenured faculty. The Chair may meet with the tenured faculty to discuss the review. The candidate's dossier is reviewed in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. The Chair provides a written evaluation and recommendation. The evaluation, recommendation, and dossier are forwarded to the Dean's office by February 15. A copy of the evaluation and recommendation is provided to the candidate.
4. The dossier is reviewed by the CAS Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee; the committee's evaluation, recommendation, and the dossier are forwarded to the Dean by March 7. A copy of the evaluation and recommendation is provided to the candidate and the Department Chair.
5. The Dean provides a written evaluation and recommendation, and forwards these with the dossier to the Provost by April 1. A copy of the evaluation and recommendation is also provided to the faculty member and the Department Chair.

The Provost will provide a written evaluation no later than May 15.

CAS October 1998

College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Procedures

Candidates for promotion or tenure will be judged on their accomplishments in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service according to University, College and department criteria, as well as potential for continuing contributions to the unit, College and University. Levels of performance for judgment are Excellent, Meritorious, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. The procedure is as follows:

September 1--Faculty member's dossier to department. Dossier follows format in *CAS Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers*. Departmental review begins.

Third week in September--Suggested deadline for departmental review completion; forward to Department Chair.

October 1--Chair's and departmental written recommendation added to dossier and forwarded to Dean's office for review by the CAS Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee. Copy of recommendation to candidate.

November 1--Written recommendation by the CAS Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee added to dossier and forwarded to the Dean for review. Copy of recommendation to candidate and Department Chair.

December 1--Dean's written recommendation added to dossier and forwarded to the Provost. Copy of recommendation to candidate and Department Chair.

CAS October 1998

College of Arts and Sciences

Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Dossiers

Given below in standard type is the "Outline of Promotion/Tenure Recommendation Documents for Submission to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs." Provided in italics is interpretive information for candidates from the College of Arts and Sciences. Based primarily on suggestions from the Promotion and Tenure Sub-Committee of the CAS Faculty personnel Committee, this information is intended to assist candidates in preparing effective dossiers.

Dossier Outline:

PART I: RECOMMENDATION OF THE DEAN, CHAIR, AND FACULTY

- A. Cover page (with signatures)
- B. Assessment and Evaluation by the Dean
- C. Assessment and Evaluation by the College/School Committee
- D. Assessment and Evaluation by the Department Chair (if the unit has a chair)
- E. Assessment and Evaluation by the Department/Area Faculty

PART II: CANDIDATE'S PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF PROMOTION

- A. Teaching: A one to three page discussion of the candidate's achievements in teaching, with reference to documentation in Part III. *Discussion should include how the candidate fosters the CAS Desired Characteristics and Capabilities of Graduates.*
- B. Scholarship: A one to three page discussion of the candidate's achievements as a scholar, with reference to documentation in Part III.
- C. Service: A one to three page discussion of the candidate's accomplishments in professional service to the University and the community, with reference to documentation in Part III.

Note: For teaching, scholarship, and service, a one to three page discussion is only a guideline. More than three pages may be appropriate in individual circumstances.

PART III: APPENDICES: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

- A. Current curriculum vitae
 - 1. *Should be edited to clearly identify which accomplishments occurred since the last promotion or edited to include only those materials. For tenure, the vitae should clearly identify accomplishments since the date of appointment at SIUE. Any*

exceptions to this (i.e. hiring agreements to include prior years) should be fully explained and supported by appropriate administrative documents.

2. *Research should focus only on those publications produced during the review period. If copies of publications are attached, they must only be from the most recent years.*
3. *Some interpretation of the quality of publications/artistic works such as quality of journals, etc, would be very helpful to the Committee.*
4. *Candidate should clearly identify and separate works "in progress" from articles or books accepted for publication, from articles and books submitted for publication and conference presentations.*
5. *Candidate should clearly explain "invited" papers/exhibitions versus juried papers/exhibitions.*

B. Evidence of teaching effectiveness. This may include:

1. Reports of peer and chair evaluations
2. Summarized student evaluations with evidence of growth over time
Department should provide some overall analysis and summary which shows evidence of quality of instruction and general evaluation.
3. Evidence of curriculum development
4. Teaching awards
5. Course Portfolio/Teaching Portfolio
6. Other

C. Evidence of scholarly and creative activity. This may include:

1. External reviews of publications or other scholarly work
The CAS Promotion and Tenure committee would like to encourage Departments to utilize appropriate outside evaluators for all levels of tenure and promotion, but deems it especially important in the case of promotion to Professor. Evaluators should not be drawn only from the list of names provided by the candidate but should also reflect evaluators chosen by the Department.
2. Letters of evaluation by external scholars
The CAS committee would like to encourage Departments to utilize appropriate outside evaluators for all levels of tenure and promotion, but deems it especially important in the case of promotion to Professor. Evaluators should not be drawn only from the list of names provided by the candidate but should also reflect evaluators chosen by the Department.
3. Internal peer reviews
4. Information of funded grants

5. Citation of candidate's works by other scholars
6. Reviews of recitals, exhibitions, or performances
7. Other

D. Evidence of University and Community service. This may include:

1. Information about public service grants
2. External assessment of public service activity
3. Internal assessment of University service activity
4. Documentation of public service accomplishments
5. Other

E. Copies of Annual, Retention, and Other Reviews by Chairs

F. Midpoint Evaluation (For Tenure Only)

G. Other Documents

This should include:

1. *Departmental criteria in the three areas of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activity, and Service, as well as Departmental standards for Excellent, Meritorious, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory performance.*
2. *Information on any changes in contractual assignment or split appointments should be communicated to the committee by the Departmental Chair.*

Note: Evidence provided for teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and university and community service should be summarized and organized. Raw data and unorganized materials such as original student course evaluations are not sufficient.

PART IV: RAW DATA

- A. Copies or portfolio of publications or other scholarly work
- B. Student evaluations of teaching
- C. Other documents

Note: This information is to remain in the Dean's office available for review.

IN NORMAL CIRCUMSTANCES, THE ENTIRE FILE SHOULD NOT EXCEED ONE LARGE, SIX INCH, THREE RING BINDER. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY BE HELD IN THE DEPARTMENT OFFICE IN CASE IT IS NEEDED.

7/27/98

Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty Holding Joint Appointments

The following evaluation policies and procedures apply to CAS tenure-track faculty holding joint appointments in which one of the Departments or Units will not be granting tenure. The appropriate ratifications to the Department's and/or Unit's Operating Papers regarding these reviews should be made.

At the time of hire and at the end of each calendar year the Department Chair(s), Unit Director(s), and faculty member holding the joint appointment will meet and set expectations regarding such activities as course load, scholarship, and service commitment within each department/unit during the following calendar year. This written understanding will then become part of the faculty member's official record.

Each Department and/or Unit, in accordance with their approved Operating Papers' guidelines, shall independently evaluate and/or review their faculty members holding joint appointments for the purpose of annual retention, performance and salary increases. The tenure granting Department will be responsible for preparing the initial four month retention review. Each evaluation will be conducted within the timeframe set forth by CAS. After the Department's and Unit's reviews are completed, the Chair and Director will then review the department's and unit's recommendations, and make additional recommendations regarding the faculty member. A faculty member's evaluation must be communicated confidentially to that person orally and in writing by the Chair and Director. Both the department's and unit's evaluation of the faculty member will then be forwarded to CAS as part of the candidate's official record.

The following additions and/or modifications in the evaluation policies and procedures apply for the purposes of Midpoint, Tenure, and Promotion review of the faculty member. The non-tenure granting Unit shall review the candidate's record and portfolio first, and then forward its evaluation and recommendation as part of the candidate's dossier to the tenure granting department. The evaluation forwarded shall be used as supporting material to assess the candidate's performance. During the evaluation process the department review committee may seek clarification from the Unit Director and/or the candidate regarding the Unit's written expectations and the candidate's record. At the conclusion of the tenure granting department's evaluation, both the Chair and Director shall meet and then write separate evaluations of the faculty member's performance. Copies of the evaluations shall be provided to the candidate and review committees. All evaluations and recommendations will then be forwarded to CAS with the candidate's portfolio to be used at subsequent levels of review.

At the time of hiring, the Chair, Director, and the Dean of CAS shall communicate in writing to the faculty member a suitable timeframe for their evaluations. The only differences in timing from that of other tenure-track faculty members shall be the timing for Midpoint, Tenure, and Promotion reviews. Earlier deadlines will ensure that the non-tenure granting unit forward its evaluations and recommendations to the tenure granting department within the timeframe necessary for its evaluations.