Listing of Approved Standards
2016 - 2021

Click on Y in Tenure/Promotion, Full Professor, and Promotion Clinical columns to quickly move to section

DEPARTMENT	Tenure/ Promotion	Full Professor	Promotion Clinical	Promotion Sr. Lec.	Year (Updated/Revised)
College of Arts & Sciences					
Biology	Y	Y		Y	2016 2016 2018
Chemistry & Biochemistry					
Crime & Justice Studies	Y	Y			2016
Economics	Y	Y			2018
Educational Leadership					
English	Y	Y			2016
Foreign Literature & Languages	Y	Y			2016
History					
Mathematics	Y	Y			2016
Philosophy					
Political Science	Y	Y			2016
Portuguese	Y	Y			2016
Psychology	Y	Y			2016
Public Policy	Y	Y			2016
Sociology & Anthropology					
STEM Education & Teacher Development					
Women's & Gender Studies	Y	Y			2016
Charlton College of Business					
Accounting & Finance	Y	Y			2016
Decision & Information Sciences	Y	Y			2016
Management & Marketing	Y	Y			2016; 2019

Listing of Approved Standards
2016 - 2021

DEPARTMENT	Tenure/ Promotion	Full Professor	Promotion Clinical	Promotion Sr. Lec.	Year (Updated/Revised)
College of Engineering					
Bioengineering	Y	Y			2016
Civil & Environmental Engineering	Y				2018
Computer & Information Science	Y	Y*			2018; 2018*contested
Electrical & Computer Engineering	Y				2018
Mechanical Engineering	Y	Y			2016
Physics	Y	Y			2018
College of Visual & Performing Arts					
Art & Design					
Art Education, Art History & Media Studies					
Music					
College of Nursing					
Adult & Child Nursing	Y	Y	Y	Y	2016 2018 2018 2019
Community Nursing	Y	Y	Y	Y	2016 2018 2018 2019
Medical Laboratory Science					
School for Marine Science & Technology					
Estuarine & Ocean Sciences					
Fisheries Oceanography					
Law School					
Law					DUE IN 2017
				Updated:	10/15/2019

APPROVED

Accounting and Finance Department
Evaluation Standard for Promotion to Full Professor
(for tenured faculty applying for promotion to full professor beginning 9-1-16 or later)

Categories of Evaluation

Faculty must be evaluated for promotion to full professor in the categories of (a) teaching and advising, and (b) scholarship and professional activities. They must also be evaluated in one or both of the categories of (c) university and (d) public service, depending on the candidate's choice. The evaluation will be based on the post tenure period. The contractual requirement for a positive recommendation for promotion to full professor by the Department is an excellent in either teaching effectiveness and advising or scholarship and professional activities and a very good in the other of these two categories and no unsatisfactory ratings.

Standards for Teaching and Advising

The successful candidate for promotion to full professor will demonstrate that he or she is an effective teacher and will carry out assigned duties. The candidate will be expected to prepare an annual written self-evaluation of teaching in which goals and expectations should be specified outcomes assessed against the goals. These annual self-evaluations are intended to identify strengths and weaknesses and to help the instructor to improve teaching effectiveness.

Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated by the department Faculty Evaluation Committee (DFEC) and the chair on the basis of student evaluations and other evidence such as syllabi, assignments, pedagogy, peer reviews in the classroom. Student demand for the instructor's courses and an assessment of the individual's self-evaluation statements. Interpretation of the student ratings will be based on comparative quantified data from the student evaluations, including comparisons among instructors teaching similar levels and types of courses. The Accounting and Finance Department uses a standard form for student evaluation of teaching (the most recent version is attached). In addition, the use of labs / technology, projects and student presentations if present will be utilized in evaluation of teaching.

Advising is assigned by the Chairperson of the Department. While advising will not receive as much weight as teaching in this category, if assigned, advising duties must be carried out seriously and effectively. Exceptional advising will get additional weight. Failure to conduct assigned advising effectively will influence the rating in this category.

Evaluations of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Satisfactory," or Unsatisfactory" by the DFEC and chair will be made based on the above process. They will weigh more heavily during the latter part of the probationary period.

Standards for Scholarship and Professional Activities

The successful candidate for promotion to full professor will have an active research agenda and will have produced a body of scholarship that contributes to the growth of knowledge in the faculty member's discipline.

The best evidence of having accomplished this is publications in peer-reviewed journals, publications of the peer-reviewed monographs, books, chapters in books, or peer-reviewed externally-funded research grants. A record of presenting papers at professional meetings and conferences and peer reviewing the work of the scholars reflects having an active and productive research agenda and will

be considered but is less important than refereed publications. Letters written by external reviewers will constitute additional evidence of the candidate's scholarly achievement.

To be rated "Satisfactory" the candidate will have at least four articles published or accepted for publication in well-regarded peer-reviewed journals during the candidate's post tenure period at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth.

To be rated "Very Good" the candidate will have at least five articles published or accepted for publication in well-regarded peer-reviewed journals during the candidate's post tenure period at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth.

To be rated "Excellent" the candidate will have at least six articles published or accepted for publication in well-regarded peer-reviewed journals while the candidate is employed at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth during the candidate's post tenure period at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth.

The subject of the research should be appropriate to the program in which the faculty member is working (e.g., accounting and finance).

The required quantity of publications may be fewer when the quality of the journal is very high. Similarly, the required quantity may be greater when the quality is lower. Among the things to consider as to quality of journal are reputation of the journal, prestige of the editor and editorial board, acceptance rate, circulation and importance of readership. In addition, a candidate may be able to earn a higher rating than satisfactory or very good under the conditions described above with excellence in peer-reviewed proceedings; book chapters or monographs; externally funded grants; and holding office in a significant academic or professional society.

The required quality of publications would be determined based on a journal list developed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The candidate has to demonstrate journal quality if they publish in a journal that is not from this list.

Standards for University Service

A rating "Excellent" requires a demonstrated record of significant and substantial achievement and effectiveness at the Departmental, College, or University level. A rating of "Very Good" requires demonstration of sustained significant service to the Department, College, or University. A rating of "Satisfactory" requires a modest level of involvement in the service functions, at least at the Departmental level.

It should be noted that faculty may opt to be not rated in university service but must be evaluated in at least three of the four categories. It should also be noted that the successful candidate will be judged primarily on teaching and scholarship.

Standard for Public Service

Public service involves use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies or units other than the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise, or other assistance to these external entities.

To be rated “Very Good” in public service, a record of consistent and significant service to one or more external entities must be demonstrated. To be rated “Excellent” in public service, in addition to providing consistent and significant service, a record of demonstrated leadership is required.

It should be noted that faculty may opt to be not rated in public service but must be evaluated in at least three of the four categories. It should also be noted that the successful candidate will be judged primarily on teaching and scholarship.

APPROVED

Accounting and Finance Department
Evaluation Standard for Tenure/Promotion to Associate Professor
(for tenure-track faculty with initial contracts beginning 9-1-16 and later)

Categories of Evaluation

Faculty must be evaluated for tenure/promotion in the categories of (a) teaching and advising, and (b) scholarship and professional activities. They must also be evaluated in one or both of the categories of (c) university and (d) public service, depending on the candidate's choice. The evaluation period will concentrate on the five and one-half years prior to submission of the application for tenure. This period includes years of credit granted, if any, for prior academic employment. The contractual requirement for a positive recommendation for tenure by the Department is an excellent in either teaching effectiveness and advising or scholarship and professional activities and a very good in the other of these two categories and no unsatisfactory ratings.

Standards for Teaching and Advising

The successful candidate for tenure and concurrent promotion will demonstrate that he or she is an effective teacher and will carry out assigned duties. New faculty will be expected to prepare an annual written self-evaluation of teaching in which goals and expectations should be specified an outcomes assessed against the goals. These annual self-evaluations are intended to identify strengths and weaknesses and to help the instructor to improve teaching effectiveness.

Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated by the department Faculty Evaluation Committee (DFEC) and the chair on the basis of student evaluations and other evidence such as syllabi, assignments, pedagogy, peer reviews in the classroom. Student demand for the instructor's courses and an assessment of the individual's self-evaluation statements. Interpretation of the student ratings will be based on comparative quantified data from the student evaluations, including comparisons among instructors teaching similar levels and types of courses. The Accounting and Finance Department uses a standard form for student evaluation of teaching (the most recent version is attached). In addition, the use of labs / technology, projects and student presentations if present will be utilized in evaluation of teaching.

Advising is assigned by the Chairperson of the Department. While advising will not receive as much weight as teaching in this category, if assigned, advising duties must be carried out seriously and effectively. Exceptional advising will get additional weight. Failure to conduct assigned advising effectively will influence the rating in this category.

Evaluations of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Satisfactory," or Unsatisfactory" by the DFEC and chair will be made based on the above process. They will weigh more heavily during the latter part of the probationary period.

Standards for Scholarship and Professional Activities

The successful candidate for tenure and concurrent promotion will have an active research agenda and will have produced a body of scholarship that contributes to the growth of knowledge in the faculty member's discipline.

The best evidence of having accomplished this is publications in peer-reviewed journals, publications of the peer-reviewed monographs, books, chapters in books, or peer-reviewed externally-funded research grants. A record of presenting papers at professional meetings and conferences and peer

reviewing the work of the scholars reflects having an active and productive research agenda and will be considered but is less important than refereed publications. Letters written by external reviewers will constitute additional evidence of the candidate's scholarly achievement.

To be rated "Satisfactory" the candidate will have at least three articles published or accepted for publication in well-regarded peer-reviewed journals while the candidate is employed at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth. An exception applies when the candidate was granted three years of credit towards tenure upon hiring. In that case, at least one of the three articles must have been published while at this University, and the remainder must have been published in the three years prior to being hired.

To be rated "Very Good" the candidate will have at least four articles published or accepted for publication in well-regarded peer-reviewed journals while the candidate is employed at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth. If the candidate was granted three years of credit toward tenure upon hiring, two of the four articles must have been published while at this University, and the remainder must have been published during the three years prior to being hired.

To be rated "Excellent" the candidate will have at least five articles published or accepted for publication in well-regarded peer-reviewed journals while the candidate is employed at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth. If the candidate was granted three years of credit toward tenure upon hiring, at least three of the five articles must have been published while at this University; the remainder must have been published during the three years before being hired.

The subject of the research should be appropriate to the program in which the faculty member is working (e.g., accounting and finance).

The required quantity of publications may be fewer when the quality of the journal is very high. Similarly, the required quantity may be greater when the quality is lower. Among the things to consider as to quality of journal are reputation of the journal, prestige of the editor and editorial board, acceptance rate, circulation and importance of readership. In addition, a candidate may be able to earn a higher rating than satisfactory or very good under the conditions described above with excellence in peer-reviewed proceedings; book chapters or monographs; externally funded grants; and holding office in a significant academic or professional society.

The required quality of publications would be determined based on a journal list developed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The candidate has to demonstrate journal quality if they publish in a journal that is not from this list.

Standards for University Service

A rating "Excellent" requires a demonstrated record of significant and substantial achievement and effectiveness at the Departmental, College, or University level. A rating of "Very Good" requires demonstration of sustained significant service to the Department, College, or University. A rating of "Satisfactory" requires a modest level of involvement in the service functions, at least at the Departmental level. Evaluation for tenure and concurrent promotion will weigh more heavily during the latter part of the probationary period.

It should be noted that faculty may opt to be not rated in university service but must be evaluated in at least three of the four categories. It should also be noted that the successful candidate will be judged primarily on teaching and scholarship.

Standard for Public Service

Public service involves use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies or units other than the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise, or other assistance to these external entities.
To be rated “Very Good” in public service, a record of consistent and significant service to one or more external entities must be demonstrated. To be rated “Excellent” in public service, in addition to providing consistent and significant service, a record of demonstrated leadership is required.

It should be noted that faculty may opt to be not rated in public service but must be evaluated in at least three of the four categories. It should also be noted that the successful candidate will be judged primarily on teaching and scholarship.

Approved

Expectations for Promotion to Professor
Department of Biology, UMass Dartmouth
For faculty tenured on or after September 1, 2014

Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

The successful candidate for promotion to professor will have maintained a record of high-quality teaching and advising. To be evaluated, the candidate is expected to provide: a narrative written by the candidate that describes course objectives, student learning outcomes, in-class assessment of student learning, and/or improvements to courses; course materials including course syllabi, course assignments, and/or original laboratory exercises; measures of student learning such as exams, laboratory reports, and term papers; documentation of class visits in which tenured faculty serve as reviewers and use a standard department protocol resulting in a written report; and course ratings by students (both narrative and quantitative). Faculty are also expected to advise undergraduate biology majors in designing their curricula to meet their personal and career goals, and mentor graduate students in conducting their theses. The candidate must provide evidence of effective advising, which may include correspondence to advisees and other mentees; names, projects, and graduation dates of undergraduate and graduate research mentees; publications of research resulting from student theses; and any evidence of success in employment and/or further postgraduate training upon graduation from this university.

It is expected that the candidate, to be rated "Excellent," will maintain and teach a portfolio of courses that effectively cover important concepts in biology, that are relevant to students pursuing careers in biology, and that challenge students to expand their knowledge and skills, as evidenced by course syllabi, assignments, and exams. The candidate is also expected to make continuous improvements to courses, such as revising lectures to include up-to-date scientific information, or refining course formats based on self-reflection, suggestions from colleagues, and constructive comments from student ratings of teaching. Additional evidence supporting an "Excellent" rating could include attendance of professional workshops on teaching innovations, development and instruction of new course offerings, peer-reviewed publication of education research or instructional approaches, and awards recognizing teaching excellence. Evidence of effective advising will be evaluated based on regular semester meetings with advisees, related correspondence to advisees and other students, mentoring of undergraduate research projects, and participation in graduate student training and mentoring. The candidate will be rated "Very Good" if he/she for the most part maintains the standards above but has exhibited recurrent evidence of a shortfall preventing classification as Excellent. Examples include a history of failing to adequately address a repeated and credible criticism from colleagues or student ratings of teaching or failing to update courses with relevant scientific information. A candidate will be rated as "Satisfactory" if he/she met all of the contractual responsibilities in terms of Teaching and Advising but showed no evidence of course improvement, a history of failing to address repeated and credible criticisms from colleagues or students, and poor completion success of graduate students with other evidence of ineffective mentoring or supervision. A candidate will be rated as "Unsatisfactory" if he/she failed to meet all of the contractual responsibilities in terms of Teaching and Advising and had a history of credible complaints about ineffective teaching from colleagues and students.

Scholarship and Professional Activities

The successful candidate for promotion to professor will have maintained an active research program and produced a body of scholarship that is recognized for contributing to the growth of knowledge in his or her area of expertise. To be evaluated, the candidate is required to provide a written narrative describing his/her scholarly activities, with evidence of these activities in the form of copies of published papers and chapters, submitted grant proposals, conference abstracts, and other relevant materials. External reviewers who are recognized scholars and authorities in the candidate's field of research will be asked to evaluate the candidate's scholarly achievements.

The rating in Scholarship and Professional Activities is based primarily on publication of journal articles in the peer-reviewed biological literature or chapters in edited books and on the record of pursuing and obtaining extramural funding sufficient to support the candidate's research. It is expected that, in order to be rated "Excellent", the candidate will have produced five publications (an average of one per year), and have a record of securing extramural funding to sufficiently support their research. To be rated "Very Good", the candidate will have produced at least four publications and have a record of securing extramural funding to sufficiently support their research, or five publications with a record of sustained effort to obtain external research funding. To be rated "Satisfactory", the candidate will have produced at least three publications and made a minimal effort to obtain research funding. Exceptions to the number of publications may apply if a given article, monograph or book can be shown to have had a disproportionate impact upon the candidate's field of research, as documented by the standing of the journal or book in the subfield of biology and recognition by external reviewers.

In addition, a record of the candidate and his/her students developing patents, delivering papers or presenting posters at national and international meetings, or presenting invited talks, is evidence of an active and productive research agenda. Professional service, such as manuscript and proposal reviewing, service as an editor or associate editor for professional journals and serving in the governance of a professional society are also signs of professional recognition. Some combination of presentations and/or professional service is required for a rating of "Excellent" or "Very Good". A candidate will be rated as "Unsatisfactory" if he/she failed to attain the minimum standards to reach a rating of Satisfactory.

University Service

The Biology Department expects tenured faculty to assume more service responsibilities when compared to tenure-track faculty. To be ranked "Excellent," a faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as assume a leadership role in at least one college and/or university activity. Examples include, but are not limited to, chairship of a major committee and leadership of an academic program. To be ranked "Very Good," a faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as participate in multiple college and/or university activities or in a single university activity of unusual importance or intensity. A faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as at least one college and/or university activity outside the department to be ranked "Satisfactory". A candidate will be rated as "Unsatisfactory" if he/she failed to attain the minimum standards to reach a rating of Satisfactory.

Public Service

The Biology Department expects tenured faculty to focus most of their efforts on teaching, advising, and scholarship. Nonetheless, tenured faculty who share their scientific expertise with the broader community may be evaluated in this category. The Biology Department defines public service as the application of professionally related expertise or skills that enrich local, regional, or national communities. Faculty members who choose to be evaluated in public service must provide evidence of the nature of their public service as well as evidence of the benefit of this public service to the university and the community. To be ranked "Excellent," a faculty member must participate in multiple instances of limited duration and one sustained activity of significant benefit to the community OR multiple instances of sustained activity of significant benefit to the community. To be ranked "Very Good," a faculty member must participate in one sustained activity of significant benefit to the community. A faculty member must participate in multiple instances of limited duration in order to be ranked "Satisfactory". A candidate will be rated as "Unsatisfactory" if he/she failed to attain the minimum standards to reach a rating of Satisfactory.

Approved

Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
Department of Biology, UMass Dartmouth
For faculty hired after September 1, 2017

Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

The successful candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor will have a record of high-quality teaching and advising. To be evaluated, the candidate is expected to provide: a narrative written by the candidate that describes course objectives, student learning outcomes, in-class assessment of student learning, and/or improvements to courses; course materials including course syllabi, course assignments, original laboratory exercises; measures of student learning such as exams, laboratory reports, and term papers; documentation of class visits in which tenured faculty serve as reviewers and use a standard department protocol resulting in a written report; and course ratings by students (both narrative and quantitative). Faculty are also expected to advise undergraduate biology majors in designing their curricula to meet their personal and career goals, and mentor graduate students in conducting their theses. The candidate must provide evidence of effective advising, which may include correspondence to advisees and other mentees; names, projects, and graduation dates of undergraduate and graduate research mentees; publications of research resulting from student theses; and any evidence of success in employment and/or further postgraduate training upon graduation from this university.

It is expected that the candidate, to be rated "Excellent," will have taught a portfolio of courses that effectively cover important concepts in biology, that are relevant to students pursuing careers in biology, and that challenge students to expand their knowledge and skills, as evidenced by course syllabi, assignments, and exams. The candidate is also expected to make continuous improvements to courses, such as revising lectures to include up-to-date scientific information, or refining course formats based on self-reflection, suggestions from colleagues, constructive comments from student ratings of teaching. Additional evidence supporting an "Excellent" rating could include attendance of professional workshops on teaching innovations, development and instruction of new course offerings, peer-reviewed publication of education research or instructional approaches, and awards recognizing teaching excellence. Evidence of effective advising will be evaluated based on regular semester meetings with advisees, related correspondence to advisees and other students, mentoring of undergraduate research projects, and participation in graduate student training and mentoring. The candidate will be rated "Very Good" if he/she for the most part maintains the standards above but has exhibited recurrent evidence of a shortfall preventing classification as Excellent. Examples include a history of failing to adequately address a repeated and credible criticism from colleagues or student ratings of teaching or failing to update courses with relevant scientific information. A candidate will be rated as "Satisfactory" if he/she met all of the contractual responsibilities in terms of Teaching and Advising but showed no evidence of course improvement, a history of failing to address repeated and credible criticisms from colleagues or students, and poor completion success of graduate students with other evidence of ineffective mentoring or supervision. A candidate will be rated as "Unsatisfactory" if he/she failed to meet all of the contractual responsibilities in terms of Teaching and Advising and had a history of credible complaints about ineffective teaching from colleagues and students.

Scholarship and Professional Activities

The successful candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor will have achieved an active research program and produced a body of scholarship that is recognized for contributing to the growth of knowledge in his or her area of expertise. To be evaluated, the candidate is required to provide a written narrative describing his/her scholarly activities, with evidence of these activities in the form of copies of published papers and chapters, submitted grant proposals, conference abstracts, and other relevant materials. External reviewers who are recognized scholars and authorities in the candidate's field of research will be asked to evaluate the candidate's scholarly achievements.

The rating in Scholarship and Professional Activities is based primarily on publication of journal articles in the peer-reviewed biological literature or chapters in edited books and on the record of pursuing and obtaining extramural funding sufficient to support the candidate's research. Of utmost importance is that faculty candidates for tenure and promotion have established a productive research program at UMass Dartmouth that results in publication(s) in the peer-reviewed scientific literature. The Biology Department recognizes that it takes one year to set up a functioning laboratory and establish an active research program.

It is expected that, in order to be rated "Excellent", the candidate will have produced four publications (an average of one per year after the first year), and have a record of securing extramural funding to sufficiently support their research. To be rated "Very Good", the candidate will have produced at least three publications and have a record of securing extramural funding to sufficiently support their research, or four publications with a record of sustained effort to obtain external research funding. To be rated "Satisfactory", the candidate will have produced at least two publications and made a minimal effort to obtain research funding. Exceptions to the number of publications may apply if a given article, monograph or book can be shown to have had a disproportionate impact upon the candidate's field of research, as documented by the standing of the journal or book in the subfield of biology and recognition by external reviewers.

In addition, a record of the candidate and his/her students developing patents, delivering papers or presenting posters at national and international meetings, or presenting invited talks, is evidence of an active and productive research agenda. Professional service, such as manuscript and proposal reviewing, service as an editor or associate editor for professional journals and serving in the governance of a professional society are also signs of professional recognition. Some combination of presentations and/or professional service is required for a rating of "Excellent" or "Very Good". A candidate will be rated as "Unsatisfactory" if he/she failed to attain the minimum standards to reach a rating of Satisfactory.

University Service

The Biology Department expects tenure track faculty to focus most of their efforts on teaching, advising, and scholarship. New tenure track faculty are expected to begin by participating in departmental activities at a modest level but increase involvement as they become more established. To be ranked "Excellent," a faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as participate in multiple college and/or university activities or in a single university activity of unusual importance or intensity. A faculty member must participate

actively in departmental affairs as well as at least one college and/or university activity outside the department to be ranked “Very Good”. A faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs to be ranked “Satisfactory”. A candidate will be rated as “Unsatisfactory” if he/she failed to attain the minimum standards to reach a rating of Satisfactory.

Public Service

The Biology Department expects tenure track faculty to focus most of their efforts on teaching, advising, and scholarship. Nonetheless, tenure track faculty who share their scientific expertise with the broader community may be evaluated in this category. The Biology Department defines public service as the application of professionally related expertise or skills that enrich local, regional, or national communities. Faculty members who choose to be evaluated in public service must provide evidence of the nature of their public service as well as evidence of the benefit of this public service to the university and the community. To be ranked “Excellent,” a faculty member must participate in multiple instances of limited duration and one sustained activity of significant benefit to the community OR multiple instances of sustained activity of significant benefit to the community. To be ranked “Very Good,” a faculty member must participate in one sustained activity of significant benefit to the community. A faculty member must participate in multiple instances of limited duration in order to be ranked “Satisfactory”. A candidate will be rated as “Unsatisfactory” if he/she failed to attain the minimum standards to reach a rating of Satisfactory.

APPROVED

UMass Dartmouth
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Department of Bioengineering
Standard for Promotion to Full Professor

Fall 2016

It should be noted that the promotion to full professor is based on a higher level of achievement than for associate professor.

Teaching

The candidate for promotion is expected to have demonstrated a high level of effectiveness in teaching, developed one or more courses in their specialization and to have taught required/core courses in bioengineering at both graduate and undergraduate levels. Supervising graduate students in research is expected.

- **Excellent**:
  - an average student teaching evaluation rating above the third quartile of the department average for all courses taught; and
  - with at least one PhD student graduated under the direct supervision in the years before the promotion application
- **Very Good**:
  - an average student teaching evaluation rating above the second quartile of the departmental average; and
  - with at least one PhD student actively carrying out research, or at least two MS students having completed thesis/capstone research.

Scholarship

It is expected that the candidate for promotion will have established an independent and active research group with one or two focus areas and produced a significant and sustained record of high-quality, scholarly research. A significant level of service to the profession is also expected. Active involvement with industry or research organization such as medical facilities or government labs is strongly encouraged. An established national or international reputation in the field should be evident.

- **Excellent** would be demonstrated by at least two of the following:
  - Two or more peer-reviewed publications annually based on the work performed at UMass Dartmouth, additionally including invited articles and book chapters, with evidence of independent citations. Some of the publications should be in high impact journals in the field and as one of the primary authors.
  - Research expenditure from external funding over $200K in the last six years, or 3 times the average annual R&D expenditures per CoE faculty.
  - Significant research awards or recognitions (such as fellow of a professional society) or honors granted by professional societies, government agencies, or industry, or a leadership role in an interdisciplinary research collaboration,

institution, or professional society, or an editorship of high impact peer-reviewed journals.

- **Very Good** would be demonstrated by at least two of the following:
    - One or more peer-reviewed publications annually based on the work performed at UMass Dartmouth, additionally including conference presentations and book chapters, with evidence of independent citations.
    - Research expenditure from external funding over $100K in the last six years or 2 times the average annual R&D expenditures per CoE faculty, and two grant proposals submitted as PI per year.
    - At least one patent granted, or a few patent applications sponsored by the University, or invited keynote speaker, visiting scholar or honorific appointment in other institutions, or as reviewers in a grant review panel or high impact peer-reviewed journals.

University Services

The candidate is expected to provide services to the department, college and university.

- **Excellent**: a leadership role on committees at different levels, with leadership in at least one significant committee, such as curriculum committee or program assessment committee.
- **Very Good**: active participation in University activities, committees, and outreaches promoting the university, marketing the academic programs or engaging the local and regional communities.

Public Service

Optional

Note: BNG Promotion standards shall be reviewed/revised at least every five years.

UMass | Dartmouth
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

APPROVED

Department of Bioengineering
Tenure and Promotion Standards, Final Version

Reviewed December 2016

Teaching

The candidate for tenure or promotion is expected to have demonstrated a high level of effectiveness in teaching, developed one or more courses in their specialization and to have taught one or more other courses in bioengineering at both graduate and undergraduate level. Supervising graduate students in research is expected.

- Excellent: an average rating of student teaching evaluation above the third quartile of the department average for all courses taught in the years before the tenure or promotion application, and at least one PhD student past the qualifying exam and one MS student having completed thesis research (after the BNG MS program is established).
- Very Good: the average student teaching evaluation above the second quartile of the departmental average, and at least one PhD students actively carrying out research, or at least two MS students having completed thesis research (after the BNG MS program is established).

Scholarship

It is expected that the candidate for tenure or promotion will have formed an active research group with one or two focus areas of their own and produced a significant and sustained record of high-quality, scholarly research. A satisfactory level of service to the profession is also expected. Active involvement with the MAB, with industry or with mission-oriented research organization such as hospitals or government labs is strongly encouraged. The following objective criteria can define this.

- Excellent would be demonstrated by at least two of the following:
  - Two or more peer-reviewed journal publications annually based on the work performed at UMass Dartmouth, additionally including peer-reviewed conference proceedings, invited articles, and book chapters, with evidence of independent citations. Some of the publications should be in high impact journals in the field.
  - External funding over $200K in the last five years, or 3 times the average annual R&D expenditures per CoE faculty.
  - Research awards and honors granted by professional societies, government agencies, or industry, or a leadership role in an interdisciplinary research collaboration, institution, or professional society, or an editorship of peer-reviewed journals.

- Very good would be demonstrated by at least two of the following:
  - One or more peer-reviewed, high-impact journal publications annually based on the work performed at UMass Dartmouth, additionally including

peer-reviewed conference presentations and book chapters, with evidence of independent citations.

- External funding over $100K in the last five years or 2 times the average annual R&D expenditures per CoE faculty, and two grant proposals per year submitted.
- At least one patent granted, or a few patent applications sponsored by the University, or invited keynote speaker, visiting scholar or honorific appointment in other institutions, or as reviewers in a grant review panel or peer-reviewed journals.

University Services

The candidate is expected to provide services to the department, college and university.

- Excellent: a leadership role on committees at different levels
- Very Good: active participation in University activities, committees, and outreaches promoting the university, marketing the academic programs or engaging the local and regional communities.

Public Service

Optional

BNG P&T standards shall be reviewed/revised at least every five years.

Adopted: December 2013

Reviewed: December 2016

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING Approved

Department of Computer and Information Science
Standard for Promotion to Full Professor
(Revised 2018, Effective Fall 2018)

This document describes the performance standards that will be used in evaluation for promotion to full professor in the Department of Computer and Information Science at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth.

Promotion to the rank of Professor is based on a higher level of achievement and recognition than for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The Department of Computer and Information Science will use the following criteria as typical performance indicators in evaluating the qualifications of candidates for promotion and will assign ratings of Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory as required by the faculty federation agreement. All the evaluation metrics listed here are based on activities after the faculty has attained tenure.

1.1. Effectiveness of Teaching & Advising

A candidate is required to present the following evidence in this category to support the faculty member's application for promotion:

(a) Complete set of annual student evaluations in all courses taught. The number of students providing evaluations has to be large enough to make any statistical sense. This will require the faculty member to have had the opportunity to teach a reasonable number of courses to a reasonable number of students. Departmental chairperson will make sure that the candidates have opportunities to teach courses at different levels including lower- and upper-division undergraduate courses and graduate courses.
(b) Evidence of continuous course improvement for existing computer science and/or service courses; course improvement includes new content as well as new pedagogical methods of course implementation.
(c) Evidence of development and successful delivery of new computer science courses in areas of specializations of computer science programs or computer science service courses.
(d) The candidate should show evidence of innovation or creative approaches in delivering the subject material. He/she should indicate whether the courses have been enriched by the inclusion of modern computer science methodologies and technologies for the delivery of the material.
(e) The candidate should provide course assessment material in the same format required by ABET, including samples of student work from each course

taught: course outline, evaluation and academic honesty policy statement, exams, homework, projects, reports, and evidence of documented feedback related to course assignments provided to students.

(f) Complete record of advising students majoring in Computer Science, and of graduate student research advising. A list of advisees assigned to the faculty and all students in the list that have been advised on a regular basis with advising records will assist in evaluation of this activity.

(g) Examples of success of students advised by the faculty member in national competitions, student paper publications/presentations or exceptional projects, if appropriate.

Departmental FEC and chairperson will develop the following assessment mechanisms of teaching and advising effectiveness:

a) A comparison of the course evaluation on the overall effectiveness of the faculty with others who teach similar courses at similar sizes and similar levels will be made based on student evaluations (chairperson is responsible for this analysis).

b) If available, exit interview comments made by graduating students (chairperson is responsible for this analysis)

A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(a) An overall (weighted average) score of 4.0 (on a scale of 1-5) or higher in all courses taught on questions of the CIS Department Faculty Evaluation Form and, if available, extremely favorable senior exit interview comments.

(b) Evidence of Excellent course delivery will be supported by results from review of course materials showing high-quality content.

(c) Evidence is presented that demonstrates the candidate *is highly effective and active* in advising: by being available to students during convenient office hours; by a willingness to answer class-related questions; by being knowledgeable about the curricula and by providing accurate course-planning information; by providing timely letters of recommendation upon request; and by effective mentoring of research students.

(d) Evidence is presented showing that the candidate's implementation of teaching innovations with a demonstrated commitment to a process of continuous improvement, and significant contributions to curricular enhancement development and reformation.

(e) Evidence is presented showing that the candidate has actively participated in all ABET related activities and made significant contributions in the process.

A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(a) An overall (weighted average) score of 3.5 (on a scale of 1-5) or higher in all courses taught on questions of the CIS Department Faculty Evaluation Form and, if available, very favorable senior exit interview comments.
(b) Documented evidence of Very Good delivery and Very Good content of new computer science course(s) prepared by faculty measured by an overall average score of 3.5 (on a scale of 1-5) of all questions of the CIS Department Faculty Evaluation Form and by quantity and quality of course materials prepared by faculty as assessed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and departmental chairperson; evidence of Very Good course delivery will be supported by comparative analysis of classroom performance with other faculty teaching similar courses.
(c) Evidence is presented that demonstrates the candidate *played an active role* in advising: by being available to students during convenient office hours; by a willingness to answer class-related questions; by being knowledgeable about the curricula and by providing accurate course-planning information; by providing letters of recommendation upon request; and by effective mentoring of research students.
(d) Evidence is presented showing a high level of performance in the development of new course materials and a commitment to a process of continuous improvement.
(e) Evidence is presented showing that the candidate has actively participated in all ABET related activities.

A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(a) An overall (weighted average) score of 3.0 (on a scale of 1-5) or higher in all courses taught on questions of the CIS Department Faculty Evaluation Form and, if available, positive senior exit interview comments.
(b) Documented evidence of Satisfactory delivery and Satisfactory content of new computer science course(s) prepared by faculty measured by an overall average score of 3.0 (on a scale of 1-5) of all questions of the CIS Department Faculty Evaluation Form and by quantity and quality of course materials prepared by faculty as assessed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and departmental chairperson; evidence of Satisfactory course delivery will be supported by comparative analysis of classroom performance with other faculty teaching similar courses
(c) Evidence is presented that demonstrates the candidate carried out his/her advising duties in an acceptable manner
(d) Evidence is presented showing an acceptable level of performance in the development of course materials and a commitment to a process of continuous improvement.
(e) Evidence is presented showing that the candidate has completed all ABET related activities in a satisfactory manner.

The total number of student credit hours (SCH) and the number of students enrolled in faculty courses and advised by faculty will be taken into account in final determination of faculty effectiveness in teaching and advising as compared with national and/or college averages for comparable disciplines.

Percentage of faculty teaching load and SCH as compared with Faculty Standard Teaching Load will have influence on final evaluation in this category.

1.2. Scholarship and Professional Activities

A candidate is expected to establish an independent and active research group (involving graduate and undergraduate students) with a track record of consistently producing high-quality research results as demonstrated by evidence such as peer-reviewed journal, refereed conference publications and external funding.

A determination of "**Excellent**" shall be made upon the demonstration of (a), [(c) or (d)], and any two of the other three of the following outcomes:

(a) At least six publications in peer-refereed professional computer science journals, four of which are published in top journals such as IEEE Transactions or ACM Journals/Transactions or journals of similar statue in Europe (patents are considered as equivalent to journal publications);
(b) At least ten publications in proceedings of major conferences in the field and at least half of them in IEEE/ACM sponsored conferences;
(c) At least eight full-time graduate student-semesters of externally funded support for computer science graduate students;
(d) Research funding of $250,000 (excluding equipment) with at least $175,000 of it coming from nationally recognized organizations, for which the faculty member has spending authority;
(e) Has graduated at least one student with Ph.D. degree;
(f) Has served significant professional leadership positions such as conference chair, session chair, journal editor, and proposal evaluator for national funding agencies.

A determination of "**Very Good**" shall be made upon the demonstration of (a), [(c) or (d)], and any two of the other three of the following outcomes:

a) At least five publications in peer refereed professional computer science journals, three of which are published in top journals such as IEEE Transactions or ACM Journals/Transactions or journals of similar statue in Europe (patents are considered as equivalent to journal publications);
b) At least seven publications in proceedings of major conferences in the field, and at least half of them in IEEE/ACM sponsored conferences;
c) At least five full-time graduate student-semesters of externally funded support;

d) Research funding of $200,000 (excluding equipment) with at least $125,000 of it coming from nationally recognized organizations, for which the faculty member has spending authority;
e) Has mentored at least one Ph.D. student for at least four semesters and with at least one journal publication co-authored with this student based on the thesis work of this student;
f) Significant professional service such as organizing conference/session, serving on journal editor board and panel for national funding agencies.

A determination of "**Satisfactory**" shall be made upon the demonstration of at least three of the following outcomes:

a) At least three publications in peer-refereed professional computer science, two of which published in IEEE Transactions or ACM Journals/Transactions or journals of similar statue in Europe (patents are considered as equivalent to journal publications);
b) At least four publications in proceedings of major conferences in the field;
c) At least four full-time graduate student-semesters of externally funded support;
d) Research funding of $150,000 (excluding equipment) with at least $100,000 of it coming from nationally recognized organizations, for which the faculty member has spending authority.

Note 1: Publications referred to here consist of those with the candidate as the first author or a co-author with his/her graduate student(s).

Note 2: Above publications and grants are based on the work accomplished at UMass Dartmouth (UMassD) by the professor after tenure.

Note 3: CIS Faculty Evaluation Committee, CIS Chair, and the COE Dean can consider credits for books or book chapters as substitutes for some of the above accomplishments, but under no circumstances, promotion will be granted to faculty with no major peer-reviewed publications and no externally funded grant activity.

Note 4: These ratings may be influenced by the committee's assessment of the overall contribution of the faculty to the field of computer science and/or additional evidence provided by the faculty. Examples of additional evidence that might influence the rating include large numbers of citations of the faculty's work.

1.3. University Service

If the candidate for promotion elects to be evaluated in this category, he/she is to present evidence in the following areas:

a) Leadership roles in committees at the departmental, college, and university levels, along with documented achievements; at least half of the service work has to be done in the department in which faculty has primary academic assignment;

b) Meaningful active contributions to Open Houses, Discovery Days, Orientation, and other major recruiting and retention events;
c) Effective outreach programs that enhance the reputation and visibility of the department, college and university;
d) Sustained support of professional and non-professional student organizations (ACM, IEEE, etc.).

A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made provided the candidate makes significant contributions in (a) plus meaningful contributions in three other categories. In addition, the candidate should also have played leadership roles on at least one committee in the CIS Department for at least six (6) years since earning tenure (does not have to be the same committee in all six years), and at least three (3) years since earning tenure of significant contribution to COE or the University (committee service, major task/project benefiting our community).

A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made provided the candidate makes significant contributions in (a) plus meaningful contribution in two other categories. In addition, the candidate should have played leadership roles on at least one committee in the CIS Department for at least three (3) years since earning tenure, and notable contribution to COE or the University (committee service, notable task/project benefiting our community).

A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made provided the candidate makes meaningful contributions in any two of the above categories.

1.4. Public Service

If the candidate for promotion elects to be evaluated in this category, he/she is to present evidence in the following areas:

(a) Active community service without pay related to one's area of professional expertise, including documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.;
(b) Other active community service including demonstrated leadership, along with documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.

A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made provided the candidate plays a significant role in both of the above areas with very high level of activity.

A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made provided the candidate plays a significant role in either of the two areas with very high level of activity.

A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made provided the candidate performs either of the two (2) above activities.

August 10, 2018

Approved

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Tenure Criteria for Faculty Joining Department of Computer and Information Science Starting from Fall 2018

Revised August 10, 2018

Department of Computer and Information Science will use the following as a typical performance indicator in rating faculty's qualifications for tenure and will assign ratings of excellence, very good, and satisfactory as required by the faculty federation agreement.

1.1. Effectiveness of Teaching & Advising

Candidates are required to present the following evidence in this category to support the faculty member's application for tenure:

(a) Complete set of annual student evaluations in all courses taught. The number of students providing evaluations has to be large enough to make any statistical sense. This will require the faculty member to have had the opportunity to teach a reasonable number of courses to a reasonable number of students. Departmental chairperson will make sure that the candidates have opportunities to teach computer science courses at different levels including lower- and upper-division undergraduate courses and graduate courses.

(b) Evidence of continuous course improvement for existing computer science and/or service courses; course improvement includes new content as well as new pedagogical methods of course implementation.

(c) Evidence of development and successful delivery of new computer science courses in areas of specializations of computer science programs or computer science service courses.

(d) Evidence of innovation or creative approaches in delivering the subject material. He/she should indicate whether the courses have been enriched by the inclusion of modern computer science methodologies and technologies for the delivery of the material.

(e) Assessment of material in the same format required for program assessment, including samples of student work from each course taught: course outline, evaluation and academic honesty policy statement, exams, homework, projects, reports, and evidence of documented feedback related to course assignments provided to students.

(f) Complete record of advising students majoring in Computer Science, and of graduate student research advising. A list of advisees assigned to the faculty and all students in the list that have been advised on a regular basis with advising records will assist in evaluation of this activity.

(g) Examples of success of students advised by the faculty member in national competitions, student paper publications/presentations or exceptional projects, if appropriate.

Departmental FEC and chairperson will develop the following assessment mechanisms of teaching and advising effectiveness:

a) A comparison of the course evaluation on the overall effectiveness of the faculty with others who teach similar courses at similar sizes and similar levels will be made based on student evaluations (chairperson is responsible for this analysis).
b) Peer evaluation of classroom performance during FEC classroom visitations (FEC is responsible for this scheduling and assessment).
c) If available, exit interview comments made by graduating students (chairperson is responsible for this analysis)

A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(a) An overall (weighted average) score of 4.0 (on a scale of 1-5) or higher in all courses taught on questions of the CIS Department Faculty Evaluation Form and, if available, extremely favorable senior exit interview comments.
(b) Evidence of Excellent course delivery will be supported by results from FEC peer classroom visitations and review of course materials showing high-quality content.
(c) Evidence is presented that demonstrates the candidate *is highly effective and active* in advising: by being available to students during convenient office hours; by a willingness to answer class-related questions; by being knowledgeable about the curricula and by providing accurate course-planning information; by providing timely letters of recommendation upon request; and by effective mentoring of research students.
(d) Evidence is presented showing a very high level of performance in the development of course materials and a demonstrated commitment to a process of continuous improvement.

A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(a) An overall (weighted average) score of 3.5 (on a scale of 1-5) or higher in all courses taught on questions of the CIS Department Faculty Evaluation Form and, if available, very favorable senior exit interview comments.
(b) Documented evidence of Very Good delivery and Very Good content of new computer science course(s) prepared by faculty measured by an overall average score of 3.5 (on a scale of 1-5) of all questions of the CIS Department Faculty Evaluation Form and by quantity and quality of course materials prepared by faculty as assessed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and departmental chairperson; evidence of Very Good course delivery will be

supported by results from FEC peer classroom visitations and by comparative analysis of classroom performance with other faculty teaching similar courses.

(c) Evidence is presented that demonstrates the candidate *played an active role* in advising: by being available to students during convenient office hours; by a willingness to answer class-related questions; by being knowledgeable about the curricula and by providing accurate course-planning information; by providing letters of recommendation upon request; and by effective mentoring of research students.

(d) Evidence is presented showing a high level of performance in the development of new course materials and a commitment to a process of continuous improvement.

A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(a) An overall (weighted average) score of 3.0 (on a scale of 1-5) or higher in all courses taught on questions of the CIS Department Faculty Evaluation Form and, if available, positive senior exit interview comments.

(b) Documented evidence of Satisfactory delivery and Satisfactory content of new computer science course(s) prepared by faculty measured by an overall average score of 3.0 (on a scale of 1-5) of all questions of the CIS Department Faculty Evaluation Form and by quantity and quality of course materials prepared by faculty as assessed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and departmental chairperson; evidence of Satisfactory course delivery will be supported by results from FEC peer classroom visitations and by comparative analysis of classroom performance with other faculty teaching similar courses.

(c) Evidence is presented that demonstrates the candidate carried out his/her advising duties in an acceptable manner.

(d) Evidence is presented showing an acceptable level of performance in the development of course materials and a commitment to a process of continuous improvement.

The total number of student credit hours (SCH) and the number of students enrolled in faculty courses and advised by faculty will be taken into account in final determination of faculty effectiveness in teaching and advising as compared with national and/or college averages for comparable disciplines.

Percentage of faculty teaching load and SCH as compared with Faculty Standard Teaching Load will have influence on final evaluation in this category.

1.2. Scholarship and Professional Activities

A candidate is expected to demonstrate ability to develop an independent, sustainable, impactful research program. Funded research carries more weight than professional activities for a faculty member seeking tenure. Accordingly, the tenure candidate is to present evidence of the items listed below to support the faculty member's application for tenure:

A determination of "**Excellent**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(a) At least five publications in peer refereed professional computer science journals, four of which are published in top journals such as IEEE Transactions or ACM Journals/Transactions or journals of similar statue in Europe (patents based on work conducted at UMassD are considered as equivalent to journal publications); and
(b) At least eight publications in proceedings of major conferences in the field and at least half of them in IEEE/ACM sponsored conferences; and
(c) At least eight full-time graduate student-semesters of externally funded support for computer science, data science or EAS graduate students; and
(d) Research funding of $225,000 (excluding equipment) with at least $150,000 of it coming from nationally recognized organizations, for which the faculty member has spending authority.

A determination of "**Very Good**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

a) At least four publications in peer refereed professional computer science journals, three of which are published in top journals such as IEEE Transactions or ACM Journals/Transactions or journals of similar statue in Europe (patents are considered as equivalent to journal publications); and
b) At least six publications in proceedings of major conferences in the field, and at least half of them in IEEE/ACM sponsored conferences; and
c) At least six full-time graduate student-semesters of externally funded support; and
d) Research funding of $175,000 (excluding equipment) with at least $125,000 of it coming from nationally recognized organizations, for which the faculty member has spending authority;

A determination of "**Satisfactory**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

a) At least three publications in peer refereed professional computer science, two of which published in IEEE Transactions or ACM Journals/Transactions or journals of similar statue in Europe (patents are considered as equivalent to journal publications); and
b) At least four publications in proceedings of major conferences in the field; and
c) At least four full-time graduate student-semesters of externally funded support; and
d) Research funding of $150,000 (excluding equipment) with at least $100,000 of it coming from nationally recognized organizations, for which the faculty member has spending authority;

Note 1: Publications referred to here consist of those with the candidate as the first author or a co-author with his/her graduate student(s).

Note 2: Above publications and grants are based on the work accomplished at UMass Dartmouth (UMassD) by the professor seeking tenure over the five and half years period preceding to tenure application. For faculty joining the college with experience and a record from another institution with credit toward tenure, the accomplishments will still be judged based on the work done at UMassD but will be prorated for the number of years to tenure application.

Note 3: CIS Faculty Evaluation Committee, CIS Chair, and the COE Dean can consider credits for books or book chapters as substitutes for some of the above accomplishments, but under no circumstances tenure will be granted to faculty with no major peer-reviewed publications and no externally funded grant activity.

Note 4: These ratings may be influenced by the committee's assessment of the overall contribution of the faculty to the field of computer science and/or additional evidence provided by the faculty. Examples of additional evidence that might influence the rating include large numbers of citations of the faculty's work or substantial products such as software contributing to a large research community.

1.3. University Service

If the candidate for tenure elects to be evaluated in this category, he/she is to present evidence in the following areas:

a) Active service in committees at the departmental, college, and university levels, along with documented achievements; at least half of the service work has to be done in the department in which faculty has primary academic assignment;
b) Meaningful active contributions to Open Houses, Discovery Days, Orientation, and other major recruiting and retention activities;
c) Effective outreach programs that enhance the reputation and visibility of the department, college and university;
d) Sustained support of professional and non-professional student organizations (ACM, IEEE, etc.).

A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made provided the candidate makes significant contributions in (a) with leadership role plus meaningful contributions in three other categories.

A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made provided the candidate makes significant contributions in (a) plus meaningful contribution in two other categories.

A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made provided the candidate makes meaningful contributions in any two of the above categories.

1.4. Public Service

If the candidate for tenure elects to be evaluated in this category, he/she is to present evidence in the following areas:

(a) Active community service without pay related to one's area of professional expertise, including documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.;
(b) Other active community service including demonstrated leadership, along with documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.

A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made provided the candidate plays a significant role in both of the above areas with very high level of activity.

A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made provided the candidate plays a significant role in either of the two areas with very high level of activity.

A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made provided the candidate performs either of the two (2) above activities.

UMass | Dartmouth

Approved

CIVIL & ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
Criteria for Tenure
Effective Fall 2018

The Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering will use the following criteria as typical performance indicators in evaluating the qualifications of candidates for tenure and will assign ratings of excellent, very good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory as required by the faculty federation agreement.

Teaching Effectiveness & Advising

The Civil & Environmental Engineering Department requires the tenure candidate to present the following evidence in this category to support the faculty member's application for tenure:

Evidence collected by chair/FEC

a) Complete set of student evaluations in all courses taught. Number of students providing evaluations has to be large enough to make the results statistically meaningful. This will require the faculty member to have had the opportunity to teach a reasonable number of courses to a reasonable number of students. Chairs will ensure that all faculty will have opportunities to teach courses at several levels and of several sizes. If the assignment is not made, the faculty member should ask for such an assignment.

b) A comparison of student evaluation of the faculty candidate with those of other faculty who taught similar courses with similar sizes and at similar levels;

c) If available, exit interview comments made by graduating seniors;

d) Complete set of peer evaluations developed during class visitations by the chair and members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) (See attached Faculty Peer Evaluation Forms);

e) Complete record of advising of students majoring in the department and students enrolled in the faculty member's own classes, and a list of graduate student advisees. A list of advisees assigned to the faculty member and a list of those advised on a regular basis will assist in evaluation of this activity. The FEC will conduct a survey of the faculty member's advisees with an appropriate questionnaire that reflects: willingness to answer class-related questions, knowledge about the curricula, service of providing accurate course-planning information, service of providing letters of recommendation

upon request, and effective mentoring of student researchers;

f) Solicited comments or letters from at least five alumni, holding the BS or MS degree from the department, who are familiar with the faculty member's teaching and advising. This could be taken from students' comments in their evaluations of candidate's teaching, provided these comments clearly reflect candidate's strengths in teaching.;

Evidence that should be presented by the candidate

g) A list of graduate and undergraduate research advisees, their projects and any presentations, awards or publications resulting from the research.

Possible additional evidence that may be collected/provided by candidate

h) Evidence of continuous course improvement, including particularly the development and successful delivery of new courses should be presented. The candidate should in addition show evidence of any innovation or creative approaches in delivering the subject material. He/she should indicate whether the courses have been enriched by the inclusion of modern engineering experiences and the use of information technology for the delivery of the material. The candidate should provide course material data in the same format required by ABET, including samples of student work from each course taught: course outline, policy statement, exams, homework, projects, reports, etc.

i) Evidence of effective research advising indicating student success including papers published by UMass Dartmouth students, off campus student research presentations, and student placement in research programs outside of UMass Dartmouth.

j) Examples of success of students advised by the faculty member in national competitions, student research awards, undergraduate student paper presentations or exceptional class projects.

A determination of **"Satisfactory** "shall be made if all the following outcomes are met:

a) A weighted average student evaluation score of at least 3.0/5.0 in the overall rating category.
b) The candidate attended all assigned classes for instruction except for valid medical excuses or when the chair was notified of the absence in advance and approved arrangements for coverage.
c) The candidate carried out his/her academic advising duties in an acceptable manner which includes providing accurate course planning

information and providing letters of recommendation upon request.

d) The candidate kept mandated office hours as outlined in the contract and helped students in their class related questions.
e) The candidate actively participated in ABET course assessment practices.
f) The candidate's course grades were turned in on time without intervention by the chair or other administration officials.

Failure to meet any of the above criteria will be expected to result in a rating of "Unsatisfactory".

A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made if all the criteria for satisfactory are met and the following additional outcomes are achieved:

All of the criteria in this section:

a) A weighted-average student evaluation score of at least 3.5/5.0 in the overall rating category.
b) Evidence of continuous teaching improvement through SET ratings and peer evaluation.
c) An overall average rating of 3.5 (on a scale of 1-5) or higher in the four broad areas of the Peer Evaluation Form averaged over all courses taught by the candidate and assessed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee.
d) Graduation of at least two MS student advisees OR one PhD student advisee.
e) Publication of at least two student-authored or co-authored journal publications by the candidate's research advisees. The Department recognizes the advising effort by the candidate in authoring papers with research advisees.

AND at least two of the following

f) Evidence is presented that demonstrates the candidate played an exceptionally active role in academic advising: by being available to students during convenient office hours; by a willingness to answer class-related questions; by being knowledgeable about the curricula and by providing accurate course-planning information; by providing letters of recommendation upon request.
g) Extremely favorable comments or letters from alumni.
h) Evidence is presented showing a very high level of performance in the development or improvement of course materials and a demonstrated commitment to a process of continuous improvement.
i) Evidence of success of graduate or undergraduate research advisees post-graduation from UMass Dartmouth.

A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made upon meeting the requirements for "Satisfactory" and "Very Good" and meeting one of the two sets of additional outcomes:

I. All of the criteria in this section:

a) A weighted-average SET rating of 4.0 or greater in overall rating

for all courses taught.

b) Evidence of continuous teaching improvement through SET ratings and peer evaluation.
c) An overall average rating of 4.0 (on a scale of 1-5) or higher in the four broad areas of the Peer Evaluation Form averaged over all courses taught by the candidate and assessed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee.
d) Graduation of at least three MS student advisees OR one PhD student advisee and one MS student advisee.
e) Publication of at least three student-authored or co-authored journal publications by the candidate's research advisees. The Department recognizes the advising effort by the candidate in authoring papers with research advisees.

AND at least two of the following

f) Evidence is presented that demonstrates the candidate played an exceptionally active role in academic advising: by being available to students during convenient office hours; by a willingness to answer class-related questions; by being knowledgeable about the curricula and by providing accurate course-planning information; by providing letters of recommendation upon request.
g) Extremely favorable comments or letters from alumni.
h) Evidence is presented showing a very high level of performance in the development or improvement of course materials and a demonstrated commitment to a process of continuous improvement.
i) Evidence of success of graduate or undergraduate research advisees post-graduation from UMass Dartmouth.

OR

II. All of the criteria in this section:

a) Overall student evaluation scores in the top quartile of the department in required undergraduate courses in at least two out of three years immediately preceding application for tenure.
b) A weighted average SET rating of at least 4.0 in overall rating for all courses taught.
c) Evidence in peer evaluation of continuous improvement and adoption of modern teaching practice.
d) Graduation of at least three MS student advisees OR one PhD student advisee and one MS student advisee.
e) Publication of at least three student-authored or co-authored journal publications by the candidate's research advisees. The Department recognizes the advising effort by the candidate in authoring papers with research advisees.

Note: The numerical scores of teaching effectiveness above are not rigid standards and the CEN FEC may take the number and nature of courses

taught and the number and level of students in each course into consideration to justify any deviation from these levels.

Scholarship and Professional Activities

Funded research carries more weight than professional activities for a faculty member seeking tenure. Accordingly, the Civil & Environmental Engineering Department requires the tenure candidate to present evidence of the items listed below to support the faculty member's application for tenure. Evidence may include: peer- reviewed publications in archival journals/monographs of high quality and impact, publications in refereed conference proceedings, chapters in edited volumes, invited presentations at technical meetings and workshops, patents and copyrights, research awards and citations, and procuring competitive external grant support.

Examples of professional activities may include but are not limited to leadership in professional societies, conference organization, editorships of high-quality journals, service on grant review panels, service on accrediting bodies and consulting activity.

A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made upon meeting one of the following outcomes:

a) At least ***three*** journal papers based on the research work performed at UMASSD published in refereed professional journals recognized as major journals by the FEC in the candidate's field of research, with at least ***two*** journal papers published with UMASSD students.
b) Sustained level of at least one presentation and/or publication in proceedings of recognized conferences in the field every other year.
c) Research expenditure (including ICR) of at least ***$160,000*** (excluding equipment donation or grant), of which $90,000 should come from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations and for which the faculty member has spending authority OR research expenditure (including ICR) for the three years preceding application for tenure that are greater than the average for faculty expenditures in the college of engineering over that period.
d) The grant amount received from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations should include the funding required to support at least ***three*** full-time graduate student-semesters of externally funded support, including the salary, tuition and indirect cost.
e) Competitive grants for major research equipment obtained under competitive category should be considered as a part of research funding. However, such grants will not be considered as a complete substitute for supporting graduate students or towards a major part of the research funding.

A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

a) At least ***four*** journal papers based on the research work performed at UMASSD published in refereed professional journals recognized as major journals by the FEC in the candidate's field of research, with at least ***two*** journal papers published with UMASSD students.
b) Sustained level of at least two presentations and/or publication in proceedings of recognized conferences in the field every three years.
c) Research expenditure (including ICR) of at least ***$200,000*** (excluding equipment donation or grants), of which $125,000 should come from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations and for which the faculty member has spending authority OR research expenditure (including ICR) for the three years preceding application for tenure that are ***two*** times greater than the average for faculty expenditures in the college of engineering over that period.
d) At least four full-time graduate student-semesters of externally funded support, including the salary, tuition and indirect cost.
e) Competitive grants for major research equipment obtained under competitive category should be considered as a part of research funding. However, such grants will not be considered as a complete substitute for supporting graduate students or towards a major part of the research funding.

A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

a) At least ***five*** journal papers based on the research work performed at UMASSD published in refereed professional journals recognized as major journals by the FEC in the candidate's field of research, with at least ***three*** journal papers published with UMASSD students.
b) Sustained level of at least one presentation and/or publication in proceedings of recognized conferences in the field per year.
c) Research expenditure (including ICR) of at least ***$225,000*** (excluding equipment donation or grants), of which $150,000 should come from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations and for which the faculty member has spending authority OR research expenditure (including ICR) for the three years preceding application for tenure that are ***three*** times greater than the average for faculty expenditures in the college of engineering over that period.
d) At least five full-time graduate student-semesters of externally funded support, including the salary, tuition and indirect cost.
e) Competitive grants for major research equipment obtained under competitive category should be considered as a part of research funding. However, such grants will not be considered as a complete substitute for supporting graduate students or towards a major part of the research funding.

Note 1: Refereed professional journals mean peer reviewed journals. An acceptable publication is defined as a paper with the candidate as the first author, corresponding author or co-author with a graduate student. If the

candidate is not the first, senior or the corresponding author, he/she should provide additional evidence showing that the candidate's contribution was significant. Additionally, all publications must include UMass Dartmouth affiliation in order to be considered part of the tenure package. Impact factor of journals should be a strong consideration. Citations should be mentioned where relevant.

Note 2: Above publications and grants are based on the work accomplished by a tenure track faculty over the six years preceding tenure application while working at UMass Dartmouth. For faculty joining the college with experience and a record from another institution with credit towards tenure, the accomplishments will still be judged based on the work done at while at UMD but will be prorated for the number of years at UMD prior to the tenure application.

Note 3: FEC, Chair, and the Dean can give credit for books (peer-reviewed, non-textbook) published or patents obtained to substitute for some of the above accomplishments, but under no circumstances will tenure be granted to a faculty who does not have both major peer reviewed publications and grant activity.

Note 4: While the expectation is that the candidate will meet all the outcomes identified above, substantial weight will be placed on evaluating the total package of accomplishments in scholarship over specific metrics.

University Service

If the tenure candidate elects to offer this category for evaluation, the Civil & Environmental Engineering Department requires the candidate to present evidence in the following areas:

a) Active service including demonstrated leadership on committees at the departmental, college, and university levels, along with documentation on the frequency of meetings;
b) Meaningful contributions to Open Houses, Orientation, and other major events;
c) Effective outreach or community programs that enhance the reputation and visibility of the University;
d) Sustained support of professional and non-professional student organizations (ASCE, SWE, etc.);

A determination of "Excellent" shall be made provided the candidate makes contributions in (a) with significant leadership role plus meaningful contributions in three other categories.

A determination of "Very Good" shall be made provided the candidate makes contributions in (a) with significant leadership role plus meaningful contribution in two other categories.

A determination of "Satisfactory" shall be made provided the candidate makes meaningful contributions in any two of the above categories.

Public Service

If the tenure candidate elects to offer this category for evaluation, the Civil & Environmental Engineering Department requires the candidate to present evidence in the following areas:

a) Active community service related to one's area of professional expertise, including documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.;
b) Other active community service including demonstrated leadership, along with documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.

A determination of "Excellent" shall be made provided the candidate plays a significant role in both of the above areas with very high level of activity.

A determination of "Very Good" shall be made provided the candidate plays a significant role in either of the two areas with very high level of activity.

A determination of "Satisfactory" shall be made provided the candidate performs either of the two (2) above activities.

APPROVED

Tenure and Promotion
Department of Crime and Justice Studies
10/26/16

Categories of Evaluation and Timelines for Application

As required by the Faculty Federation Contract (Article VII, Personnel Recommendations, Section B, Evaluative Statement, page 70, lines 9-13), faculty are evaluated annually, for contract renewal and for promotion and tenure:

Each faculty member shall be evaluated in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising, Scholarship and Professional Activities, and *at least* one in category of service: University Service or Public Service. If the faculty member chooses not to be evaluated in one of the service categories, the phrase "Not Applicable" shall be used for that category.

Applications for promotion shall follow the timeline stipulated by the Faculty Federation Contract (Article VII, Personnel Recommendations, Category K, Promotions, Section 2, lines 7-18, page 88):
While length of service alone is not cause for promotion, the following shall be considered the normal period of time to be spent in rank:

a) Instructor, not more than five (5) years
b) Assistant Professor, six (6) to seven (7) year
c) Associate Professor, six (6) or more years.
d) Professor, six (6) or more years (total years teaching shall ordinarily be eighteen (18) or more)

Nothing in these rules on the normal period of time to be spent in rank shall prevent consideration for promotion at an earlier date. Promotion before the normal time spent in rank will be recommended only upon evidence of extraordinary achievement and experience in one's professional career.

A. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Application for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will be made during the candidate's sixth year of service to the university. The following ratings for the evaluation of faculty are established for promotion and tenure recommendations (Article VII, Personnel Recommendations, Section E, Ratings for Promotion and Tenure Recommendations, page 71, lines 19-26):

1. Recommended
(a) “Excellent” in either Teaching Effectiveness and Advising or Scholarship and Professional Activities; (b) at least a “Very Good” in the other of these two categories; and (c) no unsatisfactory ratings.

2. Not Recommended
Failure to meet the standards under the Recommended rating

I. Scholarship and Professional Activities

A successful candidate for tenure and promotion is someone with an active research agenda who has produced a body of high quality scholarship and is recognized for contributing to the growth of knowledge in their area. Given the variety of approaches to the study of justice that faculty bring to the department, the evaluation process must take into account and respect the varying research and scholarly activities of the multi and interdisciplinary fields represented. Evaluation must also regard scholarly activity in non-English languages with the same weight as that conducted in English.

The Department considers each of the activities listed below as relevant forms of scholarly activity, but expects that a candidate's dossier will include a mixture of venues and activities for scholarly activity appropriate to the candidate’s particular research agenda. That is, the list below indicates the range of recognized venues and activities, not the expectation that a candidate actively utilize all of them. Nonetheless, certain activities are emphasized over others in the review of all candidates, including publication in refereed venues, conducting research, acquiring grant support, and delivering papers at professional meetings.

- **Publication in refereed venues** (journal articles and/or monographs) constitutes the best evidence of high quality scholarship and such publications are given the highest value in the evaluation process. Quality and reputation of the journal or publisher will enter into assessing the merits of publications.

- **Contributing a chapter or article to a multi-authored or edited book**. Quality of the publisher and significance of the volume as a whole will be taken into account.

- **Editing a book or journal volume**. Quality and reputation of the publisher/journal will be taken into consideration, as will the impact of the volume on the field.

Publications for non-academic audiences based on scholarly research. **Public Scholarship.** This work may include community organizing, public discussion, policy-related or and more “application” and or “practitioner” oriented venues that are aimed at communities affected by a particular field of research, government agencies, NGO's, community groups, or contracting entities, rather than exclusively academic audiences. The intent here is to recognize original research conducted for a targeted audience. (Communicating research results to wider, non-specialized audiences may be considered under "Service.")

- **Delivering papers or presenting posters at professional meetings** also constitutes evidence of an active and productive research agenda and is recognized as a step toward publication. This is, however, less important than publications in refereed venues. Rigor of the review process and significance of the venue will be taken into consideration.

- **Organizing conferences, professional panels, lecture series** and **serving as editor, reviewer, or board member for a scholarly journal.** Scope and importance of the conference/panel and the quality of the journal will be taken into consideration.

- I**nitiating new research projects and conducting field research**. The Department regards ambition, vision, and creativity in the investigation of new scholarly areas or in the initiation of inquiries into new aspects of established areas of research as valuable markers of committed and engaged scholar-teachers. Evidence of such a research program can include, but is not limited to, grant and fellowship applications, research designs, literature reviews, field notes, interview transcripts, concept papers, and position papers. A record of **receiving grant support** for research from funders external to UMass and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts constitutes an important aspect of scholarly activity. Evidence of new and ongoing research conducted without grant funding or internal funding is also considered an important component of scholarly activity.

The Department expects the composition of a candidate's research and scholarly production to reflect their particular research agenda and area of expertise. That is, the “research package” of one candidate may look significantly different from that of another candidate. Likewise, expectations for candidates coming in with time counted towards tenure are adjusted accordingly.

External Reviewers: As stipulated in Article VII of the contract, three letters written by external reviewers will offer important evidence of a candidate’s scholarly

achievement. That is, they provide an expert assessment as to the quality of a candidate's scholarship record, including but not limited to, originality, impact on the field, command of and contribution to the relevant literature, quality of the research on which publications are based, and comparative assessment to other scholars in the field. The external reviewers' position in the field and relationship with the candidate will enter into assessing the letters. The external reviewer's letters will inform but not determine the internal review process of determining the quality of the candidate's scholarly work.

In addition to the external reviewers' letters, the candidate may offer additional evidence as to scholarly impact on knowledge, including but not limited to documentation of the importance of the presentation venues in the candidate's field (e.g. journal readership, rigor of review process, reputation, etc.); citations to the candidate's scholarship; invitations to present research in significant or highly selective venues; and evidence of productive collaboration with established scholars in the candidate's field.

The evaluation ratings for Scholarship and Professional Activities are defined as follows:

Excellent means having established an active and coherent research agenda and completed a significant body of scholarly work. Any one of the following combinations of work merit this rating: publication of *one* book-length peer-reviewed monograph; publication or acceptance for publication *four* journal articles in refereed journals or peer-reviewed book chapters in edited volumes (or some combination of); publication of three journal articles in refereed journals or peer-reviewed book chapters in edited volumes (or some combination of) along with a body of significant other scholarly activity (e.g. book contract, conference presentations, editing a book or journal volume, contributing article to an edited volume, acquisition of research grants, reviews of scholarly work, "applied" publications). In addition to any of the above instances, the likelihood of a robust post-tenure scholarly agenda must be demonstrated. In other words, there must evidence that research beyond current publications and publications-in-progress has been conceptualized and is underway.

Very Good means having achieved any one of the following combinations: publication or acceptance for publication of *three* articles in refereed journals or peer-reviewed book chapters in edited volumes; publication or acceptance for publication of *two* journal articles in refereed journals or peer-review book chapters inedited volumes along with significant other scholarly activity (e.g. book contract, conference presentations, editing a book or journal volume, contributing article to an edited volume, organizing conferences or panels, initiation of new research, acquisition of research grants, reviews of scholarly work, "applied" publications). In addition to any of the above

instances, the likelihood of a rich post-tenure scholarly agenda must be demonstrated. In other words, there must evidence that research beyond current publications and publications-in-progress has been conceptualized and is underway.

Satisfactory means publication or acceptance for publication of *two* articles in refereed peer-reviewed journals or peer-reviewed book chapters in edited volumes, without a significant body of other scholarly activity.

Unsatisfactory means having achieved fewer than *two* publications or acceptances for publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals or book chapters in peer-reviewed edited volumes.

Certain scholarly activities—such as editing a book or journal volume or acquiring a research grant—can be considered as equivalent to one refereed publication. Otherwise, non-publication activities are considered part of a body of significant scholarly activity, with no one of them alone being the equivalent of a publication but collectively signifying an active and influential scholarly life. Where the candidate's scholarship has had truly exceptional impact and is of outstanding quality, the evaluation committee may consider providing a rating higher than the one merited by the number of publications prescribed for each rating.

II. Standards for Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

Effective teaching and advising is vital for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The Department recognizes that there are many different ways to teach and advise effectively, and we strive to reward excellence in all its forms. The Department considers together all of the sources of evidence listed below to construct a full and detailed portrait of a candidate's effectiveness as a teacher and advisor.

- **Teaching History** includes basic information on which courses the candidate has taught during the probationary period (including the sponsoring of independent studies and mentoring of honor's theses), new preparations, and the introduction of new courses into the CJS curriculum.

- Review of **course syllabi, assignments,** and **assessment rubrics** yields information on the relevance of the topics covered in forwarding the interdisciplinary mission of the Crime and Justice Studies curriculum. These include but are not limited to the following: Well organized and clearly presented course themes. Appropriate use of required readings and course materials. Well defined student performance assessments.

- **Self-Evaluation and Teaching Statement.** The candidate's reflection on teaching philosophy, practices, and the integration of various relevant evaluation data and pedagogical research findings constitute the most significant documentation of teaching effectiveness.

- **Peer Classroom Observations.** The department strives to provide the candidate with annual peer review of classroom teaching. Observations are an opportunity to provide constructive feedback, enhance professional growth, and discuss evolving pedagogy.

- **Teaching Development Efforts**. It is expected that a candidate will seek to further develop their teaching skills. Evidence of professional development sought can include participation in Office of Faculty Development-sponsored programs, consultations with CITS or other campus entities to incorporate technology or otherwise enhance curricular offerings, and, importantly, through the candidate's own self-reflection as documented in the narrative section of the tenure application materials. Attendance at conferences and professional workshops focused on pedagogy are also evidence of teaching development efforts.

- **Student Evaluations**. The departmental evaluation form provides for extensive student feedback on the effectiveness of the course and the instructor. The results include quantitative scores, as well as qualitative commentary. The Department uses student evaluations to compare students' perceptions of the candidate's teaching performance with that of other tenure-track faculty in the Department teaching similar courses with similar enrollments.

- **Advising.** Department majors is an important aspect of teaching effectiveness. Evidence of availability during registration periods, time spent advising students, numbers of students advised, formally and informally, as well as work in the Academic Advising Centers, mentoring student groups, writing reference letters for students, working with students on understanding and preparing for graduate school applications, and overseeing Honors projects, independent or directed studies, and these are all considered pertinent for the evaluation of advising performance.

Assessment of a candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness requires that the totality of accomplishment outweigh any one area in the teaching record. Additionally, improvement in peer observations and student evaluations is valuable, and therefore,

evidence from the latter part of the probationary period will weigh more heavily in the overall assessment.

Excellent means having an excellent record of producing a coherent and well implemented teaching agenda. A strong representation of excellent and/or very good of the following merits this rating - supportive peer evaluation letters, student assessments (above the departmental mean in each individual course taught on-load), demonstrated self-reflection, teaching statements, evidence of implementation of critical pedagogy, evidence of teaching development, evaluations of course syllabi and effectiveness of course assignments and/or record of advising.

Very Good means having a very good record of a coherent teaching agenda. A good representation of the following accomplishments merits this rating - very good peer evaluation letters, very good student assessments (at or above the departmental mean in almost all courses), demonstrated self-reflection, very good teaching statements, evidence of very good implementation of critical pedagogy, evidence of very good teaching development, very good evaluations of course syllabi and effectiveness of course assignments and/or very good record of advising.

Satisfactory means having a satisfactory record of a coherent teaching agenda. A representation of the following accomplishments merits this rating - satisfactory peer evaluation letters, satisfactory student assessments (below the department mean in almost all courses), a satisfactory demonstration of self-reflection, satisfactory teaching statements, evidence of satisfactory implementation of pedagogy, evidence of satisfactory teaching development, satisfactory evaluations of course syllabi and effectiveness of course assignments and/or satisfactory record of advising.

Unsatisfactory means having a lack of a coherent teaching agenda. A representation of the following merits this rating - unsatisfactory peer evaluation letters, unsatisfactory student assessments (across the board negative responses from the vast majority), an unsatisfactory demonstration of self-reflection, unsatisfactory teaching statements, lack of implementation of critical pedagogy, lack of demonstrated teaching development, unsatisfactory evaluations of course syllabi and course assignments and/or unsatisfactory record of advising.

III. Standards for or University Service

During the first two-year contract, new faculty are expected to limit university service to activities within the Department. During subsequent contracts, faculty are encouraged to explore additional service opportunities to the College and the University that are made available to the candidate based on years of employment and as their other

responsibilities in preparation for tenure allow. A rating of **Excellent** requires a demonstrated record of significant and substantial leadership at the Departmental, College, or University level. A rating of **Very Good** requires sustained significant service to the Department, College, or University. A rating of **Satisfactory** requires a modest level of involvement in service functions, at least at the Departmental level. A rating of **Unsatisfactory** connotes inconsistent and insignificant service.

IV. Standards for Public Service

Public service involves the use of professional knowledge and expertise to benefit entities external to the University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth, including but not limited to: individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies or units other than the UMD, or other community groups or campaigns by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise or support. To be rated **Excellent** in public service, a candidate must have a record of demonstrated leadership, along with providing consistent and significant service. To be rated **Very Good**, a candidate must demonstrate consistent and significant service to the public. A rating of **Satisfactory** signifies a modest level of involvement in public service, while **Unsatisfactory** is reserved for inconsistent and insignificant public service.

It should be noted that faculty may choose to be evaluated in *either* University Service *or* Public Service. It should also be noted that the successful candidate will be judged primarily on teaching and scholarship.

B. Full Professor

I. Standards for Scholarship and Professional Activities

The successful candidate for promotion to Full Professor will be a person who has sustained an active research agenda and produced a body of high quality scholarship that is recognized for contributing to the growth of knowledge in his or her area. Given the variety of backgrounds that faculty bring to the department, the evaluation process must take into account and respect the diverse nature of research and scholarly activity in each of these different fields, and recognize as equivalent scholarship in native and/or non-English languages.

The Department considers all the venues and activities listed below as relevant forms of scholarly activity, but expects that candidate's dossiers will include the particular venues and activities most appropriate to their particular research agenda. That is, the list below indicates the range of recognized venues, not the expectation that a candidate actively utilize all of them. Publication in refereed venues, conducting research,

acquiring grant support, and delivering papers at professional meetings are emphasized in the review of all candidates.

- **Publication in refereed venues** (journal articles and/or monographs) constitutes the best evidence of high quality scholarship and such publications are given the highest value in the evaluation process. Quality and reputation of the journal or publisher will enter into assessing the merits of publications.

- I**nitiating new research projects and conducting field research**. The Department regards ambition, vision, and creativity in the investigation of new scholarly areas or in the initiation of inquiries into new aspects of established areas of research as valuable markers of committed and engaged scholar-teachers. Evidence of such a research program can include, but is not limited to, grant and fellowship applications, research designs, literature reviews, field notes, interview transcripts, concept papers, and position papers.

- A record of **receiving grant support** for research from funders external to UMass and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts constitutes an important aspect of scholarly activity. Evidence of new and ongoing research conducted without grant funding or internal funding is also considered an important component of scholarly activity.

- **Delivering papers or presenting posters at professional meetings** also constitutes evidence of an active and productive research agenda and is recognized as a step toward publication. This is, however, less important than publications in refereed venues. Rigor of the review process and significance of the venue will be taken into consideration.

- **Contributing a chapter or article to a multi-authored or edited book**. Quality of the publisher and significance of the volume as a whole will be taken into account.

- **Editing a book or journal volume**. Quality and reputation of the publisher/journal will be taken into consideration, as will the impact of the volume on the field.

- **Organizing conferences, professional panels, lecture series** and **serving as editor, reviewer, or board member for a scholarly journal.** Scope and importance of the conference/panel and the quality of the journal will be taken into consideration.

- **Publications for non-academic audiences based on scholarly research**. This work may include policy-related and more “application” or “practitioner” oriented venues that are aimed at government agencies, NGO's, community groups, or contracting entities, rather than exclusively academic audiences. The intent here is to recognize original research conducted for a targeted audience. (Communicating research results to wider, non-specialized audiences may be considered under Service.)

The Department expects the composition of a candidate's research and scholarly production to reflect the candidate’s particular research agenda and area of expertise. That is, the “research package” of one candidate may look significantly different from that of another candidate.

External Reviewers: As stipulated in Article VII of the contract, **three letters** written by external reviewers will offer important evidence of a candidate’s scholarly achievement. That is, they provide an expert assessment as to the quality of a candidate’s scholarship record, including but not limited to, originality, impact on the field, command of and contribution to the relevant literature, quality of the research on which publications are based, and comparative assessment to other scholars in the field.

In addition to the external reviewers’ letters, the candidate may offer additional evidence as to scholarly impact on knowledge, including but not limited to documentation of the importance of the presentation venues in the candidate’s field (e.g. journal readership, rigor of review process, reputation, etc.); citations to the candidate’s scholarship; invitations to present research in significant or highly selective venues; and evidence of productive collaboration with established scholars in the candidate’s field.

The evaluation ratings for promotion to Full Professor for Scholarship and Professional Activities are defined as follows:

Excellent means having established an active and coherent research agenda and completed a significant body of scholarly work. Any one of the following combinations of work merit this rating: publication of a book-length peer-reviewed monograph; publication or acceptance for publication of 5 journal articles in refereed journals or peer-reviewed edited volumes; publication of 4 journal articles in refereed journals or peer reviewed edited volumes along with a body of significant other scholarly activity (e.g. book contract, conference presentations, editing a book or journal volume, contributing article to an edited volume, acquisition of research grants, reviews of scholarly work, "applied" publications).

Very Good means having achieved any one of the following combinations: publication or acceptance for publication of 4 articles in refereed journals or peer-reviewed edited volumes; publication or acceptance for publication of 3 journal articles in refereed journals or edited volumes along with significant other scholarly activity (e.g. book contract, conference presentations, editing a book or journal volume, contributing article to an edited volume, acquisition of research grants, reviews of scholarly work, "applied" publications).

Satisfactory means publication or acceptance for publication of 3 articles in refereed peer-reviewed journals or peer-reviewed edited volumes, without a significant body of other scholarly activity.

Unsatisfactory means having achieved fewer than 2 publications or acceptances for publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals or peer-reviewed edited volumes.

Certain scholarly activities—specifically, editing a book or journal volume or acquiring a research grant—can be considered as equivalent to one refereed publication. Otherwise, non-publication activities will considered as part of a body of significant scholarly activity, with no one of them alone being the equivalent of a publication but collectively signifying an active and influential scholarly life. Where the candidate's scholarship has had truly exceptional impact and is of outstanding quality, the evaluation committee may consider providing a rating higher than the one merited by the number of publications prescribed for each rating.

II. Standards for Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

The standards for evaluating teaching effectiveness and advising for promotion to Full Professor are the same for the tenure evaluation and promotion to Associate Professor.

Effective teaching and advising is vital for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The Department recognizes that there are many different ways to teach and advise effectively, and we strive to reward excellence in all its forms. The Department considers together all of the sources of evidence listed below to construct a full and detailed portrait of a candidate's effectiveness as a teacher and advisor.

- **Teaching History** includes basic information on which courses the candidate has taught during the probationary period (including the sponsoring of independent studies and mentoring of honor's theses), new preparations, and the introduction of new courses into the CJS curriculum.

- Review of **course syllabi, assignments,** and **assessment rubrics** yields information on the relevance of the topics covered in forwarding the interdisciplinary mission of the Crime and Justice Studies curriculum. These include but are not limited to the following: Well organized and clearly presented course themes. Appropriate use of required readings and course materials. Well-defined student performance assessments.

- **Self-Evaluation and Teaching Statement.** The candidate's reflection on teaching philosophy, practices, and the integration of various relevant evaluation data and pedagogical research findings constitute the most significant documentation of teaching effectiveness.

- **Peer Classroom Observations.** The department strives to provide the candidate with annual peer review of classroom teaching. Observations are an opportunity to provide constructive feedback, enhance professional growth, and discuss evolving pedagogy.

- **Teaching Development Efforts**. It is expected that a candidate will seek to further develop their teaching skills. Evidence of professional development sought can include participation in Office of Faculty Development-sponsored programs, consultations with CITS or other campus entities to incorporate technology or otherwise enhance curricular offerings, and, importantly, through the candidate's own self-reflection as documented in the narrative section of the tenure application materials. Attendance at conferences and professional workshops focused on pedagogy are also evidence of teaching development efforts.

- **Student Evaluations**. The departmental evaluation form provides for extensive student feedback on the effectiveness of the course and the instructor. The results include quantitative scores, as well as qualitative commentary. The Department uses student evaluations to compare students' perceptions of the candidate's teaching performance with that of other tenure-track faculty in the Department teaching similar courses with similar enrollments.

- **Advising.** Department majors is an important aspect of teaching effectiveness. Evidence of availability during registration periods, time spent advising students, numbers of students advised, formally and informally, as well as work in the Academic Advising Centers, mentoring student groups, writing reference letters for students, working with students on understanding and preparing for graduate school applications, and overseeing Honors projects, independent or directed

studies, and these are all considered pertinent for the evaluation of advising performance.

Assessment of a candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness requires that the totality of accomplishment outweigh any one area in the teaching record. Additionally, improvement in peer observations and student evaluations is valuable, and therefore, evidence from the latter part of the probationary period will weigh more heavily in the overall assessment.

Excellent means having an excellent record of producing a coherent and well implemented teaching agenda. A strong representation of excellent and/or very good of the following merits this rating - supportive peer evaluation letters, student assessments (above the departmental mean in each individual course taught on-load), demonstrated self-reflection, teaching statements, evidence of implementation of critical pedagogy, evidence of teaching development, evaluations of course syllabi and effectiveness of course assignments and/or record of advising.

Very Good means having a very good record of a coherent teaching agenda. A good representation of the following accomplishments merits this rating - very good peer evaluation letters, very good student assessments (at or above the departmental mean in almost all courses), demonstrated self-reflection, very good teaching statements, evidence of very good implementation of critical pedagogy, evidence of very good teaching development, very good evaluations of course syllabi and effectiveness of course assignments and/or very good record of advising.

Satisfactory means having a satisfactory record of a coherent teaching agenda. A representation of the following accomplishments merits this rating - satisfactory peer evaluation letters, satisfactory student assessments (below the department mean in almost all courses), a satisfactory demonstration of self-reflection, satisfactory teaching statements, evidence of satisfactory implementation of pedagogy, evidence of satisfactory teaching development, satisfactory evaluations of course syllabi and effectiveness of course assignments and/or satisfactory record of advising.

Unsatisfactory means having a lack of a coherent teaching agenda. A representation of the following merits this rating - unsatisfactory peer evaluation letters, unsatisfactory student assessments (across the board negative responses from the vast majority), an unsatisfactory demonstration of self-reflection, unsatisfactory teaching statements, lack of implementation of critical pedagogy, lack of demonstrated teaching development, unsatisfactory evaluations of course syllabi and course assignments and/or unsatisfactory record of advising.

III. Standards for University Service

University Service responsibilities increase after tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, most notably in faculty evaluation and review processes. A rating of **Excellent** requires a demonstrated record of significant and substantial leadership at the Departmental, College, or University level. A rating of **Very Good** requires sustained significant service to the Department, College, or University. A rating of **Satisfactory** requires a modest level of involvement in service functions, at least at the Departmental level. A rating of **Unsatisfactory** connotes inconsistent and insignificant service.

IV. Standards for Public Service

Public service involves the use of professional knowledge and expertise to benefit entities external to the University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth, including but not limited to: individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies or units other than the UMD, or other community groups or campaigns by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise or support. To be rated **Excellent** in public service, a candidate must have a record of demonstrated leadership, along with providing consistent and significant service. To be rated **Very Good**, a candidate must demonstrate consistent and significant service to the public. A rating of **Satisfactory** signifies a modest level of involvement in public service, while **Unsatisfactory** is reserved for inconsistent and insignificant public service.

It should be noted that faculty may choose to be evaluated in *either* University Service *or* Public Service. It should also be noted that the successful candidate will be judged primarily on teaching and scholarship.

Approved

Evaluation Standards for Promotion to Full Professor
Department of Decision & Information Sciences
Charlton College of Business

Categories of Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated for promotion to full professor in the categories of (a) scholarship and professional activities, (b) teaching effectiveness and advising, and (c) university service, or public service. The evaluation period will focus on the post-tenure period. The contractual requirement for a positive recommendation for promotion by the Department is an Excellent in either Teaching Effectiveness and Advising or Scholarship and Professional Activities and a Very Good in the other of these two categories and no unsatisfactory ratings.

Scholarship and Professional Activities

The successful candidate for promotion to full Professor will have an active research agenda and will have produced a body of scholarship that contributes to the growth of knowledge in the faculty member's discipline. The best evidence of having accomplished this is publications in peer-reviewed journals, publications of peer-reviewed monographs, books, chapters in books, peer-reviewed conference proceedings, and/or peer-reviewed externally funded research grants. A record of presenting papers at professional meetings and conferences and peer reviewing the work of other scholars reflects having an active and productive research agenda, and will be considered, but is less important than refereed publications. Letters written by external reviewers will constitute important evidence of the candidate's scholarly achievement.

The following criteria will be used to evaluate scholarship performance.

To be rated "Excellent," the candidate will have at least seven articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals during the candidate's post-tenure period at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth. At least two of the seven articles must be in top-tier journals and at least one other must be in a second-tier journal. If a candidate publishes more articles in top-tier journals, and/or provides evidence of significant leadership in scholarship/professional activities, then the expectation for the quantity of papers may be fewer to receive a rating of Excellent. Articles published (or accepted for publication) must also include at least one leading-authored article and at least one co-authored article among the peer-reviewed publications. The candidate must explain explicitly how much contribution she/he has made for the published (or accepted) co-authored journal articles.

To be rated "Very Good," the candidate will have at least five articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals during the candidate's post-tenure period at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth. At least one of the five articles must be in a top-tier journals or at least two must be in a second-tier journal. Articles published (or accepted for publication) must also include at least one leading-authored article and at least one co-authored article among the peer-reviewed publications. The candidate must explain explicitly how much contribution she/he has made for the published (or accepted) co-authored journal articles.

To be rated "Satisfactory," the candidate will have at least three articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals during the candidate's post-tenure period at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth. Articles published (or accepted for publication) must also include at least one leading-authored article and at least one co-authored article among the peer-reviewed publications. The candidate must explain explicitly how much contribution she/he has made for the published (or accepted) co-authored journal articles.

Failure to meet the requirements for "Satisfactory" performance will lead to a rating of "Unsatisfactory".

The DIS DFEC will determine the ranking of journals. Candidates for promotion to full Professor are encouraged to seek the advice of DFEC members regarding the ranking of journals they plan on submitting papers to and/or publishing in. The quality of journals will be determined by the acceptance rate, reputation of the journal, impact factor, the prestige of the editor and editorial board, circulation, and importance of readership. A variety of sources will be used to determine the quality of journals including journal citation reports and journal rankings as determined by peer universities. In addition, a candidate may be able to earn a higher rating than Satisfactory or Very Good under the conditions described above with excellence in peer-reviewed proceedings (evidenced by, for example, one or more paper awards); book chapters or monographs; externally funded grants; and/or holding one or more meaningful officer positions (e.g., a member of the Board of Directors, President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, etc.) in relevant academic or professional societies (e.g., Decision Sciences Institute, INFORMS, APICS, ASQ).

Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

The successful candidate for promotion to full Professor will demonstrate that he or she is an effective teacher and will carry out assigned advising duties. Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated by the Department Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and the Chair on the basis of student evaluations and other evidence such as syllabi, assignments, teaching load, pedagogical review, teaching scholarship such as cases or notes written for pedagogical purposes, the use of information technology for teaching, the candidate's work on student project design(s) and learning outcomes such as exams, student projects and/or simulations, peer reviews in the classroom, and an evaluation of the individual's self-assessment statements. The DIS FEC does not necessarily view student evaluation scores alone as accurate indicators of effective teaching. To put student evaluation scores in context, interpretation of student ratings will be based on comparative quantified data including class size vis-a-vis the candidate's submitted evidence related to work he/she did in grading assignments, exams, projects, and similar learning activities, teaching course load, comparisons among instructors teaching similar levels and types of courses within UMass Dartmouth as well as FEC evaluation of the above listed qualitative criteria. In this context, with evidence of rigor and solid effort with respect to teaching activities, the FEC may view student evaluation scores more or less favorably, depending on the quality of such evidence provided. The following table, related to student evaluations, should be included in the applicant's packet:

Student Evaluations

Each Fall XXXX and Spring XXXX class taught, listed chronologically in order of year and semester taught:

Semester and Year taught	Course Code and Section Number	Number of Students Per Section	Course Name	Average Student Evaluation Score
X XXXX	XX XXX	XX	XXXXXXXXXX	X.XX
X XXXX	XX XXX	XX	XXXXXXXXXX	X.XX
Overall student evaluation average score across XX sections				X.XX

Advising is assigned by the Chairperson of the Department. While advising will not receive as much weight as teaching in this category, if assigned, advising duties must be carried out seriously and effectively. Exceptional advising will get additional weight. Failure to conduct assigned advising effectively will influence the rating in this category.

At each respective level of evaluation, ratings of "Excellent", "Very Good", "Satisfactory", or "Unsatisfactory" by the DFEC and Chair will be made based on the above process.

University Service

A rating of "Excellent" in University Service requires a demonstrated record of significant and substantial achievement and effectiveness at the departmental, college, or university level. To be considered "Excellent", the service should include accomplishments that increase the visibility and/or value of the department, college and university in general. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate not only active participation in this area but also significant leadership. The quality of service will outweigh the number of committees served on.

A rating of "Very Good" requires demonstration of sustained, quality service to the department, college, and university or a significant, focused service activity.

A rating of "Satisfactory" requires a modest level of involvement in service at one or more of the three levels, for example, at least at the departmental level.

Failure to meet the requirements for "Satisfactory" performance will lead to a rating of "Unsatisfactory".

A candidate's rating can be adjusted based on (1) the frequency and intensity of committee work as well as the candidate's contribution as documented by meeting minutes and the committee chair and/or (2) information from the chair that documents special circumstances.

It should be noted that faculty may opt not to be rated in University Service but must be evaluated in at least three of the four categories. It should also be noted that the successful candidate will be judged primarily on Teaching and Scholarship.

Public Service

Public service involves the use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies or units other than the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise, or other assistance to these external entities.

To be rated “Excellent” in public service, in addition to providing consistent and significant service, a record of notable, demonstrated leadership is required.

To be rated “Very Good” in public service, a record of consistent and significant service to one or more external entities must be demonstrated.

To be rated "Satisfactory" in public service, a modest level of involvement in service to one or more external entities must be demonstrated.

Failure to meet the requirements for “Satisfactory” performance will lead to a rating of “Unsatisfactory”.

It should be noted that faculty may opt not to be rated in Public Service but must be evaluated in at least three of the four categories. It should also be noted that the successful candidate will be judged primarily on teaching and scholarship.

Version: Mar 8, 2017

APPROVED

Tenure and Concurrent Promotion Standards - DIS department

(for tenure candidates as of Spring 2016 and beyond)

Categories of Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated annually for contract renewal and for promotion and tenure in the four categories of scholarship and professional activities, teaching effectiveness and advising, university service, and public service. The standards listed below apply to the recommendations for tenure and concurrent promotion, made typically during the candidate's sixth year of service to the university. The evaluation period will concentrate on the five and one-half years prior to submission of the application for tenure. Exceptions to these periods of evaluation apply to candidates hired with up to three years' credit for service at other institutions of higher learning; adjustments in expectations are laid out in a given category if expectations differ from those for a candidate who was hired with no years' credit for prior academic experience. In accordance with the contract, the requirement for a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion by the department Faculty Evaluation Committee is an evaluation of "Excellent" in either Teaching Effectiveness and Advising or Scholarship and Professional Activities, a "Very Good" or better in the other of these two categories, and no "Unsatisfactory" ratings.

Scholarship and Professional Activities

The successful candidate for tenure and, in most cases, concurrent promotion will have an active research agenda and will have produced a body of scholarship that contributes to the growth of knowledge in the faculty member's discipline. The best evidence of having accomplished this is publications in peer-reviewed journals, publications of peer-reviewed monographs, books, chapters in books, peer-reviewed conference proceedings, and/or peer-reviewed externally-funded research grants. A record of presenting papers at professional meetings and conferences and peer reviewing the work of other scholars reflects having an active and productive research agenda and will be considered but is less important than refereed publications. Letters written by external reviewers will constitute important evidence of the candidate's scholarly achievement.

The following criteria will be used to evaluate scholarship performance. For each rating, a candidate must have published (or have accepted for publication) at least one solo-authored article and at least one co-authored article among the peer-reviewed publications listed. The candidate must explain explicitly how much contribution she/he has made for the published (or accepted) co-authored journal articles.

To be rated "Satisfactory" the candidate will have at least **three** articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals while the candidate is employed at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth. An exception applies when the candidate was granted a certain number of years of credit toward tenure upon hiring. In that case, a prorated proportion of the required number of journal articles must have been published while at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth and the remainder must have been published in the three years prior to being hired. At least two of the three articles must be in second-tier journals.

Last reviewed & approved:
Feb 17, 2016

To be rated "Very Good" the candidate will have at least **five** articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals while the candidate is employed at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth. If the candidate was granted a certain number of years of credit toward tenure upon hiring, then a prorated proportion of the required number of journal articles must have been published while at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth and the remainder must have been published during the three years prior to being hired. At least one of the five articles must be in a top-tier journal and at least two others must be in second-tier journals; alternatively, the candidate may earn a Very Good in Scholarship and Professional Activities by publishing six articles, at least four of which must be in second- and/or top-tier journals.

To be rated "Excellent" the candidate will have at least **six** articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals while the candidate is employed at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth. If the candidate was granted a certain number of years of credit toward tenure upon hiring, then a prorated proportion of the required number of journal articles must have been published while at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth; the remainder must have been published during the three years before being hired. At least two of the six articles must be in top-tier journals and at least one other must be in a second-tier journal.

The DIS DFEC will determine the ranking of journals; candidates for tenure are encouraged to seek the advice of DFEC members regarding the ranking of journals they plan on submitting papers to and/or publishing in. The quality of journals will be determined by the reputation of the journal, impact factor, the prestige of the editor and editorial board, acceptance rate, circulation, and importance of readership. A variety of sources will be used to determine the quality of journals including journal citation reports and journal rankings as determined by peer universities. In addition, a candidate may be able to earn a higher rating than satisfactory or very good under the conditions described above with excellence in peer-reviewed proceedings (evidenced by, for example, one or more paper awards); book chapters or monographs; externally funded grants; and holding one or more meaningful officer positions (e.g., a member of the Board of Directors, President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, etc.) in relevant academic or professional societies (e.g., Decision Sciences Institute, INFORMS, APICS, ASQ).

Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

The successful candidate for tenure and, in most cases, concurrent promotion will demonstrate that he or she is an effective teacher and will carry out assigned advising duties. Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated by the Department Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and the Chair on the basis of student evaluations and other evidence such as syllabi, assignments, teaching load, pedagogical review, teaching scholarship such as cases or notes written for pedagogical purposes, the use of information technology for teaching, the candidate's work on student project design(s) and learning outcomes such as exams, student projects and/or simulations, peer reviews in the classroom, and an evaluation of the individual's self assessment statements. The DIS FEC does not necessarily view student evaluation scores alone as accurate indicators of effective teaching. To put student evaluation scores in context, interpretation of student ratings will be based on comparative quantified data including class size vis-a-vis the candidate's submitted evidence related to work he/she did in grading assignments, exams,

projects, and similar learning activities, teaching course load, comparisons among instructors teaching similar levels and types of courses within UMass Dartmouth as well as FEC evaluation of the above listed qualitative criteria. In this context, with evidence of rigor and solid effort with respect to teaching activities, the FEC may view student evaluation scores more or less favorably, depending on the quality of such evidence provided. The DIS Department uses a standard form for student evaluation of teaching (the most recent version is attached).

The following table, related to student evaluations, should be included in the applicant's packet:

Student Evaluations

Each Fall XXXX and Spring XXXX class taught, listed chronologically in order of year and semester taught:

Semester and Year taught	*Course Code and Section Number*	*Number of Students Per Section*	*Course Name*	*Average Student Evaluation Score*
X XXXX	XX XXX	XX	XXXXXXXXXX	*X.XX*
X XXXX	XX XXX	XX	XXXXXXXXXX	*X.XX*
Overall student evaluation average score across XX sections				***X.XX***

An applicant for tenure should also summarize their peer evaluations in a similar table:

Semester and Year taught	*Course Code and Section Number*	*Number of Students Per Section*	*Course Name*	*Average Peer Evaluation*
X XXXX	XX XXX	XX	XXXXXXXXXX	*XXX*
X XXXX	XX XXX	XX	XXXXXXXXXX	*XXX*

Untenured faculty will be expected to prepare an annual written self-assessment of teaching in which goals and expectations are specified and outcomes assessed against these goals. The candidate's annual self-assessment statements are intended to identify strengths and weaknesses and to help the candidate improve teaching effectiveness. While required as part of a candidate's teaching portfolio, these self-assessment statements are one item among many that will be evaluated by the DIS DFEC and the Chair when considering a candidate for tenure and concurrent promotion.

The successful candidate for tenure shall demonstrate the willingness to perform academic advising and present records (written evidence) of effective advising activities.

At each respective level of evaluation, ratings of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Satisfactory," or Unsatisfactory" by the DFEC and Chair will be made based on the above process. Evaluation for tenure and concurrent promotion typically attaches greater weight to performance during the latter part of the probationary period.

|University Service

The successful candidate for tenure and, in most cases, concurrent promotion may opt out of being rated in university service, but must be evaluated in at least university or public service. It should also be noted that more emphasis will be placed on teaching/advising and scholarship/ professional activities in evaluating the successful candidate.

A rating of "Excellent" in University Service requires a demonstrated record of significant and substantial achievement and effectiveness at the departmental, college, or university level.

To be considered “Excellent”, the service should include efforts to increase the visibility and/or value of the department, college and university in general. In addition, the candidate should demonstrate active participation in this area. The quality of service will outweigh the number of committees served on.

A rating of "Very Good" requires demonstration of sustained, quality service to the department, college, and university or a significant, focused service activity.

A rating of "Satisfactory" requires a modest level of involvement in service at one or more of the three levels, for example, at least at the departmental level.

A candidate’s rating can be adjusted based on (1) the frequency and intensity of committee work as well as the candidate's contribution as documented by meeting minutes and the committee chair and/or (2) information from the chair that documents special circumstances.

Public Service

Public service involves the use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies or units other than the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth by providing uncompensated instruction, applied research, technical expertise, or other assistance to these external entities.

To be rated “Satisfactory” in public service, a candidate for tenure and, in most cases, concurrent promotion, must demonstrate at least a modest level of uncompensated service to at least one external entity. To be rated "Very Good" in public service, a candidate must demonstrate a record of consistent, quality service to one or more external entities. To be rated "Excellent" in public service, in addition to providing consistent quality service, a candidate must demonstrate a record of demonstrated leadership and/or significant service to multiple external entities.

It should be noted that a candidate may opt out of being rated in public service but must be evaluated in at least university or public service. It should also be noted that more emphasis will be placed on teaching/advising and scholarship/professional activities in evaluating the successful candidate.

University of Massachusetts Dartmouth **APPROVED**
College of Engineering
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

ECE Tenure / Promotion to Associate Professor Standards

(Revised 2018, Effective 9/1/18)

This document describes the performance standards that will be used in evaluations for awarding tenure/promotion to associate professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth (UMass Dartmouth). The next review of the document will occur by December 31, 2020. Any candidate hired with years of credit toward tenure will be evaluated based on the following standards, pro-rated by the proportion of years spent at UMass Dartmouth and based on work conducted at UMass Dartmouth.

1. Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

The most important components of the evidence of candidate's performance in the area of teaching effectiveness and advising are related to evaluations of classroom instruction by students, alumni, and peers (including comparative analyses with respect to other faculty teaching similar courses), course materials (including course syllabi, exams, samples of student homework and class-work, projects, reports, samples of ABET course and program outcomes measure spreadsheets, lecture notes, web-based learning modules, etc.), course improvements and revisions, development of new courses, implementation of new pedagogies, and curriculum development, as well as graduate and undergraduate student advising. The evaluation may also be based on publication of textbooks, teaching awards, journal papers and conference publications in engineering education, external support for curricular reforms and developments, and impact of candidate's teaching and advising on the performance of B.S., M.S., and Ph.D. graduates in their post-UMassD careers.

As a part of the specific quantitative requirements for awarding tenure, the candidate's performance in teaching and advising is given one of the following composite ratings: "excellent", "very good", "satisfactory", and "unsatisfactory". Each of these ratings is obtained, in turn, as a combination of the performance levels rated in a point system from 1 through 4, with 4 being the highest, in each of the sub-categories - teaching content, instruction delivery, and advising, respectively.

The quantitative rating (points) of the candidate's level of performance relative to the **teaching content** including course materials, course and curriculum developments, and other elements of the classroom teaching portfolio that are not directly associated with the candidate's contact with students and can be evaluated by the FEC independently of the student evaluations of the actual delivery of classes by the candidate, is obtained as follows:

4 For **teaching content** record which includes excellent course materials and evidence of a very high level of instructional innovations and improvements within the courses taught and the curriculum, at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

3 For **teaching content record** which includes excellent course materials and evidence of instructional innovations and improvements within the courses taught and the curriculum at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

2 For **teaching content record** which includes complete and organized course materials within the courses taught and the curriculum at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

1 For **teaching content record** which fails to satisfy the minimum requirements for 2 points.

The quantitative rating (points) of the candidate's level of performance relative to the actual delivery of classes is based on the average ratings on a scale 1 through 5 for the instructor over all evaluated courses on official ECE evaluation forms by students and faculty peers (based on class visitations), respectively. In addition, the results of student evaluations of the candidate are compared with those of other faculty members in the department teaching similar courses, using data collected over the last several years. For this purpose, the courses are categorized in terms of the level, size (enrollment), type (required vs. elective), and content. In particular, the **instruction delivery** is evaluated as follows:

4 For **instruction delivery record** which includes average ratings of not less than 4.0 by both students and faculty peers. In addition, the presented evidence must indicate a superior record of candidate's student evaluations for individual courses based on a comparative analysis with evaluations of other faculty teaching courses within the same category.

3 For **instruction delivery record** which includes average ratings of not less than 3.5 by both students and faculty peers. In addition, the presented evidence must indicate a strong record of candidate's student evaluations for individual courses based on a comparative analysis with evaluations of other faculty teaching courses within the same category.

2 For **instruction delivery record** which includes average ratings of not less than 3.0 by both students and faculty peers. In addition, the presented evidence must indicate a competent record of candidate's student evaluations for individual courses based on a comparative analysis with evaluations of other faculty teaching courses within the same category.

1 For **instruction delivery record** which fails to satisfy the minimum requirements for 2 points.

The numerical ratings of instruction effectiveness specified above (4.0, 3.5, and 3.0) should not be considered as rigid general standards for the ECE Department. The rating shall take the number and nature of courses taught by the candidate and the comparisons with numerical evaluations of other faculty teaching similar courses into consideration to justify any deviation from these levels (to either strengthen or relax the requirements). Teaching loads in terms of student credit hours shall also be taken into consideration in this process.

The quantitative rating (points) of the candidate's level of performance relative to **graduate advising** is based on the number of graduate student advisees who have been certified for graduation, with one Ph.D. graduate being equivalent to three M.S. graduates, and is obtained as follows:

4 For **graduate advising record** which includes 4 M.S.-equivalent graduates.

3 For **graduate advising record** which includes 3 M.S.-equivalent graduates.

2 For **graduate advising record** which includes 2 M.S.-equivalent graduates.

1 For **graduate advising record** which fails to satisfy the minimum requirements for 2 points.

A strong record of **undergraduate advising** may substitute for one required M.S.-equivalent graduate. A record of unsatisfactory undergraduate advising may result in degrading the candidate's rating in graduate advising by the FEC.

The candidate's composite rating in **Teaching Effectiveness and Advising** is obtained using the aggregate point score from the three sub-categories and is as follows:

(i) For an **"excellent" rating in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising**, the candidate must have the following:

An aggregate score of 11 or better

(ii) For a **"very good" rating in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising**, the candidate must have the following:

An aggregate score of 9 or 10

(iii) For a **"satisfactory" rating in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising**, the candidate must have the following:

An aggregate score of 7 or 8

(iv) An **"unsatisfactory" rating for Teaching Effectiveness and Advising** is obtained if the minimum requirements for a "satisfactory" rating are not met.

2. Scholarship and Professional Activities

The most important components of the candidate's performance in the area of scholarship and professional activities relative to the evaluation for awarding tenure/promotion to associate professor in the ECE Department are the publication record and external funding record. The record of activities within the professional and scholarly communities is also evaluated. External letters of reference and evaluation from recognized experts in the field are considered an essential part of the evidence of candidate's scholarly accomplishments.

As a part of the specific quantitative requirements for awarding tenure, the candidate's performance in Scholarship and Professional Activities is given one of the following composite ratings: "excellent", "very good", "satisfactory", and "unsatisfactory". Each of these ratings is obtained, in turn, as a combination of the performance levels rated in a point system from 1 through 4, with 4 being the highest, in each of the sub-categories – publication record and external funding.

The candidate is required to publish a combination of peer-reviewed archival journals and conference papers. A Journal Paper Equivalent (JPE) is defined as a peer-reviewed paper published in a journal. Two peer- reviewed conference papers are equivalent to one JPE. Only papers accepted after the candidate joined UMassD will be considered for tenure. The candidate's performance rating in **publication** is obtained as follows:

4 For **publication record** which includes at least 10 JPE (published or accepted), 5 of which in top journals in the field based on ISI's impact factor.
3 For **publication record** which includes at least 7 JPE (published or accepted), 4 of which in top journals in the field based on ISI's impact factor.
2 For **publication record** which includes at least 4 JPE (published or accepted), 3 of which in top journals in the field based on ISI's impact factor.
1 For **publication record** which fails to satisfy the minimum requirements for 2 points

All of the candidate's journal papers used for tenure consideration must be of high quality, appearing in internationally-recognized archival journals in the appropriate field with a rigorous peer review process and selective acceptance criteria.

A majority of the conference publications used for tenure consideration must be at IEEE societies, ACM, SPIE or ASA premier international conferences or meetings with similar reputation.

A majority of the journal papers and a majority of the conference publications should have the candidate as the first author or a co-author with graduate advisees.

The value of one issued or granted U.S. patent, based on work conducted after arriving at UMassD, is equivalent to that of one JPE, but not more than two JPE's may be substituted by patents.

An appropriate scholarly monograph may substitute for one or more journal papers, with the limitation that not more than a half of the required journal publications may be substituted by books and patents combined. Appropriate monographs and textbooks are books of the highest scholarly value in the candidate's research area that have undergone a formal and rigorous peer review process and appear through a major, internationally-recognized publishing house.

Best-paper awards, strong citation records, seminal papers in the field, invited papers, proposal review panels, exceptional acceptance rates at conferences, plenary talk at a conference, etc. may be parts of such evidence.

In exceptional cases, other published scholarly works may be considered as equivalents when the equivalent scholarly value is clearly evidenced.

The candidate's performance rating in **external funding** is obtained as follows:

4 For **funding record** which includes total awarded external funding of at least $300,000 (no more than 25% of which may include UMass Foundation sources) including 8 or more semesters of graduate student support. The candidate must be PI on at least a half of the funding.

3 For **funding record** which includes total awarded external funding of at least $225,000 (no more than 25% of which may include UMass Foundation sources) including 6 or more semesters of graduate student support.

2 For **funding record** which includes total awarded funding of at least $150,000 (no more than 25% of which may include UMass Foundation sources) including 4 or more semesters of graduate student support.

1 For **funding record** which fails to satisfy the minimum requirements for 2 points.

The funding record considered for the evaluation consists of awards by government, industrial, and other external sources for grants and contracts (excluding in-kind equipment and software donations) with the candidate in the role of a principal investigator (PI) or co-principal investigator (co-PI). Awards with the candidate in a role other than PI or co-PI may be considered as equivalents only in exceptional cases, with a proper additional justification and evidence provided by the candidate.

In cases of multiple-investigator awards, the candidate must state the share in the funds for which he/she has spending authority and provide associated evidence. It is understood that the distribution of funds between the investigators based on the spending authority reflects the actual distribution of research tasks and other responsibilities within the grant or contract.

The semesters of graduate student support are counted only for students acquiring full-time research assistantships (20 hours/week during the academic year and 40 hours/week during the summer) on external grants or contracts. The candidate must serve as advisor or co-advisor for these students.

In cases of multiple-investigator awards, the support for the graduate student semesters that are counted must fall within the candidate's share in the total award funds.

The candidate's composite rating in **Scholarship and Professional Activities** is obtained using the aggregate point score from the two sub-categories as:

(i) An **"excellent" rating for Scholarship and Professional Activities** is obtained with any of the following combinations:

An aggregate score of 7 or better

(ii) A **"very good" rating for Scholarship and Professional Activities** is obtained with any of the following combinations:

An aggregate score of 6

(iii) A **"satisfactory" rating for Scholarship and Professional Activities** is obtained with any ofthe following combinations:

An aggregate score of 5

(iv) An **"unsatisfactory" rating for Scholarship and Professional Activities** is obtained if the minimum requirements for a "satisfactory" rating are not met.

3. University Service

If the candidate elects to be evaluated in University Service, the evaluation is based on the evidence in the following categories:

(a) Active service including demonstrated leadership on committees at the department, college, and university levels, along with documentation on the frequency of meetings;

(b) Meaningful contributions to open houses, orientation, and other major events;

(c) Effective outreach programs that enhance the reputation and visibility of the university;

(d) Sustained support of professional and non-professional student organizations (IEEE, ACM, HKN, etc.);

(e) Service as director of a university-defined center, program (e.g., ECE Graduate Program Director) or multi-section course coordinator (e.g., EGR 111 Coordinator) or similar positions.

The candidate's rating in University Service is obtained as follows:

a. A determination of **"excellent"** is made provided the candidate makes contributions in category (a) with significant leadership role plus meaningful contributions in one other category or substantial contributions to any three categories.

b. A determination of **"very good"** is made provided the candidate makes contributions in category (a) with a leadership role plus meaningful contribution in any other category.

c. A determination of **"satisfactory"** is made provided the candidate makes meaningful contributions in any two of the above categories.

d. A determination of **"unsatisfactory"** is made if the minimum requirements for a "satisfactory" rating are not met.

4. Public Service

If the candidate elects to be evaluated in Public Service, the evaluation is based on the evidence in the following areas:

(a) Active non-remunerative public service related to the candidate's area of professional expertise, including documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.;

(b) Other active non-remunerative public service including demonstrated leadership, along with documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.

The candidate's rating in public service is obtained as follows:

(i) A determination of **"excellent"** is made provided the candidate plays a very significant role in one of the two above areas with a very high level of activity.

(ii) A determination of **"very good"** is made provided the candidate plays a significant role in one of the two areas with a high level of activity.

(iii) A determination of **"satisfactory"** is made provided the candidate performs some activity in one of the two areas.

(iv) A determination of **"unsatisfactory"** is made if the minimum requirements for a "satisfactory" rating are not met.

APPROVED

University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
Department of Economics
Faculty Evaluation Standards for
Promotion to Full Professor
For Faculty Hired on or after
September 1, 2018

Categories of Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated for all personnel actions in the four categories of teaching and advising, scholarship and professional activities, university service, and public service. The standards listed below apply to the recommendations for promotion to Professor, made typically after 6 or more years of service in the rank of Associate Professor.

Promotion to Professor is a significant milestone in an academic career. The Professor designation is intended to express to the academic community that an individual has achieved the highest rank and implies a distinguished and sustained record in teaching, scholarship, and service. The contractual requirement for a positive recommendation for promotion is an evaluation of "Excellent" in either teaching effectiveness and Advising or scholarship and professional activities, and a "Very Good" in the other of these two categories and no "Unsatisfactory" ratings.

Standards for Teaching and Advising

The successful candidate for promotion to Professor will demonstrate that he or she is an effective adviser. Advising effectiveness in economics implies 1.) providing students with accurate information about university and departmental policies and requirements, and about student's role in the advising process, 2.) maintaining accurate and effective documentation of advising, and 3.) referring students to additional resources as needed.

Effective advising also includes providing mentorship and academic guidance specific to individual student needs, which might include letters of reference, materials reviewed, re-direction in major, assessment of student's abilities or academic record, etc., as appropriate. This type of advising includes advising of students enrolled in the faculty member's own classes. Economics advisers will strive to establish respectful mentoring relationship with student advisees and will see the number of advisees assigned by the department chairperson, which is determined by the student-faculty ratio in the department.

Economics Department advisers will reply to email messages from advisees within two business days from September through May (the academic year) and are strongly encouraged to reply within one week from June through August (over the summer break.)

The successful candidate for promotion to Professor will demonstrate that he or she is an effective teacher, has sustained a record of distinguished teaching for an appropriate period, and promises to continue with significant achievements in teaching. Teaching effectiveness in economics implies ensuring that students learn economics; it also implies communicating an enthusiasm for economics to students. Effective teaching requires (1) maintaining currency in

the field in terms of content: theory, data, applications, current events, and policy questions; (2) maintaining currency in terms of teaching methodology: innovative approaches to teaching and learning, effective use of technology, and developing teaching methodologies to accommodate the wide diversity of backgrounds, abilities, and motivations that exist among UMassD students; and (3) developing courses, assignments, and requirements that contribute to developing students' skills in critical thinking, written communication, oral communication, information literacy, and quantitative analysis including use of appropriate computing and information technology tools.

The evaluation is based on evidence of teaching effectiveness and advising since the previous promotion, normally a period of 6 or more years. Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated on the basis of teaching and advising done at UMass Dartmouth. Evaluation will be based on the following types of evidence: (1) Results of student ratings, which should include a copy of the ratings form and an interpretation of the responses that students provide. The candidate should show the progression of their student evaluations during the period leading up to promotion. Evidence of student demand for the candidate's courses is also considered. (2) Evidence on the effectiveness of the candidate's advising. (3) Evidence and interpretation of the evidence that the candidate employs teaching methods that pedagogical research shows can be effective in enhancing student learning. (4) Evidence demonstrating superior academic and/or professional success of the candidate's students after completion of their course work and/or thesis/dissertation work with the candidate. (5) An analysis of course syllabi showing that they incorporate best-practice standards and approaches for each course.

The evidence in the last paragraph should be used to demonstrate effective teaching, and should address the following 15 specific areas, when appropriate to the courses instructed:

1) Maintaining currency in the field in terms of content:
    a. theory
    b. data
    c. applications
    d. current events
    e. policy questions
2) Maintaining currency in terms of teaching methodology:
    a. innovative approaches to teaching and learning
    b. effective use of technologies
    c. developing teaching methodologies to accommodate the wide diversity of backgrounds, abilities.
    d. Accommodate motivations that exist among UMD students.
3) Developing courses, assignments, and requirements that contribute to developing students' skills in
    a. critical thinking
    b. written communication
    c. oral communication
    d. information literacy
    e. quantitative analysis including
    f. use of appropriate computing and information technology tools

Evidence of success in these fifteen areas will be gathered from student ratings, peer observation of teaching and teaching portfolio review.

To be rated "Satisfactory" the candidate's performance will indicate success in addressing at least 70% of these areas and require improvement in others, but on balance, the work will meet expectations for teaching and advising.

To be rated "Very Good" the candidate's performance will indicate success in addressing at least 80% of these areas and require improvement in others, but on balance, the work will exceed expectations for teaching and meet or exceed expectations for advising.

To be rated "Excellent" the candidate performance will indicate success in least 90% of these areas and require improvement in others and that expectations are exceeded in all essential areas of teaching responsibility due to effort and expertise and expectations for advising are met or exceeded.

There is an expectation of sustained effective performance in teaching and advising, especially during the period leading up to the promotion recommendation. Evaluation for promotion will weigh more heavily the evaluations during the period since the previous promotion.

Scholarship and Professional Activities

Candidates for promotion to Professor will have demonstrated a sustained and continuing record of contributions to the growth of knowledge in their area of specialization. The candidate's scholarship will be recognized by other scholars and/or practitioners in the field as substantive and significant. Quality of journals in which peer-reviewed papers are published, peer reviewed grant support and particularly support by national agencies, and reviews of the candidate's body of work by faculty external to the university who are experts in the candidate's field of scholarship are examples of elements that should be considered in evaluating a candidate's scholarship. Presentation of papers at professional meetings and conferences, peer review of articles, books, and associated activities leading to publication, preparation of applications for externally-funded research grants are important components of an active research agenda and will be considered. Examples of professional activities may include but are not limited to leadership in professional organizations, the organization of regional or national meetings, service on editorial/review boards or as a manuscript or grant reviewer, service on accrediting bodies and consulting activity.

While the number of publications is less important than their effect on knowledge and the scholarship of colleagues at other institutions, it is expected that the candidate will continue to specify and pursue an active research agenda. Evaluation will take into account the quantity and quality of the individual's scholarship, and may waive the minimum quantitative standards in recognition of the exceptional quality or impact of the individual's scholarship in a particular area. Quality will be measured by the department faculty's knowledge of the discipline, citations of published works, publication/agency acceptance rates and journal impact factors.

At the time of consideration for promotion, the candidate will have the following achievements in the time since promotion to Associate Professor for the specified rating.

To be rated “Satisfactory” the candidate will have at least three articles published in peer-reviewed journals since promotion to Associate Professor; in lieu of one of the three published or accepted articles, one peer-reviewed book chapter or monograph or one peer-reviewed externally funded research grant may be substituted. Forthcoming works with official confirmation of acceptance may be included in this evaluation.

To be rated “Very Good” the candidate will have at least five articles published in peer-reviewed journals since promotion to Associate Professor; in lieu of one of the four published or accepted articles, one peer-reviewed book chapter or monograph or one peer-reviewed externally funded research grant may be substituted. Forthcoming works with official confirmation of acceptance may be included in this evaluation.

To be rated “Excellent” the candidate will have at least six articles published in peer-reviewed journals since promotion to Associate Professor; in lieu of one or two of the six published or accepted articles, one or two peer-reviewed book chapter(s) or monograph(s) or one or two peer-reviewed externally funded research grant(s) may be substituted. Forthcoming works with official confirmation of acceptance may be included in this evaluation.

Standards for University Service

Evaluation of service will be based on a clear statement of the nature and extent of the activities cited. The evaluation will consider the list of committees and other activities, but the principal basis will be an evaluation of the nature of participation and in particular, the outcomes of the service. Service activities without evidence of substantive outcomes do not carry significant weight in the evaluation.

While the evaluation should include a list of the committees or other activities engaged in, it should therefore also include an assessment of the significance and impact of the outcomes of the service. Evidence of either a qualitative or quantitative nature should be provided and interpreted.

A rating of "Excellent" requires a demonstrated record of significant, substantial, and sustained leadership at the Departmental, College, or University level, with evidence provided to substantiate the impact of the service. A rating of "Very Good" requires demonstration of sustained significant service to the Department, College, or University. A rating of "Satisfactory" requires a modest but sustained level of involvement in service functions, at least at the Departmental level.

Standards for Public Service

Public service involves use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies or units other than the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise, or other assistance to these external entities, pro bono or substantially below market rates.

Evaluation of service should be based on a clear statement of the nature and extent of the activities cited. While the evaluation should include a list of the activities engaged in, it should also include an assessment of the significance and impact of the service. Evidence of either a

qualitative or quantitative nature should be provided and interpreted.

A rating of "Excellent" requires a demonstrated record of significant, substantial, and sustained service to one or more external entities as well as substantial leadership in the provision of the service, with evidence provided to substantiate the impact of the outcomes. To be rated "Very Good" in public service, a record of consistent and significant service to one or more external entities must be demonstrated. A rating of "Satisfactory" requires a modest but sustained level of involvement in the service functions of some external entity.

APPROVED

University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
Department of Economics
Faculty Evaluation Standards for
Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
For Faculty Hired on or after
September 1, 2018

Categories of Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated annually, for contract renewal, and for promotion and tenure in the four categories of teaching and advising, scholarship and professional activities, university service, and public service. The standards listed below apply to the recommendations for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, made during the candidate's sixth year of service to the university. The contractual requirement for a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor by the Department is an evaluation of Excellent in either Teaching Effectiveness and Advising or Scholarship and Professional Activities and a Very Good in the other of these two categories and no unsatisfactory ratings.

Standards for Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

The successful candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate professor will demonstrate that he or she is an effective adviser. Advising effectiveness in economics implies 1.) providing students with accurate information about university and departmental policies and requirements, and about student's role in the advising process, 2.) maintaining accurate and effective documentation of advising, and 3.) referring students to additional resources as needed.

Effective advising also includes providing mentorship and academic guidance specific to individual student needs, which might include letters of reference, materials, reviewed, re-direction in major, assessment of student's abilities or academic record, etc., as appropriate. This type of advising includes advising of students enrolled in the faculty member's own classes. Economics advisers will strive to establish respectful mentoring relationship with student advisees and will see the number of advisees assigned by the department chairperson, which is determined by the student-faculty ratio in the department.

Economics Department advisers will reply to email messages from advisees within two business days from September through May (the academic year) and are strongly encouraged to reply within one week from June through August (over the summer break.)

The successful candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will demonstrate that he or she is an effective teacher, has demonstrated a record of distinguished teaching for an appropriate period, and promises to continue with significant achievements in teaching. Teaching effectiveness in economics implies ensuring that students learn economics; it also implies communicating an enthusiasm for economics to students. Effective teaching requires (1) maintaining currency in the field in terms of content: theory, data, applications, current events, and policy questions ; (2) maintaining currency in terms of teaching methodology: innovative approaches to teaching and learning, effective use of technology, and developing teaching methodologies to accommodate the wide diversity of backgrounds, abilities, and motivations that exist among UMassD students; and (3) developing courses, assignments, and requirements that contribute to developing students' skills in critical thinking, written communication, oral communication, information literacy, and quantitative analysis including use of appropriate computing and information technology tools.

Faculty will be expected to prepare an annual written self-evaluation of teaching in which goals and expectations should be specified and outcomes assessed against these goals. These annual self-evaluations are intended to identify strengths and weaknesses and to help the instructor to improve teaching effectiveness.

Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated on the basis of teaching and advising done at UMass Dartmouth. Evaluation will be based on the following types of evidence: (1) Results of student ratings which should include a copy of the ratings form and an interpretation of the responses that students provide. The candidate should show the progression of their student evaluations during the period leading up to the tenure evaluation. Evidence of student demand for the candidate's courses is also considered. (2) Evidence on the effectiveness of the candidate's advising. (3) Evidence and interpretation of the evidence that the candidate employs teaching methods that pedagogical research shows can be effective in enhancing student learning. (4) Evidence demonstrating superior academic and/or professional success of the candidate's students after completion of their course work and/or thesis/dissertation work with the candidate. (5) An analysis of course syllabi showing that they incorporate best-practice standards and approaches for each course.

The evidence in the last paragraph should be used to demonstrate effective teaching, and should address the following 15 specific areas, when appropriate to the courses instructed:

1) Maintaining currency in the field in terms of content:
    a. theory
    b. data
    c. applications
    d. current events
    e. policy questions
2) Maintaining currency in terms of teaching methodology:
    a. innovative approaches to teaching and learning
    b. effective use of technologies
    c. developing teaching methodologies to accommodate the wide diversity of backgrounds, abilities.
    d. accommodate motivations that exist among UMD students.
3) Developing courses, assignments, and requirements that contribute to developing students' skills in
    a. critical thinking
    b. written communication
    c. oral communication
    d. information literacy
    e. quantitative analysis including
    f. use of appropriate computing and information technology tools

Evidence of success in these fifteen areas will be gathered from student ratings, peer observation of teaching and teaching portfolio review.

To be rated “Satisfactory” the candidate’s performance will indicate success in addressing at least 70% of these areas and require improvement in others, but on balance, the work will meet expectations for teaching and advising.

To be rated “Very Good” the candidate’s performance will indicate success in addressing at least 80% of these areas and require improvement in others, but on balance, the work will exceed expectations for teaching and meet or exceed expectations for advising.

To be rated “Excellent” the candidate performance will indicate success in least 90% of these areas and require improvement in others and that expectations are exceeded in all essential areas of teaching responsibility due to effort and expertise and expectations for advising are met or exceeded.

There is an expectation of effective performance in teaching and advising during the period leading up to the tenure recommendation. Evaluation for tenure and promotion will weigh more heavily the evaluations during the latter part of the probationary period.

Standards for Scholarship and Professional Activities

The successful candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will have an active research agenda and will have produced a body of scholarship that is recognized for contributing to the growth of knowledge in the area of specialization. The best evidence of having accomplished this is publications in peer-reviewed journals, publications of peer-reviewed monographs or chapters in books, or peer-reviewed externally-funded research grants. Presentation of papers at professional meetings and conferences, peer review of articles, books, and associated activities leading to publication, preparation of applications for externally-funded research grants are important components of an active research agenda and will be considered. A record of presenting papers at professional meetings and conferences and peer reviewing the work of other scholars reflects having an active and productive research agenda but is less important than refereed publications. A record of submitting proposals and receiving grant support from external sources is also significant and is more important than presentation of papers. Letters written by external reviewers will constitute important evidence of the candidate's scholarly achievement.

The typically long process of achieving publication in a refereed journal in economics is widely acknowledged and may impact the timing of achievement in scholarship. That is, there may be a significant lag between the submission of a paper and its final acceptance for publication. Since the tenure and promotion decision is based primarily on the work done during the first five and one-half years, there may be a divergence between the number of papers submitted and the number accepted. In addition, while the number of publications is less important than their impact on knowledge and the scholarship of colleagues at other institutions, it is expected that the candidate will continue to specify and pursue an active research agenda, and at the time of consideration for tenure and promotion (sixth year of service) will have the following achievements for the specified rating.

The candidate will be expected to have developed an active research agenda. Evaluation of the research record will take into account the quantity and quality of the individual’s scholarship, and may waive the minimum quantitative standards in recognition of the exceptional quality or impact of the individual’s scholarship in a particular area. Quality will be measured by the department faculty’s knowledge of the discipline, citations of published works,

publication/agency acceptance rates and journal impact factors.

To be rated "Satisfactory" the candidate will have at least two articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals and will show evidence of ongoing scholarship likely to result in future publications; in lieu of one of the two published or accepted articles, one peer-reviewed book chapter or monograph or one peer-reviewed externally funded research grant may be substituted.

To be rated "Very Good" the candidate will have at least four articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals and will show evidence of ongoing scholarship likely to result in future publications; in lieu of one of the four published or accepted articles, one peer-reviewed book chapter or monograph or one peer-reviewed externally funded research grant may be substituted.

To be rated "Excellent" the candidate will have at least five articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals and will show evidence of ongoing scholarship likely to result in future publications; in lieu of one or two of the five published or accepted articles, one or two peer-reviewed book chapter(s) or monograph(s) or one or two peer-reviewed externally funded research grant(s) may be substituted.

Standards for University Service

During the first two-year contract, new faculty are expected to limit university service to activities within the Department. During subsequent contracts, there may be more service to the College and the University. A rating of "Excellent" requires a demonstrated record of significant and substantial leadership at the Departmental, College, or University level. A rating of "Very Good" requires demonstration of sustained significant service to the Department, College, or University. A rating of "Satisfactory" requires a modest level of involvement in the service functions, at least at the Departmental level.

It should be noted that faculty may opt to be not rated in university service but must be evaluated in at least three of the four categories. It should also be noted that the successful candidate will be judged primarily on teaching and scholarship.

Standards for Public Service

Public service involves use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies or units other than the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise, or other assistance to these external entities.

To be rated "Very Good" in public service, a record of consistent and significant service to one or more external entities must be demonstrated. To be rated "Excellent" in public service, in addition to providing consistent and significant service, a record of demonstrated leadership is required.

It should be noted that faculty may opt to be not rated in public service but must be evaluated in at least three of the four categories. It should also be noted that the successful candidate will be judged primarily on teaching and scholarship.

APPROVED

(September 2016)

University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
English Department Faculty Evaluation
Standards for Promotion to Full Professor

The English Department at UMass Dartmouth has evolved into a composite of disciplines and sub-specialties, and standards for tenure and promotion must therefore reflect this diversity and respect differences in background, education, pedagogy, creativity, and scholarly productivity among its members.

Criteria for Evaluation of a candidate for Promotion to Full Professor

Faculty are evaluated annually for contract renewal, and as scheduled for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Full Professor in the categories of Teaching and advising, Scholarship and professional activities, and University Service and/or Public Service.

For annual evaluations, the FEC and Chair will evaluate progress within that single academic year toward the standards outlined here for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion. The department provides separate guidelines for documentation in each category for annual evaluation.

Candidates shall be evaluated in at least three categories, which must include both Teaching and Advising, and Scholarship and Professional Activities.

According to Article VII, Section D1 of the faculty contract, in order to be recommended for tenure or promotion, the candidate must earn ratings of:

a. Excellent in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising, Very Good in Scholarship and Professional Activities, and no unsatisfactory ratings; or
b. Excellent in Scholarship and Professional Activities, Very Good in Teaching and Advising, and no unsatisfactory ratings.

Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

A candidate will be deemed SATISFACTORY in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising if they have met all of their contractual responsibilities in terms of Teaching and Advising.

The successful candidate earning VERY GOOD in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising will demonstrate a sustained record of effective teaching that may include but will not be limited to any of the following: curriculum or course development, innovative teaching practices, development of effective course materials, adherence to sound pedagogical practices recognized by the profession, reflection about teaching and discussion of impact on student learning, meeting reasonable student expectations for learning, and advising in all its forms. For promotion to full, faculty will be expected to provide qualitative and quantitative evidence that can serve as the basis for evaluations in these areas, including but not limited to: peer teacher observations and reviews of materials, syllabi and other teaching materials developed by the instructor, student testimonials, evidence of professional development in teaching, and student evaluations (numerical and written).

In addition, a successful candidate may contribute to advising in ways that may include but will not be limited to any of the following: demonstrated best practices of departmental advising such as notification, scheduling, and record-keeping, advising such as chairing and participation in student projects, theses, honors projects, field trips, experiential learning, service learning, internships, participating in group advising events, independent studies, writing student recommendations and providing references, providing advising for other academic programs, and helping solve challenging student problems. For promotion, faculty will be expected to provide evidence of all advising.

The candidate earning EXCELLENT in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising will have met the standard for VERY GOOD and will have demonstrated across the period of review a philosophy of continuous improvement which the department can identify, with a focus on innovation and development of pedagogy, curriculum, and advising.

Because these kinds of innovation and development often take time to design, employ, and evaluate that may not be evident in single years, for shorter periods of review (annual reviews and contract renewals), the department may rate a candidate as EXCELLENT who demonstrates combined best practices in teaching and advising outlined above, and commensurate with their responsibilities. Variations in teaching assignments, administrative roles, and advising responsibilities may be taken into account by the department in determining overall evaluations in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising.

Scholarship and Professional Activity

Faculty tenured and promoted since 2006 have worked toward promotion to Full Professor under the reasonable expectation and practice of the department using the standard for tenured associate to evaluate the work completed since earning tenure. Therefore, for candidates earning tenure/promotion to Associate in 2016 or earlier, the department shall employ the 2006 standard for tenure and promotion to Associate

professor when they evaluate the scholarship and professional activity (since tenure) for candidates for full professor. For those candidates who were tenured and promoted to Associate professor after Sept. 1, 2016, the following standard for evaluating scholarship since tenure will apply when the department evaluates their case for Full Professor.

The English department recognizes research and scholarly writing, pedagogical writing, grant writing, and creative work in our various disciplines. Candidates for Full Professor must demonstrate a consistent, high-quality, and on-going publication record no matter what their specialty. The work will be evaluated via discipline-appropriate evidence as determined by the department, on bases including but not limited to quality, importance, originality, craft, artistic merit, insight, depth of investigation, level of difficulty or challenge, and the level of prestige of the publications, publishers, and organizations involved in such projects.

For Annual Evaluation, contract renewal, and tenure/promotion/promotion to full, candidates will provide evidence of scholarship and professional activity including but not limited to: published reviews, remarks by editors, comments by publishers, letters of acceptance, contract offers, independent peer evaluations, peer remarks, and peer testimonials. Work that is re-published, revised, re-titled, or in any way derivative from previously published work must be described in detail and the extent of new work explained. Task-oriented work, such as editing publications, peer reviewing, organizing panels, and providing organizational leadership, require documentation. As technologies of publishing continue to evolve, we recognize that electronic publications are increasingly a part of many candidates' portfolios. As long as such publications undergo the same rigorous process of external evaluation/review, the English department is committed to weighing them equally with print publications.

A Pedagogy of English and Composition/Writing Studies has evolved into its own field of research and scholarly inquiry in recent years. We expect some candidates for promotion to full professor to be active in publishing and presenting work in this area. The work must conform to accepted methodologies in the field and demonstrate rigor.

Grants will be evaluated by criteria analogous to those applied to publications: large grants from highly competitive national agencies that impact larger numbers of people (e.g., NEH) will carry more weight than smaller, less competitive grants. However, local or regional grants may be deemed as significant dependent upon factors not limited to impact, amount, and competition (e.g., MCC). Smaller, internal "seed grants" may be evaluated as evidence of progress on a project (e.g. equivalent of presenting research as a prestigious conference prior to publication). The candidate has a special burden here to make the case for the appropriate assessment of the impact of an individual grant.

Peer-Reviewed Scholarly Publication and Presentation

In this area, the successful candidate for promotion to full professor will have (since receiving tenure) a continued a record of professional publication in books and refereed journals, as well as presentations at professional meetings. The greatest weight will be assigned in descending order to the following activities:

1. Publication of a book-length monograph; book-length creative or pedagogical work; edited volume (see below).
2. Peer-reviewed articles and book chapters; significant, external grant funding; equivalent creative work.
3. Reprinted or translated articles.
4. Published conference presentations.
5. Significant reference articles or significant scholarly interviews in academic journals.
6. Substantial book reviews that contribute to an understanding of the conversations taking place in the field.
7. Conference presentations

We also recognize that professional activities contribute to scholarly impact in the field, including but not limited to the following: positions in professional societies and on editorial boards; peer review activities and organizer/respondent/chair activities for conferences and journals.

Creative Work

English faculty are immersed in a great range of creative works, professional productions, and performance arts. To fulfill the equivalent of advancing knowledge in these performance contexts, faculty may contribute creative works directly into the professional venues related to their specialty. Some of these works, such as fiction, poetry, drama, performance art, literary nonfiction, and screen writing, are largely artistic in nature. Some are more accurately described as craft, including nonfiction article writing, essay writing, journalism, technical writing, Web authoring, film production, editing in various media, and document production. All require great skill, imagination, and discipline to carry out at a level of excellence. Whether rooted primarily in art, craft, or a combination of both, the department refers to these as "creative" works.

The candidate in creative work is responsible to explain the nature of these venues and their competitive conditions, selectivity, claims to quality, and relevance to one's specialty.

The greatest weight will be assigned in descending order to work of:
International or National significance,
State or major regional significance,
Local significance.

However, sometimes local and regional publications are more important, challenging, and valuable than national articles, and may have great importance for many thousands of people and for the university's standing as a community participant. In any case, candidates must provide compelling evidence to establish the prestige and importance of their creative work and the venues where it appears, including but not limited to readership of publications, rejection rates, or other evidence as may be appropriate. Peer review by appropriate, independent, qualified peer practitioners, reviewers, scholars, etc. will be important to this evaluation.

Quantitative Expectations for Scholarly and Creative publication:

To be considered for an EXCELLENT rating in the category of Scholarship and Professional activities, the candidate for promotion to Full Professor must have a) met the standard for VERY GOOD described below; AND b) must have any one additional demonstration—quantitative or qualitative—of publication, presentation, impact, accomplishment, standing, or activity, which is viewed by the department as having exceeded the standard for VERY GOOD.

To be considered for a VERY GOOD rating in the category of Scholarship and Professional Activities, the candidate for promotion to full shall have met these criteria in the term since having earned tenure and promotion to associate:

At least four published works including scholarly articles in juried publications or book chapters in volumes published by prestigious presses. Items 1-6 on the list above are examples of these works. The candidate may count any of the following in lieu of one scholarly article: (a) a series of smaller grants which might add up to comparable magnitude of a large external grant; (b) one publication from the Creative Works category for faculty who do not entirely publish academic scholarship. This list is meant to be inclusive, so a record of combined scholarship might meet this standard. Forthcoming works with official confirmation of acceptance may be included in this evaluation.

Or, one published original book or textbook by a university, academic press, or commercial press.

Or a creative work of the scope, prestige, and complexity of a published book. This could include a collection of individually published creative works determined to be equivalent to the scope, prestige, and complexity of a published book.

Or, one edited volume addressing some area(s) above, with significant editorial contributions (foreword, introduction, a solo or co-authored chapter, chapter introductions, annotated bibliography, etc.), and at least one national conference presentation.

To have met the standard of SATISFACTORY, the quantitative requirement for combined works is two.

In situations where the candidate's scholarship has had truly exceptional impact or is deemed to be of outstanding quality, the evaluation committee may consider providing a rating higher than the one merited by the number of publications as outlined in the prior paragraphs.

University Service

Faculty involvement in university governance and programs is essential to the quality of student education. A faculty member must document their active participation in departmental affairs as well as in university activity outside the department to be ranked in this category of evaluation. To be ranked Excellent, a faculty member must either:
Participate in multiple activities that enrich the quality of university life;
Participate in a university activity of notable challenge and importance;
Advise or contribute to a student publication or campus organization that expands community knowledge or enriches campus and community culture;
Participate in a single university or department service of extended duration, challenge, and notable intensity.

For each year of a period of review:

Satisfactory University service must include at least active membership in two committees or programs, with at least one within the English department.

Very Good University service will depend on the demonstration of a significant, identifiable, individual contribution in either department or university service and also active membership in at least one other committee or program. One of these must be within the English department.

Excellent university service will depend on demonstration of two significant, identifiable individual contributions in either department or university service, one of which must be in the English department. Director roles and the Department Chair role are determined to be quantitatively sufficient to qualify for Excellent university service.

Significant, identifiable contribution is meant to include the list of activities in the first paragraph, and examples include but are not limited to: membership on a recruitment committee, membership on FEC annual review committee, membership on the HAC, Gen Ed, UCC or similar committee, chair for a committee which demonstrates productive activity, a coordinator role (e.g. advising/assessment/MAT), the development and implementation of a significant departmental initiative (curricular, assessment, social/cultural), an organizer role for a major university event or series.

IV. Public Service

The university is one of the largest regional employers, a major cultural resource, and a hub for knowledge and educational development in the state. Faculty who contribute to the public's appreciation of the university by reaching into communities are recognized by the Public Service category. The department defines public service as the application of professionally-related expertise or skills that enrich local, regional, or national communities.

In order to be ranked Excellent in this category a faculty member must engage in sustained activities of significant benefit to the community (e.g. writing or publicity projects, advising organizations or publications), or multiple instances of service of limited duration (e.g. speaking engagements, media appearances). The candidate must make a case for how the activity is related to his or her field of expertise, professional development, or contribution to student knowledge as well as how it enhances the community served. The candidate must also provide evidence of his/her contributions: letters of support for the work, newspaper articles about the work/contributions, listing of meetings attended and what the individual contributed, etc. The faculty member may not be paid for his or her work if considered in the area of Public Service.

APPROVED

(September 2016)

University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
English Department Faculty Evaluation
Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The English Department at UMass Dartmouth has evolved into a composite of disciplines and sub-specialties, and standards for tenure and promotion must therefore reflect this diversity and respect differences in background, education, pedagogy, creativity, and scholarly productivity among its members.

Criteria for Evaluation including annual evaluation, Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Faculty are evaluated annually, for contract renewal, and as scheduled for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in the categories of Teaching and advising, Scholarship and Professional activities, and University Service and/or Public Service.

For annual evaluations, the FEC and Chair will evaluate progress within that single academic year toward the standards outlined here for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion. The department provides separate guidelines for documentation in each category for annual evaluation.

Candidates shall be evaluated in at least three categories, which must include both Teaching and Advising, and Scholarship and Professional Activities.

According to Article VII, Section D1 of the faculty contract, in order to be recommended for tenure, the candidate must earn ratings of:

a. Excellent in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising, Very Good in Scholarship and Professional Activities, and no unsatisfactory ratings; or
b. Excellent in Scholarship and Professional Activities, Very Good in Teaching and Advising, and no unsatisfactory ratings.

Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

A candidate will be deemed SATISFACTORY in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising if they have met all of their contractual responsibilities in terms of Teaching and Advising.

The successful candidate earning VERY GOOD in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising will demonstrate a sustained record of effective teaching that may include but will not be limited to any of the following: curriculum or course development, innovative teaching practices, development of effective course materials, adherence to sound pedagogical practices recognized by the profession, reflection about teaching and discussion of impact on student learning, meeting reasonable student expectations for learning, and advising in all its forms. For promotion to full, faculty will be expected to provide qualitative and quantitative evidence that can serve as the basis for evaluations in these areas, including but not limited to: peer teacher observations and reviews of materials, syllabi and other teaching materials developed by the instructor, student testimonials, evidence of professional development in teaching, and student evaluations (numerical and written).

In addition, a successful candidate may contribute to advising in ways that may include but will not be limited to any of the following: demonstrated best practices of departmental advising such as notification, scheduling, and record-keeping, advising such as chairing and participation in student projects, theses, honors projects, field trips, experiential learning, service learning, internships, participating in group advising events, independent studies, writing student recommendations and providing references, providing advising for other academic programs, and helping solve challenging student problems. For promotion, faculty will be expected to provide evidence of all advising.

The candidate earning EXCELLENT in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising will have met the standard for VERY GOOD and will have demonstrated across the period of review a philosophy of continuous improvement which the department can identify, with a focus on innovation and development of pedagogy, curriculum, and advising.

Because these kinds of innovation and development often take time to design, employ, and evaluate that may not be evident in single years, for shorter periods of review (annual reviews and contract renewals), the department may rate a candidate as EXCELLENT who demonstrates combined best practices in teaching and advising outlined above, and commensurate with their responsibilities. Variations in teaching assignments, administrative roles, and advising responsibilities may be taken into account by the department in determining overall evaluations in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising.

Scholarship and Professional Activity

The English department recognizes research and scholarly writing, pedagogical writing, grant writing, and creative work in our various disciplines. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate a consistent, high-quality, and on-going publication record no matter what their specialty. In all cases, the work will be evaluated via discipline-appropriate evidence as determined by the department, on bases

including but not limited to quality, importance, originality, craft, artistic merit, insight, depth of investigation, level of difficulty or challenge, and the level of prestige of the publications, publishers, and organizations involved in such projects.

For Annual Evaluation, contract renewal, and tenure/promotion, candidates will provide evidence of scholarship and professional activity including but not limited to: published reviews, remarks by editors, comments by publishers, letters of acceptance, contract offers, independent peer evaluations, peer remarks, and peer testimonials. Work that is re-published, revised, re-titled, or in any way derivative from previously published work must be described in detail and the extent of new work explained. Task-oriented work, such as editing publications, peer reviewing, organizing panels, and providing organizational leadership, require documentation. As technologies of publishing continue to evolve, we recognize that electronic publications are increasingly a part of many candidates' portfolios. As long as such publications undergo the same rigorous process of external evaluation/review, the English department is committed to weighing them equally with print publications.

A Pedagogy of English and Composition/Writing Studies has evolved into its own field of research and scholarly inquiry in recent years. We expect some candidates for tenure and promotion to be active in publishing and presenting work in this area. The work must conform to accepted methodologies in the field and demonstrate rigor.

Grants will be evaluated by criteria analogous to those applied to publications: large grants from highly competitive national agencies that impact larger numbers of people (e.g., NEH) will carry more weight than smaller, less competitive grants. However, local or regional grants may be deemed as significant dependent upon factors not limited to impact, amount, and competition (e.g., MCC). Smaller, internal "seed grants" may be evaluated as evidence of progress on a project (e.g. equivalent of presenting research as a prestigious conference prior to publication). The candidate has a special burden here to make the case for the appropriate assessment of the impact of an individual grant.

Peer-Reviewed Scholarly Publication and Presentation

In this area the successful candidate for tenure and promotion will develop a record of professional publication in books and refereed journals, as well as presentations at professional meetings. The greatest weight will be assigned in descending order to the following activities:

1. Publication of a book-length monograph; book-length creative or pedagogical work; edited volume (see below).

2. Peer-reviewed articles and book chapters; significant, external grant funding; equivalent creative work.
3. Reprinted or translated articles.
4. Published conference presentations.
5. Significant reference articles or significant scholarly interviews in academic journals.
6. Substantial book reviews that contribute to an understanding of the conversations taking place in the field.
7. Conference presentations

We also recognize that professional activities contribute to scholarly impact in the field, including but not limited to the following: positions in professional societies and on editorial boards; peer review activities and organizer/respondent/chair activities for conferences and journals.

Creative Work

English faculty are immersed in a great range of creative works, professional productions, and performance arts. To fulfill the equivalent of advancing knowledge in these performance contexts, faculty may contribute creative works directly into the professional venues related to their specialty. Some of these works, such as fiction, poetry, drama, performance art, literary nonfiction, and screen writing, are largely artistic in nature. Some are more accurately described as craft, including nonfiction article writing, essay writing, journalism, technical writing, Web authoring, film production, editing in various media, and document production. All require great skill, imagination, and discipline to carry out at a level of excellence. Whether rooted primarily in art, craft, or a combination of both, the department refers to these as "creative" works.

The candidate in creative work is responsible to explain the nature of these venues and their competitive conditions, selectivity, claims to quality, and relevance to one's specialty.

The greatest weight will be assigned in descending order to work of:
International or National significance,
State or major regional significance,
Local significance.

However, sometimes local and regional publications are more important, challenging, and valuable than national articles, and may have great importance for many thousands of people and for the university's standing as a community participant. In any case,

candidates must provide compelling evidence to establish the prestige and importance of their creative work and the venues where it appears, including but not limited to readership of publications, rejection rates, or other evidence as may be appropriate. Peer review by appropriate, independent, qualified peer practitioners, reviewers, scholars, etc. will be important to this evaluation.

Quantitative Expectations for Scholarly and Creative publication:

To be considered for an EXCELLENT rating in the category of Scholarship and Professional Activities, a candidate for tenure/promotion to associate professor will have met the following criteria:

At least four published works including scholarly articles in juried publications or book chapters in volumes published by prestigious presses. Items 1-6 on the list above are examples of these works. The candidate may count any of the following in lieu of one scholarly article: (a) a series of smaller grants which might add up to comparable magnitude of a large external grant; (b) one publication from the Creative Works category for faculty who do not entirely publish academic scholarship. This list is meant to be inclusive, so a record of combined scholarship might meet this standard. Forthcoming works with official confirmation of acceptance may be included in this evaluation.

Or, one published original book or textbook by a university, academic press, or commercial press.

Or a creative work of the scope, prestige, and complexity of a published book. This could include a collection of individually published creative works determined to be equivalent to the scope, prestige, and complexity of a published book.

Or, one edited volume addressing some area(s) above, with significant editorial contributions (foreword, introduction, a solo or co-authored chapter, chapter introductions, annotated bibliography, etc.), and at least one national conference presentation.

To have met the standard of VERY GOOD, the quantitative requirement for combined works is three. To have met the standard of SATISFACTORY, the requirement is two.

In situations where the candidate's scholarship has had truly exceptional impact and is of outstanding quality, the evaluation committee may consider providing a rating higher than the one merited by the number of publications as outlined in the prior paragraphs.

University Service

Faculty involvement in university governance and programs is essential to the quality of student education. A faculty member must document their active participation in departmental affairs as well as in university activity outside the department to be ranked in this category of evaluation. To be ranked Excellent, a faculty member must either:
Participate in multiple activities that enrich the quality of university life;
Participate in a university activity of notable challenge and importance;
Advise or contribute to a student publication or campus organization that expands community knowledge or enriches campus and community culture;
Participate in a single university or department service of extended duration, challenge, and notable intensity.

For each year of a period of review:

Satisfactory University service must include at least active membership in two committees or programs, with at least one within the English department.

Very Good University service will depend on the demonstration of a significant, identifiable, individual contribution in either department or university service and also active membership in at least one other committee or program. One of these must be within the English department.

Excellent university service will depend on demonstration of two significant, identifiable individual contributions in either department or university service, one of which must be in the English department. Director roles and the Department Chair role are determined to be quantitatively sufficient to qualify for Excellent university service.

Significant, identifiable contribution is meant to include the list of activities in the first paragraph, and examples include but are not limited to: membership on a recruitment committee, membership on FEC annual review committee, membership on the HAC, Gen Ed, UCC or similar committee, chair for a committee which demonstrates productive activity, a coordinator role (e.g. advising/assessment/MAT), the development and implementation of a significant departmental initiative (curricular, assessment, social/cultural), an organizer role for a major university event or series.

IV. Public Service

The university is one of the largest regional employers, a major cultural resource, and a hub for knowledge and educational development in the state. Faculty who contribute to

the public's appreciation of the university by reaching into communities are recognized by the Public Service category. The department defines public service as the application of professionally-related expertise or skills that enrich local, regional, or national communities.

In order to be ranked Excellent in this category a faculty member must engage in sustained activities of significant benefit to the community (e.g. writing or publicity projects, advising organizations or publications), or multiple instances of service of limited duration (e.g. speaking engagements, media appearances). The candidate must make a case for how the activity is related to his or her field of expertise, professional development, or contribution to student knowledge as well as how it enhances the community served. The candidate must also provide evidence of his/her contributions: letters of support for the work, newspaper articles about the work/contributions, listing of meetings attended and what the individual contributed, etc. The faculty member may not be paid for his or her work if considered in the area of Public Service.

APPROVED

Mathematics Department Evaluation Standards

Promotion to Full Professor
Effective September 1, 2016
For Faculty Tenure on or after September 1, 2014

Categories of Evaluation

Faculty evaluations are conducted annually. Additional evaluations for contract renewal, promotion, and tenure are conducted along the timelines specified in the contract negotiated by the Faculty Federation. All evaluations follow the general procedures specified in the contract. Specifically, individuals are evaluated in four categories: (i) Teaching Effectiveness and Advising, (ii) Scholarship and Professional Activities, (iii) University Service and (iv) Public Service. As specified in the contract, the possible ratings in each of these categories are: "Excellent", "Very Good", "Satisfactory", or "Unsatisfactory". All faculty members are evaluated in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising, Scholarship and Professional Activities, and at least one service category. An individual can choose not to be rated in either category (iii) or (iv), but everyone must be rated in at least three of the four categories.

Promotion to Full Professor is recognition of a sustained distinguished record of teaching, significant impact in the scholarly field, and leadership in service to the University or the Public. This promotion is a significant achievement in an academic career, and a public expression of the caliber of the faculty member. The typical time to this promotion is six or more years from tenure, to allow for development of a significant sustained record of leadership and impact in teaching, scholarship, and service.

The contractual requirements for a positive recommendation for promotion to Full Professor are an evaluation of "Excellent" in *either* Teaching Effectiveness and Advising *or* Scholarship and Professional Activities, "Very Good" or better in the other of these two categories, and no "Unsatisfactory" ratings. The following is a summary the Mathematics Department Evaluation standards for each of the four categories[1].

Standards for evaluating Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

A candidate for promotion to Professor must demonstrate a sustained record of effective and accomplished teaching, and significant effort and accomplishment in teaching-related activities and student advising. Teaching effectiveness in Mathematics implies ensuring that students are mastering the material at levels that would allow them to apply their knowledge to other areas or that would prepare them to take more advanced mathematics courses. An effective teacher must be a good communicator and a good motivator. The instructor must also keep current with the field in terms of content and areas of special interest, and must develop assignments and projects for students, develop new course and revise existing courses as needed. For promotion to

[1] These standards apply to the promotion to Full Professor only.

Professor, the candidate must demonstrate more than excellence in classroom teaching. A significant involvement in course and curricular design, in innovative sustained advising and mentorship of students, and in assessment activities is required. Faculty will be evaluated based on what is reflected in the following four categories: (1) **Teaching Portfolio**; (2) **Teaching and Advising Activities**; (3) **Classroom Observations**, and (4) **Student Evaluations**.

For the candidate to receive a particular rating (Excellent, Very Good, or Satisfactory), he or she must be rated at that level or above by a simple majority of the DFEC (that is, more than 50%). When it is at 50%, the Chair (or the acting Chair designated by the Chair or Dean) serves as the tiebreaker. Each DFEC member shall peruse all documents in the four categories and judge the candidate based on an objective evaluation of all four categories listed above and detailed below. For the sole purpose of providing a quantitative guiding example in this document, we present a mechanism that DFEC members can refer to during their deliberation process: A DFEC member might evaluate the candidate in the following eight subareas from the four categories: organization of the course including clarity of materials, transparency of grading criteria, and completeness of the syllabi; level of preparedness; effort to engage students in the material; ability to make more challenging material accessible to learners; availability to students; positivity of peer observations; content of student feedback; and involvement in curricular design or assessment activities. A DFEC member is suggested to vote: 1) Excellent if the candidate performs well in at least seven of the eight areas listed above and the candidate does an excellent job advising students; 2) Very good if the candidate performs well in at least six of the eight areas listed above and the candidate does a very good job advising students; 3) Satisfactory if the candidate performs well in at least five of the eight areas listed above and the candidate does a satisfactory job advising students. Given the fact that many evaluations (including, but not limited to, classroom observations and student evaluation) are only feasible with the help of senior members or department administrative personnel, the candidate can expect reasonable help from the department when striving to offer the strongest possible evidence for teaching effectiveness.

(1) Teaching Portfolio: The faculty member should develop a portfolio including syllabi, classroom handouts, website contents, exams, and projects. When appropriate, samples of student work may be included as well. The portfolio should contain a syllabus for each course explaining what will be covered, what projects and assignments are required, and how grades will be determined. For each course there should be a summary sheet showing a distribution of the total points for each category identified in the grading policies, the assessments used in the more significant categories (typically exams or term projects), and the homework and exams and the corresponding final grades for the course. The portfolio will be used to evaluate the standards the instructor is setting for the class as well as the organizational structure and efforts in teaching activities. Particular weight will be placed on the teaching portfolio in evaluating teaching effectiveness, as it is the most complete reflection of the clarity and scope of the preparation and presentation of educational materials provided to aid the students in their learning.

This teaching portfolio should also contain the development of new courses and curricula. Evidence of dissemination of curricular material beyond the University (in published form or website) is desirable. Other activities related to teaching and advising include grant proposals

targeting curricular changes, undergraduate research and mentoring, and similar educational activities.

(2) Teaching and Advising Activities: Post-tenure faculty is expected to engage actively in a wide variety of teaching and advising activities beyond the classroom. The advising of majors, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research projects, and thesis advising are significant activities. These activities (the number of students advised and the type of advising) should be listed and described as part of the dossier for promotion. The candidate should justify well the effectiveness of his/her advising activities. This can be achieved in the form of a list of deliverables or a detailed account of what benefits the activities have brought to the students. Other significant contributions may include individual instruction of students in reading courses or similar activities, and the supervision of undergraduate and graduate research projects, and service on students' thesis committees, whether within the department or in other departments in complementary fields. Related mentoring efforts include taking students to conferences, and encouraging them to participate in various on-campus opportunities such as research conferences, thesis prizes, etc.

The department values involvement in mentoring student groups (such as local student chapters of international professional organizations or department-based student groups) that contributes to students' educational experience through seminars and similar activities. Faculty are encouraged to engage in curriculum development by serving on appropriate departmental committees or participating in the development of new courses.

This list of teaching and advising activities is not exhaustive and is meant only as an extended list of examples. While it is recognized that any individual candidate will not have had the opportunity to engage in all types of activities listed, candidates for promotion to Professor are expected to have participated in many and varied such activities, and invested significant efforts into these activities, at a level consistent with a leadership role in teaching and advising within the department.

(3) Classroom Observations: To evaluate how well an individual communicates in the classroom, one or more tenured colleagues may observe the individual in the classroom. For each classroom visit, the faculty member attending the class will write a brief report evaluating the classroom presentation. If there are any problems or weaknesses identified in a classroom visit report, it is expected that the faculty member will work on the issues of concern and further classroom visits will be made to determine whether or not the problems have been corrected. Independent evaluations by experienced faculty members provide strong evidence for innovative teaching approaches and for teaching effectiveness.

(4) Student Evaluations: All faculty members must conduct student evaluations in all classes each semester. The DFEC and the Department Chair, in all personnel actions, will consider the comments on these evaluations. The Mathematics Department uses a standard form for student evaluation of teaching. This form consists of ten mandatory questions developed by the University, and scoring is based on numerical responses from 1(worst) to 5 (best). In evaluating these scores, consideration is given to the nature and level of the course, as well as the size of the section. The Department will summarize results for each question by section and

instructor. Comparisons among different instructors of sections and courses at the same level will be considered in the evaluations. We suggest that a median score of all questions that is between 4 and 5 (3 and 4, 2 and 3 respectively) should warrant an "Excellent" ("Very Good", "Satisfactory" respectively) in the category of "Student Evaluation". Student evaluations have value in assessing teaching effectiveness; however, scientific studies (Boring et al.: *Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness*, ScienceOPENresearch) show that they are often strongly subjective. For this reason, the DFEC should not rely too heavily on student evaluation to gauge the candidate's teaching effectiveness, and should combine it with the three factors above. This is particularly important when conflicting evidence is presented. For example, students may deem the learning objectives vague while those shown on the syllabus included in the portfolio might offer a different picture to the DFEC. Under such scenarios, the DFEC's view prevails.

Standards for Scholarship and Professional Activities

The vitality and reputation of the Department of Mathematics depends upon active research and scholarly accomplishment. Professors in the department are expected to embody the goals of the department in research and scholarship, and demonstrate a sustained record of high impact research in one or more areas of specialization and an active research agenda. The department expects candidates for promotion to Professor to demonstrate that their research has been reviewed and accepted by peers in their research area, and that they are seen as an authority in their field. Traditionally, this has been accomplished by the peer-review process, particularly in archival journals, and evidenced by numbers of citations. However, it is widely recognized that different types of contributions may also be appropriate in specific research areas. Of primary importance to the department's evaluation are peer-reviewed publications and externally funded research grants, as well as research products such as software packages, open source codes, and patents. Other measures of impact include activity in invited conference presentations, presenting contributed papers at professional conferences and workshops and departmental seminars at other institutions, unfunded grant proposals, papers not subject to peer review, chapters in books, books, edited volumes, and technical reports. Further evidence of standing in the field include offices held in professional societies, awards from academic societies, editorial service on journals, reviews of books and articles, refereeing of papers, service to funding agencies in the candidate's field, and the like. Measures of impact on the field may also include the number of citations (or similar indices based on the number of citations) or software downloads, page views on research sites, other measures of scholarship impact (such as h-index, i-index, etc.), and measures of impact of the journals. The letters of the external reviewers provide crucial input in the evaluation of the candidate's research and its impact in the field, and are a testament to the candidate's leadership in their field.

Additionally, a candidate will be expected to have an active ongoing research agenda and to demonstrate leadership in ongoing research programs within the University pertinent to his/her area of specialization. Research support is another indicator of a candidate's recognition in the field, and while research funding is not required for promotion, it is strongly encouraged. The department expects candidates to actively pursue external funding opportunities by applying for them frequently, for personal research grants and grants supporting graduate studies, shared

research equipment, and programmatic research activities that support graduate programs and collaborative endeavors. The department highly values collaborative and interdisciplinary research and this research and related grant proposals are viewed as significant endeavors. Similarly, collaboration with colleagues both within and outside the University is highly recommended.

The standard for promotion to Professor are higher than those required for tenure, in that the dossier must indicate sustained leadership and excellence in research, scholarship, and grantsmanship. Mathematics has a wide range of different fields each with different typical publication rates. Thus, rigid numerical quotas for research publications are inadvisable, as the DFEC intends to consider primarily the quality and impact rather than the quantity of the candidate's publications. For example, fewer publications with more citations may have higher impact than more publications with fewer citations. Moreover, citation rates and journal impact factors, even for publications of the highest quality in a field's top journals, are expected to be lower in fields with fewer active researchers. Lastly, it is unrealistic to require external grants as they are sensitive to funding agencies' interests and level of funding both of which vary with time. However, evidence of effectively trying to obtain grants is critical as it indicates probability of future success in grantsmanship. On the other hand, having secured a significant external grant as sole PI should be considered recognition of the candidate's expertise in the field, and a strong factor to justify the highest rating in scholarship and professional activities.

We provide the following standard to merely serve as guidelines that should suggest quantitative expectations for the publication of research of moderately high impact in peer-reviewed forums of moderately high standing within the candidate's field of research. For an example, there are circumstances ratings should be given with less number of publications. These include, but are not limited to, when the faculty member's research area changes significantly since being tenured or when the papers are demonstrated to have exceptionally high quality. On the other hand, 5 papers may not warrant the highest rating, for example, when there are verifiable significant overlaps among papers or when they mostly appear on journals of lesser quality. Special consideration should also be given in the circumstances where the publication rate for the given sub-field is significantly different from the guidelines suggested. The guidelines are based on a standard teaching load that is typically six courses (four preparations) per year with possible releases for thesis advising or releases paid for from external funding. Moreover, this should be considered guideline for evaluating researchers in Applied and Computational Mathematics, Data Science, and Statistics. For researchers in Pure Mathematics, the DFEC may consider slightly lowering the standard for example by requiring one less peer-reviewed journal article.

(1) To be rated "Excellent", the candidate should have at least **five** articles accepted in peer-reviewed journals or other equivalently recognized research products (such as invited book chapters, published books, or software packages), and a substantive record of external grant proposals consisting of at least four unfunded proposals or one externally funded proposal. The candidate should also have a substantive record of other research and professional activities, consisting of items described above, which demonstrate sustained significant impact in the candidate's field.

(2) To be rated “Very Good", the candidate should have at least **four** articles, and a record of external grant proposals consisting of at least three unfunded proposals or one externally funded proposal. The candidate should also have a substantive record of other research and professional activities, consisting of items described above, which demonstrate sustained major impact in the candidate’s field.

(3) To be rated “Satisfactory", the candidate should have at least **three** articles, and a record of external grant proposals consisting of at least two unfunded proposals or one externally funded proposal. The candidate should also have a substantive record of other research and professional activities, consisting of items described above.

Standards for University Service

For promotion to Professor, the department requires that the candidate has become an active member in the leadership of the department. He/She is expected to list his/her service work with sufficient explanation that is satisfactory to the DFEC. The hours of service designated below for each rating only serves as a reference, and should be considered as what the said amount of service takes for an average faculty member. The DFEC intends to consider primarily the outcome of the candidate’s service and what it helped accomplish rather than the number of hours the candidate put in.

A rating of “Satisfactory” in this area requires some service each year to multiple levels including the Department, College, or University. Such service may include leadership in faculty senate, assisting at outreach or enrollment events, or serving on committees within the Department, in other related departments, or in the College or University. Positions of leadership are not expected. Candidates are encouraged to provide service to programs, groups, or entities (e.g. centers) on campus that are in harmony with their research specialties.

A rating of “Very Good” requires more sustained and significant service to multiple levels including the Department, College, or University. Such service may include leadership in the faculty senate and in strategic planning or evaluation committees, departmental search and screen activities, arranging outreach, advising, or enrollment events, or serving on committees within the Department, in other related departments, or in the College or University. Existence of positions of leadership is required. Candidates are expected to be engaged in programs, groups, or entities (e.g. centers) on campus that are in harmony with their research specialties.

A rating of “Excellent” requires a substantive record of leadership at the Department, College, or University level. Such service may include leadership in faculty senate, strategic planning or evaluation committees, departmental search and screen activities, organizing outreach, advising, or enrollment events, or actively serving on multiple committees within the Department, in other related departments, or in the College or University. Demonstrated leadership activities or formal positions of leadership are required. Candidates are expected to provide leadership in programs, groups, or entities (e.g. centers) on campus that are in harmony with their research specialties.

Standards for Public Service

Public service involves the use of professional capabilities to benefit the Commonwealth or to benefit external organizations without compensation. Such service may include community engagement, volunteering/consulting services provided to non-profit organizations of the candidate's profession, either *pro bono* or at significantly reduced rates. Effectiveness of such service should be demonstrated by such documents as deliverables to the partner organizations, letters provided by them, or positive media reports

To be rated "Satisfactory" in this category one must achieve a record of substantive service to one or more external agencies.

To be rated "Very Good" in this category one must achieve a record of significant, consistent service to one or more external agencies.

To be rated "Excellent" in this category one must achieve a record of consistent and significant service to one or more external agencies. One must also demonstrate a record of leadership in these activities.

APPROVED

Mathematics Department Evaluation Standards

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
Effective September 1, 2016
Approved July 2016

Categories of Evaluation

Faculty evaluations are conducted annually. Additional evaluations for contract renewal, promotion, and tenure are conducted along the time lines specified in the contract negotiated by the Faculty Federation. All evaluations follow the general procedures specified in the contract. Specifically, individuals are evaluated in four categories: (i) Teaching Effectiveness and Advising, (ii) Scholarship and Professional Activities, (iii) University Service and (iv) Public Service. As specified in the contract, the possible ratings in each of these categories are: "Excellent", "Very Good", "Satisfactory", or "Unsatisfactory". All faculty members are evaluated in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising, Scholarship and Professional Activities, and at least one service category. An individual can choose not to be rated in either category (iii) or (iv), but everyone must be rated in at least three of the four categories.

The contractual requirements for a positive recommendation for promotion and tenure are an evaluation of "Excellent" in *either* Teaching Effectiveness and Advising *or* Scholarship and Professional Activities, "Very Good" or better in the other of these two categories, and no "Unsatisfactory" ratings. The following is a summary the Mathematics Department Evaluation standards for each of the four categories.

Standards for evaluating Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

Teaching effectiveness in Mathematics implies ensuring that students are mastering the material at levels that would allow them to apply their knowledge to other areas or that would prepare them to take more advanced mathematics courses. An effective teacher must be a good communicator and a good motivator. The instructor must also keep current with the field in terms of content and areas of special interest, and must develop assignments and projects for students. When necessary the instructor should revise existing courses or develop new courses. Each new faculty member will be assigned a mentor to support his or her growth in teaching effectiveness and advising. In addition, the DFEC will provide feedback annually to the faculty member. Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated based on the following factors: (1) Teaching Portfolio; (2) Teaching and Advising Activities; (3) Classroom Observations, and (4) Student Evaluations.

For the candidate to receive a particular rating (Excellent, Very Good, or Satisfactory), he or she must be rated at that level or above by a simple majority of the DFEC (that is, more than 50%). When it is at 50%, the Chair (or the acting Chair designated by the Chair or Dean) serves as the tiebreaker. Each DFEC member shall peruse all documents in the four categories and judge the candidate based on an objective evaluation of all four categories listed above. For the purpose of providing a quantitative guiding example in this document, we present a mechanism that DFEC members can refer to during their deliberation process. A DFEC member can evaluate the candidate in the following eight areas from the four categories listed above: organization of the course, level of preparedness, clarity of materials, transparency of grading criteria, completeness of the syllabi, availability to students, peer observations, and student feedback.

He/She is suggested to vote: 1) Excellent if the candidate performs well in at least seven of the eight areas listed above and the candidate does an excellent job advising students; 2) Very good if the candidate performs well in at least six of the eight areas listed above and the candidate does a very good job advising students; 3) Satisfactory if the candidate performs well in at least five of the eight areas listed above and the candidate does a satisfactory job advising students. Given the fact that many evaluations (including, but not limited to, classroom observations and student evaluation) are only feasible with the help of senior members or department administrative personnel, the candidate can expect reasonable help from the department when striving to offer the strongest possible evidence for teaching effectiveness in each of the four categories.

(1) Teaching Portfolio: The faculty member should develop a portfolio including syllabi, classroom handouts, website contents, exams, and projects. When appropriate, samples of student work may be included as well. The portfolio should contain a handout for each course explaining what will be covered, what projects and assignments are required, and how grades will be determined. For each course there should be a summary sheet showing a distribution of the total points for homework and exams and the corresponding final grades for the course. The portfolio will be used to evaluate the standards the instructor is setting for the class as well as the organizational structure and efforts in teaching activities. Particular weight will be placed on the teaching portfolio in evaluating teaching effectiveness, as it is the most complete reflection of the clarity and scope of the preparation and presentation of educational materials provided to aid students in their learning.

New faculty will be encouraged to prepare an annual written self-evaluation of teaching, in which goals and expectations should be specified and outcomes assessed against these goals. These self-evaluations are intended to identify strengths and weaknesses and to help the instructor improve teaching effectiveness. The portfolio should contain a reflective statement by the faculty member addressing his or her development as an instructor. The statement might also provide insight into student and faculty feedback received by the faculty member.

(2) Teaching and Advising Activities: Faculty is expected to engage in a wide variety of teaching and advising activities beyond the classroom. The advising of majors, supervision of undergraduate and graduate research projects, and thesis advising are significant activities. These activities (the number of students advised and the type of advising) should be listed and described as part of the dossier for promotion and tenure. **The candidate should justify well the effectiveness of his/her advising activities. This can be achieved in the form of a list of deliverables or a detailed account of what benefits the activities have brought to the students.** Other significant contributions may include individual instruction of students in reading courses or similar activities, and serving on students' thesis committees, whether within the department or in other departments in complementary fields. Related mentoring efforts include taking students to conferences, and encouraging them to participate in various on-campus opportunities, such as research conferences, thesis prizes, etc.

The department values involvement in mentoring student groups (such as local student chapters of international professional organizations or department-based student groups) that contributes to students' educational experience through seminars and similar activities. Faculty is encouraged to engage in curriculum development by serving on appropriate departmental committees or participating in the development of new courses.

This list of teaching and advising activities is not exhaustive and is meant only as an extended list of examples. It is recognized that any individual candidate will not have had the opportunity to engage in all types of activities listed.

(3) Classroom Observations: To evaluate how well an individual communicates in the classroom, one or more tenured faculty members of the department will observe the individual in the classroom. For each classroom visit, the faculty member attending the class will write a brief report evaluating the classroom presentation. If there are any problems or weaknesses identified in a classroom visit report, it is expected that the faculty member will work on the issues of concern and further classroom visits will be made to determine whether or not the problems have been corrected. An initial classroom visit will take place during the first semester after an individual is hired. The time and date of the visit will be coordinated with the individual. A minimum of two observations will be conducted per year prior to tenure and promotion of the faculty member. Independent evaluations by experienced faculty members provide strong evidence for appropriate teaching approaches and for teaching effectiveness.

(4) Student Evaluations: All faculty members must conduct student evaluations in all classes each semester. The DFEC and the department chair, in all personnel actions, will consider the comments on these evaluations. The Mathematics Department uses a standard form for student evaluation of teaching. This form consists of ten mandatory questions developed by the University, and scoring is based on numerical responses from 1(worst) to 5 (best). In evaluating these scores, consideration is given to the nature and level of the course, as well as the size of the section. The Department will summarize results for each question by section and instructor. Comparisons among different instructors of sections and courses at the same level will be considered in the evaluations. We suggest that a median score of all questions that is between 4 and 5 (3 and 4, 2 and 3 respectively) should warrant an "Excellent" ("Very Good", "Satisfactory" respectively) in the category of "Student Evaluation". Student evaluations have value in assessing teaching effectiveness: however, scientific studies (Boring et al.: *Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness*, ScienceOPENresearch) show that they are often strongly subjective. For this reason, the DFEC should not rely overwhelmingly on student evaluation to gauge the candidate's teaching effectiveness, and should combine it with the three factors above. This is particularly important when conflicting evidence are presented. For example, students may deem the learning objectives vague while those shown on the syllabus included in the portfolio might offer a different picture to the DFEC. Under such scenarios, the DFEC's view prevails.

Standards for Scholarship and Professional Activities

The vitality and reputation of the Department of Mathematics depends upon active research and scholarly accomplishment. To attain tenure and promotion the candidate must demonstrate a productive record of research in one or more areas of specialization and an active research agenda. The department expects candidates to demonstrate that their research has been reviewed and accepted by peers in their research area. Traditionally, the peer-review process, particularly in archival journals, has accomplished this but it is widely recognized that different types of contributions may also be appropriate in specific research areas. Of primary importance to the department's evaluation are peer-reviewed publications and externally funded research grants, as well as research products such as software packages, open source codes, and patents. Other measures of impact include activity in presenting papers at professional conferences and work-

shops and departmental seminars at other institutions, unfunded grant proposals, papers not subject to peer review, chapters in books, books, edited volumes, and technical reports. Further evidence of standing in the field include offices held in professional societies, awards from academic societies, editorial service on journals, reviews of books and articles, refereeing of papers, service to funding agencies in the candidate's field, and the like. Measures of impact on the field may also include the number of citations (or similar indices based on the number of citations) or software downloads, page views on research sites, other measures of scholarship impact (such as h-index, i-index, etc.), and measures of impact of the journals. The letters of the external reviewers provide crucial input in the evaluation of the candidate's research and its impact in the field.

Additionally, a candidate will be expected to have an active ongoing research agenda and to participate in ongoing research programs within the University pertinent to his/her area of specialization. Research support is another indicator of a candidate's recognition in the field, and while research funding is not required for tenure and promotion the department expects candidates to actively pursue external funding opportunities. The department highly values collaborative and interdisciplinary research. This research and related grant proposals are viewed as significant endeavors.

The tenure and promotion decisions are based primarily on work performed in the first five and one-half years. It is expected that candidates will have work in progress when they begin their tenure-track position, and this ongoing research will be included in the evaluation of the scholarly activity as long as the publications (or equivalent products) reflect that a portion of the work has been performed while on campus. Rigid numerical quotas for research publications are inadvisable, as the DFEC intends to consider primarily the quality and impact rather than the quantity of the candidate's publications. However, the following standards serve as guidelines that should suggest quantitative expectations for the publication of research of moderately-high impact in peer-reviewed forums of moderately-high standing within the candidate's field of research. The guidelines are based on a standard teaching load that is typically six courses per year with releases for thesis advising or releases from external funding. In addition, the quantitative expectations listed below should be considered minimum for that rating. We note that mathematics has a wide range of different fields bearing rather different typical publication rate. Lastly, it is unrealistic to require external grants as they are sensitive to funding agencies' interests and level of funding both of which vary with time. However, evidence of effectively trying to obtain grants is critical as it indicates probability of future success in grantsmanship. On the other hand, having secured significant external grant, as sole PI should be considered recognition of the candidate's expertise in the field, and a strong factor to justify a highest rating in scholarship and professional activities.

(1) To be rated "Excellent", the candidate should have at least four articles (corresponding to an average of more than one paper every eighteen months) accepted in peer-reviewed journals or other equivalently recognized research products (such as invited book chapters, published books, or software packages), and a substantive record of external grant proposals consisting of at least four unfunded proposals or one externally funded proposal. The candidate should also have a substantive record of other research and professional activities, consisting of items described above.

(2) To be rated "Very Good", the candidate should have at least three articles (corresponding to an average of more than one paper every two years accepted in peer-reviewed journals or oth-

er equivalently recognized research products (such as invited book chapters, published books, or software packages), and a record of external grant proposals consisting of at least three unfunded proposals or one externally funded proposal. The candidate should also have a substantive record of other research and professional activities, consisting of items described above.

(3) To be rated "Satisfactory", the candidate should have at least two articles (corresponding to an average of more than one paper every three years accepted in peer-reviewed journals or other equivalently recognized research products (such as invited book chapters, published books, or software packages), and a record of external grant proposals consisting of at least two unfunded proposals or one externally funded proposal. The candidate should also have a substantive record of other research and professional activities, consisting of items described above.

Standards for University Service

The candidate is expected to list his/her service work with sufficient explanation that is satisfactory to the DFEC. The hours of service designated below for each rating only serves as a reference, and should be considered as what the said amount of service takes on average. The DFEC intends to consider primarily the outcome of the candidate's service and what it helped accomplish rather than the number of hours the candidate put in.

Pre-tenure faculty are encouraged to prioritize teaching and advising and research and scholarship; to encourage this the department's requirements to attain a rating of "Satisfactory" in this area are modest. A rating of "Satisfactory" in this area requires some service each year in the Department, College, or University. Such service may include involvement in faculty senate, assisting at outreach or enrollment events, or serving on committees within the Department, in other related departments, or in the College or University. Positions of leadership are not expected. Candidates are encouraged to provide service to programs, groups, or entities (e.g. centers) on campus that are in harmony with their research specialties.

A rating of "Very Good" requires more sustained and significant service to the Department. Such service may include involvement in faculty senate, strategic planning or evaluation committees, departmental search and screen activities, assisting at outreach or enrollment events, or serving on committees within the Department, in other related departments, or in the College or University. Positions of leadership are encouraged but not required. Candidates are encouraged to provide service to programs, groups, or entities (e.g. centers) on campus that are in harmony with their research specialties.

A rating of "Excellent" requires a substantive record of leadership at the Department, College, or University level. Such service may include leadership in faculty senate, strategic planning or evaluation committees, departmental search and screen activities, assisting at outreach or enrollment events, or serving on committees within the Department, in other related departments, or in the College or University. Demonstration of leadership activities or formal positions of leadership are required. Candidates are encouraged to provide leadership in programs, groups, or entities (e.g. centers) on campus, which are in harmony with their research specialties.

Public Service

Public service involves the use of professional capabilities to benefit the Commonwealth or to benefit external organizations without compensation. Such service may include community

engagement, volunteering/consulting services provided to non-profit organizations of the candidate's profession. Effectiveness of such service should be demonstrated by such documents as deliverables to the partner organizations, letters provided by them, or positive media reports.

To be rated "Satisfactory" in this category, one must achieve a record of consistent service to one or more external agencies.

To be rated "Very Good" in this category, one must achieve a record of significant, consistent service to one or more external agencies.

To be rated "Excellent" in this category, one must achieve a record of consistent and significant service to one or more external agencies. One must also demonstrate a record of leadership in these activities.

Approved

Management and Marketing Department

Evaluation Standard for Promotion to Full Professor

(For internal candidates tenured after 9/1/16, for initial hires after 9/1/19)

1. Categories of Evaluation

The evaluation for promotion to full professor will include criteria in the categories of (a) teaching effectiveness and advising, and (b) scholarship and professional activities. They must also be evaluated in one or both categories of (c) university service and/or (d) public service, depending on the candidate's choice. For internal candidates the evaluation will be based on activities performed post tenure period and shall include all prior annual reviews based on the annual Faculty Activity Reports. Consistent with the Faculty Federation Collective Bargaining agreement the requirement for a positive recommendation for promotion to full professor by the Department is an "excellent" in either teaching effectiveness and advising or scholarship and professional activities, and a "very good" in the other of these two categories; and, no "unsatisfactory" ratings.

2. Standards for Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

The successful candidate for promotion to full professor will demonstrate that he or she is an effective teacher and performs assigned duties. The candidate will be evaluated on teaching effectiveness and advising based on:

a. Student course ratings for all courses taught as part of the contractual requirements will be included in this review. Interpretation of the student ratings will be based on:
   - Averages and trends over semesters and courses, consistent with the measurement scale defined by the Management & Marketing Department in its adopted standard form for student evaluation of teaching
   - Comparative quantified data from the student evaluations, e.g. whenever applicable, historic student ratings for the same class, and,
   - Specifics of the course as taught by the evaluated professor, e.g. new class, new prep or major changes in its curricular design. Considerations will be made for level of course: undergraduate, honors, Masters or Doctoral.
   - When faculty are serving as academic advisers or mentors to graduate students, effectiveness will be measured in terms of student degree completion.

b. Other evidence such as peer reviews and/or teaching portfolios. The teaching portfolios may contain the following:
   - Faculty members' reflective statement
   - Sample syllabi of courses taught during the period under review

- Samples of exams and quizzes for a sample of courses
- Samples of homework or other projects assigned for sample courses
- Research productivity with student academic advisees

Advising is assigned by the Chairperson of the Department. While advising will not receive as much weight as teaching in this category, if assigned, advising duties must be carried out seriously and effectively, i.e. by providing assigned students with timely and relevant advice on academic matters. Exceptional advising, e.g. handling a group with heavier than average advising needs, will get additional weight. Failure to conduct assigned advising effectively will influence the rating in this category.

Evaluations of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Satisfactory," or Unsatisfactory" will be made based on the discussion of performance indicators defined above.

3. Standards for Scholarship and Professional Activities

The successful candidates for promotion to full professor will submit a portfolio consistent with the Faculty Federation Collective Bargaining agreement and demonstrate a continuous record of scholarship and professional activities. Scholarship will be evaluated on the basis of intellectual contributions (such as scholarly articles in professional publications, primarily but not exclusively in peer reviewed journals, books, chapters in books, law reviews, invited publications, articles in prominent trade or industry publications and peer-reviewed externally funded research grants.) A record of professional presentations, proceedings, and activities, such as conference service, reviewing, serving on editorial review boards, expert witness briefs and testimony, or other high-value activities such as Fulbright Scholar or other recognized National or International award, etc. reflect having a research portfolio and will be considered but will have less weight in the overall evaluation than refereed or law review publications.

Higher weighting will be given to significant scholarship and professional activities in publications in peer-reviewed journals, prestigious law reviews, publications of peer-reviewed monographs, books, chapters in books, or peer-reviewed externally funded research grants. It is preferable that the subject of the research be appropriate to the program in which the faculty member is working (e.g., management or marketing). Letters written by external reviewers will constitute additional evidence of the candidate's scholarly achievement.

a. To be rated "Satisfactory" the candidate will have at least four articles published or accepted for publication in well-regarded peer-reviewed journals during the candidate's post tenure period at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth.

b. To be rated "Very Good" the candidate will have at least five articles published or accepted for publication in well-regarded peer-reviewed journals during the candidate's post tenure period at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth.

c. To be rated "Excellent" the candidate will have at least six articles published or accepted for publication in well-regarded peer-reviewed journals during the candidate's post tenure period at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth.

The required quantity of publications may be fewer when the quality of the journal is very high. Similarly, the required quantity may be greater when the quality is lower. The criteria to assess quality of journal include reputation of the journal, as attested by journal metrics; prestige of the editor and editorial board; and, acceptance rate (Cabell's International or another trusted academic journal directory).

All levels of internal review and external reviewer letters will have substantial weight in the evaluation of quality and impact of all forms of scholarship.

It is the candidate's responsibility to demonstrate journal quality if the publication is in a journal that is not listed in Cabell's International.

4. Standards for University Service

The candidate’s university service will be evaluated based on the candidate’s participation in service activities to advance the goals and mission of the University. Examples include but are not limited to:

a. Support of fellow faculty members through mentoring, advice, consulting or any form of formal and continuous service to help further faculty development
b. Participation in, and especially, leadership of ad hoc committees at the department, college and university levels
c. Participation in shared governance organizations, e.g. Faculty Senate
d. Mentoring of students in clubs with an academic or professional focus
e. Support of student recruiting, university advancement, and/or management of the university or university departments/areas

A rating of "Satisfactory" requires a modest level of involvement in the service functions, at least at the Departmental level (e.g. limited to two ad hoc committees per academic year). A rating of "Very Good" requires demonstration of sustained significant service to the Department, College, or University (e.g. more than two ad hoc committees and one formal and continuous service engagement). A rating of "Excellent" requires a demonstrated record of significant and substantial achievement and effectiveness at the Departmental, College, or University level (e.g. more than two ad hoc committees, more than one formal and continuous service engagement, numerous short-term service engagements).

It should be noted that faculty may opt not to be rated in university service but must be evaluated in at least three of the four categories. It should also be noted that the successful candidate will

be judged primarily on teaching effectiveness and advising and scholarship and professional activities.

5. Standards for Public Service

Public service involves use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies or units other than the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise, or other assistance to these external entities.

The candidate's public service will be evaluated based on the candidate's participation in service activities that include but are not limited to:

a. Continuous support to community organizations, local businesses and/or local government
b. Involvement with university departments or programs providing community outreach or support to local government
c. Involvement with government and non-government organizations providing community outreach or support to local government
d. Applied research to help support local/regional businesses, government and/or communities
e. Consistent dissemination of knowledge and/or abilities to support local/regional communities and businesses

To be rated "Satisfactory" in public service the applicant must demonstrate a record of modest but noteworthy service to one or more external entities. To be rated "Very Good" in public service, a record of consistent and significant service to one or more external entities must be demonstrated. To be rated "Excellent" in public service, in addition to providing consistent and significant service, a record of demonstrated leadership is required.

It should be noted that faculty may opt not to be rated in public service but must be evaluated in at least three of the four categories. It should also be noted that the successful candidate will be judged primarily on teaching and scholarship.

APPROVED

Department of Management and Marketing Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (for candidates hired after 9/1/2017)

This document represents the Department of Management and Marketing Standards for evaluation for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

SECTION ONE: TEACHING AND ADVISING

I. **Data used for evaluation**: The Management and Marketing department recognizes three sources of data in teaching evaluations: student evaluations, faculty members' teaching portfolios, and faculty members' reflective statements.

Student evaluations: As required by the Faculty Federation Agreement, faculty members will submit to the DFEC copies of their student evaluations for the appropriate period and a copy of their syllabi for the same period along with their annual activity report.

- The mean value (i.e., simple average) of the student evaluation scores will be used to assess a faculty member's teaching.

- Only courses taught as part of the contractual faculty teaching load are included in any personnel review. This includes courses in the contractual 3-3 teaching load, but excludes overloads regardless of the source of payment for the overload.

Teaching portfolio: Faculty members **will** submit a teaching portfolio to supplement the student evaluations for tenure and promotion. The teaching portfolio may contain the following:

- Syllabi of all courses taught during the period under review
- Samples of exams and quizzes for each course taught during the period under review
- Samples of homework assigned for each course taught during the period under review
- Where applicable, documentation related to supervision of students in honors, senior, or graduate projects and theses; directed studies; internships; co-ops; and documentation related to advising of majors (e.g., list of students advised, list of graduation certifications issues).

The teaching portfolio can also contain any of the following:

- Samples of graded exams and quizzes
- Samples of written work by students
- Sample projects completed by students
- Letters or emails from students
- Peer review of classroom teaching
- Documentation related to grants for teaching innovations or programs
- Documents related to activity in programs that are directed toward curriculum improvement

Reflective Statement: Each faculty member may submit to the DFEC a reflective statement on their teaching and advising activity with their teaching portfolio. The reflective statement extends the meaning of the documentation provided above by giving a context in which to comprehend the instructional design, the pedagogy, and choices made from the teacher's own point of view. It is the faculty member's opportunity to communicate his or her goals, accomplishments, disappointments, intentions, and/or special circumstances (e.g., new prep, bi-modal student population), and can also include a plan to improve teaching. Finally, it should indicate any developmental activities that have been undertaken to improve teaching. In short, the reflective statement should help the DFEC make sense of the data provided by the other documentation. At minimum, the reflective statement must include a:

- Statement of teaching philosophy and how it influenced choices made during the period under consideration
- Statement of innovations undertaken and/or continuous improvement implemented
- Statement of special circumstances (e.g., class size, multiple preps, mandatory or elective courses, majors or non-majors, etc.) that influenced teaching effectiveness during the period under consideration
- Statement of any activities undertaken to improve teaching in the college or university

II. **Evaluating the Teaching Portfolio**: Course and teaching materials will be evaluated on the following: course organization, course content, student learning, and, where applicable, homework. The following scale will be used by the evaluators to review and rate the course and teaching materials provided on a 5-point Likert-scale anchored by "needs considerable work" to "exceptional". The mean of the scores on the 20 items will be computed as the total score for the teaching portfolio.

Organization:

1. The course objectives appear congruent with the department curriculum.
2. The course objectives are clearly stated.
3. The syllabus adequately outlines the sequence of topics to be covered.
4. The agenda and topic sequence are logical.
5. The intellectual level of the course appears appropriate for the enrolled students.
6. Time given to the various major course topics appears appropriate.
7. Written course requirements, including attendance policies, are included in the course syllabus.

Course Content

8. The required and recommended reading list is up to date and includes works of recognized authorities.
9. A variety of assignments appear available to meet individual student needs.

10. Laboratory or project work, if a part of the course, is integrated into the course.
11. The assignments appear to be intellectually challenging.
12. The breadth and depth of coverage seem appropriate for the course.
13. The instructor's teaching approaches (lectures, discussions, films, fieldwork, outside speakers) appear to be suitable to the course objectives.

Evaluation of Student Learning

14. The standards used for grading are clearly communicated to the students.
15. The written assignments and projects appear to represent course goals.
16. The exam content appears representative of the course content and objectives.
17. The tests used in the course appear well designed and selected.
18. The examination questions appear to be written so that they are easily understood.

Homework

19. Homework assignments (if applicable) appear to supplement lectures and class discussions.
20. Assignments appear to reflect course goals.

III. **Evaluating the Reflective Statement**: The following scale will be used by the evaluators to rate the reflective statement on a 5-point Likert-scale anchored by "Disagree" (1) to “Agree” (5). The mean of the ratings on the 9 items will be used as the score on the reflective statement.

1. The rationale for the content and process chosen for courses appears valid.
2. The faculty member appears to have actively reflected on the effectiveness of his or her teaching.
3. The faculty member appears committed to making continuous improvement in his or her teaching.
4. The faculty member has made a strong effort to improve his or her teaching.
5. Future goals reflect commitment to improve teaching.
6. The activities and strategies chosen to improve student learning appear appropriate.
7. The faculty member is aware of his or her strengths and weaknesses in teaching.
8. There is evidence that the faculty member changes methods to meet new classroom situations.
9. There is evidence that the faculty member does try to stay current in the subjects he or she teaches.

IV. **Determining Performance Ratings**: Faculty may choose to weight the reflective statement from 0 - 0.1 in determining their level of recognition granted for teaching and advising. One’s student teaching evaluation score can be weighed from .5 - .6 and the teaching portfolio score can be weighed from .3 - .5. The sum of the weights in the three categories should add up to 1.

Because student evaluations provide important information and are required by the Faculty Federation contract, they will be given more weight than the portfolio score or teaching statement in determining the final performance score for the period being evaluated. The final score will be computed as follows:

Reflective Statement score X Weight between 0 and 0.1 = _____
Student Evaluation of Teaching X Weight between .5 and .6 = _____
Portfolio score X Weight between .3 and .5 = _____

Final Teaching Performance Score is the sum of the above three.

A faculty member's performance will be rated as excellent, very good, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory as specified by the Faculty Federation Agreement. The rating will be determined by the level of performance in teaching and advising according to the following:

Excellent	3.8 – 5.0
Very Good	3.4 – 3.79
Good	3.0 – 3.39
Unsatisfactory	<3.0

V. **Advising**: The quantity and quality of academic advising of students majoring in the department, graduate student research advising, undergraduate student research advising, and advising of students enrolled in the faculty member's own classes shall be considered in this category. At time of tenure and promotion faculty are expected to include a written statement of their advising activities, to include number of advisees as well as a delineation of advising activities (i.e. held 20 hours of advising appointments with students, participated in adviser training, ran advising session for department, etc.)

For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member's average teaching and advising across their years of employment will be considered. The DFEC will favorably consider patterns of improvement during the faculty member's term of employment at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will be expected to have average scores of **very good** or **excellent** in the two years prior to their request for promotion.

SECTION TWO: SCHOLARSHIP AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

I. **Overview:** While we strongly encourage untenured faculty to contribute to their discipline through professional activities such as: conference service, reviewing, serving on Editorial Review Boards, etc. in this category the focus should be on publishing in peer reviewed journals, prestigious conferences (<10% acceptance rates) or other high value activities such as grant writing. The focus is necessary in order to build publication records comparable to untenured faculty in other parts of the university.

In addition to points earned from other scholarly professional activities, the Department expects untenured faculty to have an average of one refereed scholarly research journal article per year when they apply for tenure review. However, for those candidates for tenure and promotion who have published in Tier 1 journals (<10% acceptance rate) these publications will be given additional weight and count as 1.5 publications.

For those faculty coming directly from a PhD program all publications, including those published and/or accepted for publication before a faculty member's employment at UMass Dartmouth, will be included in the Scholarship and Professional Activities evaluation. For those faculty with a previous academic position, up to the last three years of their publication record will be included towards the minimum required journal article publications if the candidate chooses to use those credits and apply for tenure early. If a candidate chooses to use only two years of credit towards tenure, articles published in the two years immediately preceding the year the candidate joined UMassD will be counted. For those who are not given credit at time of hire and then seek early tenure and promotion, prior publications from at most the prior three years before joining will be evaluated for inclusion at time of tenure

At time of tenure and promotion, those who have prior academic experience are expected to produce the equivalent of one publication per year during their time at UMass D.

II. **What is Counted:** Intellectual contributions must be publicly available (i.e., proprietary and confidential research and consulting reports do not qualify as intellectual contributions).

Articles, proceedings, books, monographs, book chapters, and any other published material should only be counted once; therefore, the documentation required for such publications would be the initial (title) page of the publication, if presented on the Faculty Activity Report when published, *or* the acceptance letter from the editor/conference chair/etc., if presented on the Faculty Activity Report when accepted.

Note: Journal articles may be considered if published in either traditional print journals or in on-line journals with a verified peer reviewed process.

III. **Documentation:** Professional service can be documented by including copies of program announcements that specify the faculty member's role, letters of appreciation attesting to the faculty member's contribution, copies from a journal showing editorial review board membership, copies of professional organization newsletters or web pages that identify the faculty member's role, etc. Activities assigned 1 point on the proposed Scholarship and Professional Activities standards do not require documentation.

IV. Examples for Assessment of Points

Points

10 Tier One Scholarly research acceptance in a peer review journal with an acceptance rate of <10% in one's field (scholarly book, research monograph).

9 Editing a scholarly, professional, or pedagogic book.

8 Refereed journal article (< Tier 1). Best papers proceedings at a conference with an acceptance rate ≤10%) Journal editor, or chair of a national conference.

8 Legal research for and writing of briefs filed in a state or federal appellate court.

7 Guest editor of a scholarly journal. Scholarly book chapter. Chapter in scholarly or pedagogic book (7-9 points)

6 Officer in an academic or trade organization, chair of a regional conference, track chair of a national conference, program chair or program co-chair. Refereed presentation at a conference with an acceptance rate < 33%.

5 Editorial review board member/Associate editor, refereed national conference proceedings, or track chair of a regional conference.

4 Cases in refereed journals/textbooks, refereed regional conference proceedings, local arrangements coordinator for a conference, grant award, or member of a Conference Advisory Board.

3 Paper delivery/no proceedings (academic or trade), invited article, trade journal article, other un-refereed article, published book review of a scholarly book or textbook, reprint. A nationally broadcast podcast/webinar or other online seminar type program in your discipline based on your expertise (3-5 points).

2 Textbook, publicly available instructional software, publicly available research working paper (e.g., through the CCB Working Papers Series), or grant application. Major service role (e.g., discussant, session chair, paper reviewer) for a conference/journal, member of an academic or trade organization committee, Significant scholarly consultation (e.g., citation as a reference), or major research/publication thrust (e.g., data collection or analysis).

1 Minor service role for any conference/journal, conference/workshop attendance, minor (informal) scholarly consultation, minor research/publication thrust (e.g., creative activity toward paper completion), or publication citation.

V. Evaluation

For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Faculty will be evaluated using the following scale:

- ***Excellent*** : 48 or more points (at least 48 points must come from Peer Reviewed Journal publications)
- ***Very Good***: 40 – 47 points (at least 40 points must come from Peer Reviewed Journal publications)
- ***Satisfactory***: 32 – 40 points (at least 32 points must come from Peer Reviewed Journal publications)
- ***Unsatisfactory:*** 0 – 31 points

Note: High quality, high impact scholarly work may be substituted for at most one peer reviewed journal publication.

SECTION THREE: UNIVERSITY SERVICE

University Service includes service to the department, the college, the University, and the higher education system. Under the Faculty Federation agreement, a faculty member must be evaluated in either University Service or Public Service. The following standards will be used by the Management and Marketing Department for rating University Service.

I. Point Values Awarded for VariousActivities:

	Example Activities	**Documentation Required for Each Demand Level**	**Points Awarded**
High Demand Activities	Leadership as a director of a program, institute or center, program coordinator, or officer of the Faculty Senate or Faculty Federation	Meeting minutes where available OR	8 points/activity
Eg. 30 hours or more	Chairperson of a department		
	Chairperson of a department, college, or university committee	Product or output of effort (e.g., report) or other similar documentation OR	
	Active member of a university, college, or departmental committee requiring significant hours and effort expended (e.g., Faculty Senate Steering Committee)	Letter from committee chairperson attesting to contribution made OR	
	Student advising in the Academic Advising Center of two or more hours a week	Other similar documentation	
	Leadership role in a university, college or department initiative (whether or not there is a formal committee		
	Faculty officer in Beta Gamma Sigma or other student honorary society		
	Other comparable activity requiring significant hours and effort expended		

Moderate Demand Activities	Liaison with outside organizations and work in interdisciplinary programs	Meeting minutes where available OR	4 points/activity
	Member of a university, college, or department committee, body, or advisory board	Letter from committee chairperson attesting to contribution made OR	
	Member of a university, college, or department initiative (whether or not there is a formal committee)	Product or output of effort (e.g., report) OR	
	Student academic advising in the Academic Advising Center of one hour per week	Other similar documentation	
	Other comparable activity requiring similar hours and effort expended		
Low Demand Activities	Speaker at New Faculty Consortium	Other similar documentation	2 points/activity
	Speaker at an Open House		
	Advisor at Transfer, Walk-in, or Freshman advising		
	Participant in Discovery Day		
	Recruiter of potential UMass Dartmouth students at high schools and community colleges		
	Participant in other admissions programs		
	Faculty sponsor for campus clubs and associations		

Attendance Only Activities	Attendance at university, college, or department functions other than regular department or college meetings e.g., graduation, open houses, convocation, and external prominent campus speakers)	No documentation required	1 point/activity

The Management and Marketing Department wants assistant professors to focus their time and effort on teaching and scholarship/professional service. Thus, for promotion to associate professor with tenure, faculty members must earn an average score of 8 points or above per year in order to get a satisfactory rating. The following point system will be used to evaluate faculty in this category.

Rating	Points	
Excellent	24 or more points	per year
Very Good	16 - 23 points	per year
Satisfactory	8 - 15 points	per year
Unsatisfactory	< 8 points	per year

SECTION FOUR: PUBLIC SERVICE

Public Service includes participation in community affairs and consultation associated with one's area of professional competence. In the spirit of service, it is assumed that these activities, for the most part, are non-remunerated or non-compensated activities.

The points awarded for Public Service reflect an amount of time devoted to a particular activity or activities. It is recommended that faculty members provide appropriate documentation (i.e.: letter from the agency or group) to support their request for consideration in this category. Thus, for promotion to associate professor with tenure, faculty members must earn an average score of 2 points in order to get a satisfactory rating.

High Demand Activities - 8 points/activity– An expenditure of time equal or exceeding 60 hours per academic year, per activity.
For example, leadership of a program servicing the public; organizing a conference for general public attendance; elected member of a city or town governance board

Moderate Demand Activities – 4 points/activity – An expenditure of time equaling or exceeding 30 hours per academic year, per activity.
For example, membership in a committee for a community organization; participant in a program serving the public; volunteer consultancy for a public group or board; chairing a committee for a community organization; developing or maintaining a web site or other forms of publicly accessible data sources that can benefit the business community; community based research projects done through class

Low Demand Activities – 2 points/activity – An expenditure of time equaling or exceeding 15 hours per academic year, per activity.

For example, minor volunteer consultancy for a public group or board; participation at a one-day public activity or meeting; one-time activity with a public group or board.

Public Service Ratings

Excellent	8 or more points	per year
Very Good	4 to 7 points	per year
Satisfactory	2 to 3 points	per year
Unsatisfactory	< 2 points	per year

Approved

UMass | Dartmouth

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor is based on a higher level of achievement and recognition than for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. The Department of Mechanical Engineering will use the following criteria as typical performance indicators in evaluating the qualifications of candidates for promotion and will assign ratings of excellent, very good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory as required by the faculty federation agreement. All the evaluation metrics listed here are based on activities after the faculty has attained tenure.

1.1. Teaching Effectiveness & Advising

The Mechanical Engineering Department requires the candidate to present the following evidence in this category to support the faculty member's application for promotion:

Evidence Collected by Chair/FEC

a) Complete set of student evaluations in all courses taught. Every effort on the part of the faculty should be made to ensure participation of majority of the students in the evaluation process. Chairs will ensure that all faculty will have opportunities to teach courses at several levels and of several sizes, so that the faculty member has had the opportunity to teach a reasonable number of courses to a reasonable number of students.

b) A comparison of student evaluation of the faculty candidate with those of other faculty who taught similar courses with similar sizes and at similar levels;

c) If available, exit interview comments made by graduating seniors;

d) Complete set of peer evaluations developed during class visitations by the chair and members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) (See attached Faculty Peer Evaluation Forms);

e) Complete record of advising of students majoring in the department and informal advising of students enrolled in the faculty member's own classes, and a list of graduate student advisees. A list of advisees assigned to the faculty member and a list of those advised on a regular basis will assist in evaluation of the advising activity. The FEC will conduct a survey of the faculty member's advisees with an appropriate questionnaire that reflects: willingness to answer class-related questions, knowledge about the curricula, service of providing accurate course-planning information, service of

providing letters of recommendation upon request, and effective mentoring of student researchers;

f) Solicited comments or letters from at least five alumni, holding the BS or MS degree from the department, who are familiar with the faculty member's teaching and advising.

Evidence that should be presented by the candidate

g) A list of graduate and undergraduate research advisees, their projects and any presentations, awards or publications resulting from the research since the award of tenure.

Possible Additional Evidence that may be Collected/Provided by Candidate

h) Evidence of continuous course improvement, including particularly the development and successful delivery of new courses should be presented. The candidate should in addition show evidence of any innovation or creative approaches in delivering the subject material. He/she should indicate whether the courses have been enriched by the inclusion of modern engineering experiences and the use of information technology for the delivery of the material. The candidate should provide course material data in the same format required by ABET, including samples of student work from each course taught: course outline, policy statement, exams, homework, projects, reports, etc.

i) Evidence of effective research advising demonstrating student success through papers published with UMass Dartmouth students, off campus student research presentations, student research awards, and student placement in research programs outside of UMass Dartmouth.

j) Examples of success of students advised by the faculty member in national competitions, undergraduate student paper presentations or exceptional class projects.

CRITERIA FOR RATINGS IN TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND ADVISING

A determination of "**Satisfactory**" shall be made if all the following outcomes are met:

a) A student weighted average student evaluation score of at least 3.0/5.0 in the overall rating category.
b) The candidate attended all assigned classes for instruction except for valid medical excuses or when the chair was notified of the absence in advance and approved arrangements for coverage.
c) The candidate carried out his/her academic advising duties in an acceptable

manner: by being available to students during convenient office hours; by a willingness to answer class-related questions; by being knowledgeable about the curricula and by providing accurate course planning information; by providing letters of recommendation upon request.

d) Keep mandated office hours as outlined in the contract; help students in their class related questions.
e) The candidate actively participated in ABET course assessment practices.
f) The candidate's course grades were turned in on time without intervention by the chair or other administration officials.

Failure to meet any of the above criteria will be expected to result in a rating of "Unsatisfactory".

A determination of "**Very Good**" shall be made if all of the criteria for satisfactory are met and the following additional outcomes are achieved:

All of the criteria in this section:

a) A student weighted average student evaluation score of at least 3.5/5.0 in the overall rating category since the award of tenure.
b) Graduation of at least three MS student advisees OR one PhD student advisee and one MS student advisee.
c) Publication of at least three student authored or co-authored journal publications by the candidate's research advisees. The Department recognizes the advising effort by the candidate in authoring papers with research advisees.

AND at least two of the following

d) Evidence is presented that demonstrates the candidate played an active role in academic advising: by being available to students during convenient office hours; by a willingness to answer class-related questions; by being knowledgeable about the curricula and by providing accurate course-planning information; by providing letters of recommendation upon request.
e) Extremely favorable comments or letters from alumni.
f) Evidence is presented showing initiative and follow-through execution for the development or improvement of course materials and a demonstrated commitment to a process of continuous improvement.
g) Evidence of success of graduate or undergraduate research advisees.

A determination of "**Excellent**" shall be made upon meeting the requirements for "Satisfactory" and "Very Good" and meeting one of the two sets of additional outcomes:

I. All of the criteria in this section:

a) A student weighted SET rating of 4.0 or greater in overall rating for all courses taught.
b) Graduation of at least four MS student advisees OR one PhD student advisee and two MS student advisees.
c) Publication of at least four student authored or co-authored journal publications by the candidate's research advisees. The Department recognizes the advising effort by the candidate in authoring papers with research advisees.

AND at least two of the following

d) Evidence is presented that demonstrates the candidate played an exceptionally active role in academic advising: by being available to students beyond convenient office hours; by a willingness to answer class-related questions and improve student learning and promote student academic success; by being knowledgeable about the curricula and by providing accurate course-planning information; by providing letters of recommendation upon request.
e) Extremely favorable comments or letters from alumni.
f) Evidence is presented showing initiative and follow-through execution for the development or improvement of course materials and a demonstrated commitment to a process of continuous improvement.
g) Evidence of success of graduate or undergraduate research advisees.

OR

II. All of the criteria in this section:

a) Overall student evaluation scores in the top quartile of the department in required undergraduate courses in at least two out of three years immediately preceding application for promotion.
b) A student weighted SET rating of at least 4.0 in overall rating for all courses taught.
c) Graduation of at least four MS student advisees OR one PhD student advisee and two MS student advisees.
d) Publication of at least four student authored or co-authored journal publications by the candidate's research advisees. The Department recognizes the advising effort by the candidate in authoring papers with research advisees.

1.2. Scholarship and Professional Activities

The mechanical engineering department expects increased research momentum post tenure and thus an increase in research productivity and impact. Evidence may include: peer-reviewed publications in archival journals/monographs of high quality and impact, publications in refereed conference proceedings, chapters in edited volumes, invited presentations at technical meetings and workshops, patents

and copyrights, research awards and citations, and procuring competitive external grant support. Examples of professional activities may include but are not limited to leadership in professional societies, conference organization, editorships of high-quality journals, service on grant review panels, service on accrediting bodies and consulting activity.

A determination of "**Satisfactory**" shall be made upon meeting all of the following outcomes:

a) At least ***four*** journal papers based on the research work performed at UMASSD published in refereed professional journals recognized by the FEC as major journals in the candidate's field of research, with at least ***three*** journal papers published with UMASSD students.
b) Sustained level of presentations/publications in proceedings of recognized conferences in the field.
c) Research expenditure of ***$200,000*** (excluding equipment donation), significant portion of which should come from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations (for example, NSF, DOE, DOD, NASA, NIH, etc.), and for which the faculty member has spending authority OR research expenditures for the four years preceding application for promotion that are greater than the average for faculty expenditures in the college of engineering over that period.
d) The grant amount received from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations should be equivalent to the funding required to support at least ***five*** full-time graduate student-semesters on external grants, including the salary, tuition and indirect cost.
e) Competitive grants for major research equipment as well as high performance computing time obtained under competitive category should be considered as a part of research funding. However, such grants will not be considered as a complete substitute for supporting graduate students or towards a major part of the research funding.

A determination of "**Very Good**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

a) At least ***five*** journal papers based on the research work performed at UMASSD published in refereed professional journals recognized by the FEC as major journals in the candidate's field of research, with at least ***three*** journal papers published with UMASSD students.
b) Sustained level of presentations/publications in proceedings of recognized conferences in the field.
c) Research expenditure of at least ***$250,000*** (excluding equipment donation), significant portion of which should come from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations (for example, NSF, DOE, DOD, NASA, NIH, etc.), and for which the faculty member has spending authority OR research expenditures for the four years preceding application for promotion that are ***two*** times greater than the average for faculty expenditures in the college of

engineering over that period.

d) The grant amount received from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations should be equivalent to the funding required to support at least ***eight*** full-time graduate student-semesters on external grants, including the salary, tuition and indirect cost.
e) Competitive grants for major research equipment as well as high performance computing time obtained under competitive category should be considered as a part of research funding. However, such grants will not be considered as a complete substitute for supporting graduate students or towards a major part of the research funding.

A determination of "**Excellent**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

a) At least ***seven*** journal papers based on the research work performed at UMASSD published in refereed professional journals recognized by the FEC as major journals in the candidate's field of research, with at least ***four*** journal papers published with UMASSD students.
b) Sustained level of presentations/publications in proceedings of recognized conferences in the field.
c) Research expenditure of at least ***$325,000*** (excluding equipment donation), significant portion of which should come from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations (for example, NSF, DOE, DOD, NASA, NIH, etc.), and for which the faculty member has spending authority OR research expenditures for the four years preceding application for promotion that are ***three*** times greater than the average for faculty expenditures in the college of engineering over that period.
d) The grant amount received from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations should be equivalent to the funding required to support at least ***ten*** full-time graduate student-semesters on external grants, including the salary, tuition and indirect cost.
e) Competitive grants for major research equipment as well as high performance computing time obtained under competitive category should be considered as a part of research funding. However, such grants will not be considered as a complete substitute for supporting graduate students or towards a major part of the research funding.

Note 1: Refereed professional journals means peer reviewed journals. An acceptable publication is defined as a paper with the candidate as the first author, corresponding author or co-author with a graduate student. If the candidate is not the first, senior or the corresponding author, he/she should provide additional evidence showing that the candidate's contribution was significant. Additionally all publications must include UMass Dartmouth affiliation in order to be considered part of the promotion package. Citation numbers and impact factor of journals should be mentioned.

Note 2: Collaborative work is encouraged since collaborative activities are

increasingly important nationally, in both teaching and research. For collaborative activities evidence should establish clearly the candidate's proportion of involvement in, and specific and distinctive contribution to, each element of activity. This may include development of research grants, projects, joint publications, involvement in, or responsibility for team teaching, participation in interdisciplinary efforts and research centers, etc.

Note 3: Above publications and grants are based on the work accomplished by an associate professor over the six years preceding promotion application while working at UMass Dartmouth. For faculty coming to UMass Dartmouth from other institutions promotion to professor will be based only on the work performed after their arrival at UMD.

Note 4: Books and Patents - the FEC, Chair, and the Dean may give credit for books published or patents obtained to substitute for some of the publication expectations in the above criteria, but this is wholly at their discretion and is not guaranteed.

1.3. University Service

If the candidate elects to offer this category for evaluation, the Mechanical Engineering Department requires the candidate to present evidence in the following areas:

a) Active service including demonstrated leadership on committees at the departmental, college, and university levels, along with documentation on the frequency of meetings;

b) Meaningful contributions to Open Houses, Orientation, and other major events;

c) Effective outreach or community programs that enhance the reputation and visibility of the University;

d) Sustained support of professional and non-professional student organizations (ASME, SAE, SME, SWE, United Sisters and Brothers, etc.);

A determination of "Excellent" shall be made provided the candidate makes contributions in (a) with significant leadership role plus meaningful contributions in three other categories.

A determination of "Very Good" shall be made provided the candidate makes contributions in (a) with significant leadership role plus meaningful contribution in two other categories.

A determination of "Satisfactory" shall be made provided the candidate makes meaningful contributions in any two of the above categories.

1.4. Public Service

If the candidate elects to offer this category for evaluation, the Mechanical Engineering Department requires the candidate to present evidence in the following areas:

a) Active community service related to one's area of professional expertise, including documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.;
b) Other active community service including demonstrated leadership, along with documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.

A determination of "Excellent" shall be made provided the candidate plays a significant role in both of the above areas with very high level of activity.

A determination of "Very Good" shall be made provided the candidate plays a significant role in either of the two areas with very high level of activity.

A determination of "Satisfactory" shall be made provided the candidate performs either of the two (2) above activities.

Approved

UMass | Dartmouth

MECHANICAL ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

Criteria for Tenure

The Department of Mechanical Engineering will use the following criteria as typical performance indicators in evaluating the qualifications of candidates for tenure and will assign ratings of excellent, very good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory as required by the faculty federation agreement.

1.1. Teaching Effectiveness & Advising

The Mechanical Engineering Department requires the tenure candidate to present the following evidence in this category to support the faculty member's application for tenure:

Evidence Collected by Chair/FEC

a) Complete set of student evaluations in all courses taught. Number of students providing evaluations has to be large enough to make the results statistically meaningful. This will require the faculty member to have had the opportunity to teach a reasonable number of courses to a reasonable number of students. Chairs will ensure that all faculty will have opportunities to teach courses at several levels and of several sizes. If the assignment is not made, the faculty member should ask for such an assignment.

b) A comparison of student evaluation of the faculty candidate with those of other faculty who taught similar courses with similar sizes and at similar levels;

c) If available, exit interview comments made by graduating seniors;

d) Complete set of peer evaluations developed during class visitations by the chair and members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) (See attached Faculty Peer Evaluation Forms);

e) Complete record of advising of students majoring in the department and students enrolled in the faculty member's own classes, and a list of graduate student advisees. A list of advisees assigned to the faculty member and a list of those advised on a regular basis will assist in evaluation of this activity. The FEC will conduct a survey of the faculty member's advisees with an appropriate questionnaire that reflects: willingness to answer class-related questions, knowledge about the curricula, service of providing accurate course-planning information, service of providing letters of recommendation upon request, and effective mentoring of student researchers;

f) Solicited comments or letters from at least five alumni, holding the BS or MS degree from the department, who are familiar with the faculty member's teaching and advising;

Evidence that should be presented by the candidate

g) A list of graduate and undergraduate research advisees, their projects and any presentations, awards or publications resulting from the research.

Possible Additional Evidence that may be Collected/Provided by Candidate

h) Evidence of continuous course improvement, including particularly the development and successful delivery of new courses should be presented. The candidate should in addition show evidence of any innovation or creative approaches in delivering the subject material. He/she should indicate whether the courses have been enriched by the inclusion of modern engineering experiences and the use of information technology for the delivery of the material. The candidate should provide course material data in the same format required by ABET, including samples of student work from each course taught: course outline, policy statement, exams, homework, projects, reports, etc.

i) Evidence of effective research advising indicating student success including papers published by UMass Dartmouth students, off campus student research presentations, student research awards, and student placement in research programs outside of UMass Dartmouth.

j) Examples of success of students advised by the faculty member in national competitions, undergraduate student paper presentations or exceptional class projects.

CRITERIA FOR RATINGS IN TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AND ADVISING

A determination of "**Satisfactory**" shall be made if all the following outcomes are met:

a) A student weighted average student evaluation score of at least 3.0/5.0 in the overall rating category.
b) The candidate attended all assigned classes for instruction except for valid medical excuses or when the chair was notified of the absence in advance and approved arrangements for coverage.
c) The candidate carried out his/her academic advising duties in an acceptable manner which includes providing accurate course planning information and by providing letters of recommendation upon request.
d) Keep mandated office hours as outlined in the contract; help students in their class related questions.

e) The candidate actively participated in ABET course assessment practices.
f) The candidate's course grades were turned in on time without intervention by the chair or other administration officials.

Failure to meet any of the above criteria will be expected to result in a rating of "Unsatisfactory".

A determination of "**Very Good**" shall be made if all of the criteria for satisfactory are met and the following additional outcomes are achieved:

All of the criteria in this section:

a) A student weighted average student evaluation score of at least 3.5/5.0 in the overall rating category.
b) Evidence of continuous teaching improvement through SET ratings and peer evaluation.
c) An overall average rating of 3.5 (on a scale of 1-5) or higher in the four broad areas of the Peer Evaluation Form averaged over all courses taught by the candidate and assessed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee.
d) Graduation of at least two MS student advisees OR one PhD student advisee.
e) Publication of at least two student authored or co-authored journal publications by the candidate's research advisees. The Department recognizes the advising effort by the candidate in authoring papers with research advisees.

AND at least two of the following

f) Evidence is presented that demonstrates the candidate played an exceptionally active role in academic advising: by being available to students during convenient office hours; by a willingness to answer class-related questions; by being knowledgeable about the curricula and by providing accurate course-planning information; by providing letters of recommendation upon request.
g) Extremely favorable comments or letters from alumni.
h) Evidence is presented showing a very high level of performance in the development or improvement of course materials and a demonstrated commitment to a process of continuous improvement.
i) Evidence of success of graduate or undergraduate research advisees post graduation from UMass Dartmouth.

A determination of "**Excellent**" shall be made upon meeting the requirements for "Satisfactory" and "Very Good" and meeting one of the two sets of additional outcomes:

I. All of the criteria in this section:

a) A student weighted SET rating of 4.0 or greater in overall rating for all courses taught.
b) An overall average rating of 4.0 (on a scale of 1-5) or higher in the four broad areas of the Peer Evaluation Form averaged over all courses taught by the candidate and assessed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee.
c) Evidence in peer evaluation and SET rating of continuous improvement.
d) Graduation of at least three MS student advisees OR one PhD student advisee and one MS student advisee.
e) Publication of at least three student authored or co-authored journal publications by the candidate's research advisees. The Department recognizes the advising effort by the candidate in authoring papers with research advisees.

AND at least two of the following

f) Evidence is presented that demonstrates the candidate played an exceptionally active role in academic advising: by being available to students during convenient office hours; by a willingness to answer class-related questions; by being knowledgeable about the curricula and by providing accurate course-planning information; by providing letters of recommendation upon request.
g) Extremely favorable comments or letters from alumni.
h) Evidence is presented showing a very high level of performance in the development or improvement of course materials and a demonstrated commitment to a process of continuous improvement.
i) Evidence of success of graduate or undergraduate research advisees post graduation from UMass Dartmouth.

OR

II. All of the criteria in this section:

a) Overall student evaluation scores in the top quartile of the department in required undergraduate courses in at least two out of three years immediately preceding application for tenure.
b) A student weighted SET rating of at least 4.0 in overall rating for all courses taught.
c) Evidence in peer evaluation of continuous improvement and adoption of modern teaching practice.
d) Graduation of at least three MS student advisees OR one PhD student advisee and one MS student advisee.
e) Publication of at least three student authored or co-authored journal publications by the candidate's research advisees. The Department recognizes the advising effort by the candidate in authoring papers with research advisees.

1.2. Scholarship and Professional Activities

Funded research carries more weight than professional activities for a faculty member seeking tenure. Accordingly, the Mechanical Engineering Department requires the tenure candidate to present evidence of the items listed below to support the faculty member's application for tenure. Evidence may include: peer-reviewed publications in archival journals/monographs of high quality and impact, publications in refereed conference proceedings, chapters in edited volumes, invited presentations at technical meetings and workshops, patents and copyrights, research awards and citations, and procuring competitive external grant support. Examples of professional activities may include but are not limited to leadership in professional societies, conference organization, editorships of high-quality journals, service on grant review panels, service on accrediting bodies and consulting activity.

A determination of "**Satisfactory**" shall be made upon meeting all of the following outcomes:

a) At least ***three*** journal papers based on the research work performed at UMASSD published in refereed professional journals recognized by the FEC as major journals in the candidate's field of research, with at least ***two*** journal papers published with UMASSD students.
b) Sustained level of presentations/publications in proceedings of recognized conferences in the field.
c) Research expenditure of ***$150,000*** (excluding equipment donation), significant portion of which should come from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations (for example, NSF, DOE, DOD, NASA, NIH, etc.), and for which the faculty member has spending authority OR research expenditures for the three years preceding application for tenure that are greater than the average for faculty expenditures in the college of engineering over that period.
d) The grant amount received from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations should be equivalent to the funding required to support at least ***four*** full-time graduate student-semesters on external grants, including the salary, tuition and indirect cost.
e) Competitive grants for major research equipment as well as high performance computing time obtained under competitive category should be considered as a part of research funding. However, such grants will not be considered as a complete substitute for supporting graduate students or towards a major part of the research funding.

A determination of "**Very Good**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

a) At least ***four*** journal papers based on the research work performed at UMASSD published in refereed professional journals recognized by the FEC as major journals in the candidate's field of research, with at least ***two*** journal papers published with UMASSD students.

b) Sustained level of presentations/publications in proceedings of recognized conferences in the field.
c) Research expenditure of at least ***$200,000*** (excluding equipment donation), significant portion of which should come from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations (for example, NSF, DOE, DOD, NASA, NIH, etc.), and for which the faculty member has spending authority OR research expenditures for the three years preceding application for tenure that are ***two*** times greater than the average for faculty expenditures in the college of engineering over that period.
d) The grant amount received from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations should be equivalent to the funding required to support at least ***six*** full-time graduate student-semesters on external grants, including the salary, tuition and indirect cost.
e) Competitive grants for major research equipment as well as high performance computing time obtained under competitive category should be considered as a part of research funding. However, such grants will not be considered as a complete substitute for supporting graduate students or towards a major part of the research funding.

A determination of "**Excellent**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

a) At least ***five*** journal papers based on the research work performed at UMASSD published in refereed professional journals recognized as major journals by the FEC in the candidate's field of research, with at least ***three*** journal papers published with UMASSD students.
b) Sustained level of presentations/publications in proceedings of recognized conferences in the field.
c) Research expenditure of at least ***$250,000*** (excluding equipment donation), significant portion of which should come from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations (for example, NSF, DOE, DOD, NASA, NIH, etc.), and for which the faculty member has spending authority OR research expenditures for the three years preceding application for tenure that are ***three*** times greater than the average for faculty expenditures in the college of engineering over that period.
d) The grant amount received from nationally recognized competitive funding organizations should be equivalent to the funding required to support at least ***eight*** full-time graduate student-semesters on external grants, including the salary, tuition and indirect cost.
e) Competitive grants for major research equipment as well as high performance computing time obtained under competitive category should be considered as a part of research funding. However, such grants will not be considered as a complete substitute for supporting graduate students or towards a major part of the research funding.

Note 1: Refereed professional journals means peer reviewed journals. An acceptable publication is defined as a paper with the candidate as the first author,

corresponding author or co-author with a graduate student. If the candidate is not the first, senior or the corresponding author, he/she should provide additional evidence showing that the candidate's contribution was significant. Additionally all publications must include UMass Dartmouth affiliation in order to be considered part of the tenure package. Impact factor of journals should be a strong consideration. Citations should be mentioned where relevant.

Note 2: Above publications and grants are based on the work accomplished by an assistant professor over the six years preceding tenure application while working at UMass Dartmouth. For faculty joining the college with experience and a record from another institution with credit towards tenure, the accomplishments will still be judged based on the work done at while at UMD but will be prorated for the number of years at UMD prior to the tenure application.

Note 3: FEC, Chair, and the Dean can give credit for books published or patents obtained to substitute for some of the above accomplishments, but under no circumstances will tenure be granted to a faculty who does not have both major peer reviewed publications and grant activity.

1.3. University Service

If the tenure candidate elects to offer this category for evaluation, the Mechanical Engineering Department requires the candidate to present evidence in the following areas:

a) Active service including demonstrated leadership on committees at the departmental, college, and university levels, along with documentation on the frequency of meetings;
b) Meaningful contributions to Open Houses, Orientation, and other major events;
c) Effective outreach or community programs that enhance the reputation and visibility of the University;
d) Sustained support of professional and non-professional student organizations (ASME, SAE, SME, SWE, United Sisters and Brothers, etc.);

A determination of "Excellent" shall be made provided the candidate makes contributions in (a) with significant leadership role plus meaningful contributions in three other categories.

A determination of "Very Good" shall be made provided the candidate makes contributions in (a) with significant leadership role plus meaningful contribution in two other categories.

A determination of "Satisfactory" shall be made provided the candidate makes meaningful contributions in any two of the above categories.

1.4. Public Service

If the tenure candidate elects to offer this category for evaluation, the Mechanical Engineering Department requires the candidate to present evidence in the following areas:

a) Active community service related to one's area of professional expertise, including documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.;
b) Other active community service including demonstrated leadership, along with documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.

A determination of "Excellent" shall be made provided the candidate plays a significant role in both of the above areas with very high level of activity.

A determination of "Very Good" shall be made provided the candidate plays a significant role in either of the two areas with very high level of activity.

A determination of "Satisfactory" shall be made provided the candidate performs either of the two (2) above activities.

Approved

Clinical Associate Professor Promotion Standards

For an appointment as a Clinical Associate Professor, a candidate must possess the appropriate degree, and must have had considerable academic or professional experience beyond the level which would warrant an appointment as Clinical Assistant Professor; must have a record of achievement in teaching and advising in clinical/professional programs, scholarship and professional activities, and service that meets the goals of their department, the College, and University. Clinical nursing faculty are also expected to sustain a high level of Clinical/Professional Excellence.

Faculty Federation Agreement – July 1, 2014 (page 185). "Clinical/Professional Excellence" is defined as expertise that reflects currency in evidence-based and/or theory based practice and is validated by the professional community, as determined by the College.

Faculty Federation Agreement – July 1, 2014 (page 191-192). RATINGS FOR PROMOTION RECOMMENDATIONS
All Clinical nursing faculty will be evaluated in the categories of Teaching Effectiveness and Advising, Scholarship and Professional Activities, at least one of the service categories (University Service or Public Service) and evidence of Clinical/Professional Excellence.
1. Recommend: An Excellent in either Teaching Effectiveness and Advising, or Scholarship and Professional Activities and a Very Good in the other two categories and no unsatisfactory ratings
2. Not Recommend: Failure to meet the standards under the "Recommend" rating

Teaching Effectiveness and Advising	
Satisfactory	In order to be eligible for promotion, the candidate must achieve a Very good or Excellent in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising. Failure to meet "very good" rating indicates that candidate is ineligible to be granted promotion.
Very Good	***To achieve a rating of "Very good", a candidate:*** 1. Assumes a variety of assigned classroom and clinical course assignments to meet the CON needs. 2. Has a cumulative mean student evaluation score of "very good" or better. 3. Receives ratings of "very good" or better from a senior faculty observer. 4. If applicable, uses student evaluation feedback to make changes to the course design. 5. Uses reflective teaching practices to revise course assignments, readings and teaching/learning strategies. 6. Creatively utilizes evidence-based and innovative strategies to improve student outcomes in the classroom and clinical environment. 7. Demonstrates the integration of a variety of teaching methods in assigned courses. 8. Completes course materials and evaluation of classroom/clinical learning in a timely manner. 9. Participates in an OFD or CITS program to improve teaching effectiveness. ***Advising*** 10. Engages in the College advising processes designed to maximize student retention and progression, including but not limited to advising students on course selections and campus life, and socializing students to professional nursing 11. Provides mentorship to an undergraduate or graduate student. 12. Provides mentorship to a new faculty member (if available).

Excellent	***To achieve a rating of "Excellent", a candidate:*** 1. Assumes a variety of assigned classroom and clinical course assignments to meet the CON needs. 2. Has a cumulative mean student evaluation score of excellent. 3 Receives ratings of "excellent" from a senior faculty observer. 4 Course materials and evaluation of classroom/clinical learning in a timely manner. 5 If applicable, uses student evaluation feedback to make changes to course design. 6 Demonstrates the integration of a variety of teaching methods in assigned courses. 7 Focuses on improving teaching effectiveness demonstrated by attending an on-campus (OFD or CITS) program focused on improving teaching effectiveness; or attending a regional/national conference focused on improving teaching effectiveness; or completing a course, or CEU program focused on improving teaching effectiveness 8 Provides a presentation to faculty based on a teaching/learning program, conference, or course attended. ***Advising*** 11. Engages in the College advising processes designed to maximize student retention and progression, including but not limited to advising students' on course selections and campus life, and socialize students to professional nursing. 12. Provides mentorship to an undergraduate or graduate student. 13. Provides mentorship to a new faculty member, focused on improving teaching effectiveness (if available).

Clinical Associate Professor Promotion Standards continued

In accordance with the Faculty Federation Contract, Article XVI section B (effective July 1, 2014, p. 185), for an appointment as a Clinical Associate Professor, a candidate must have a record of achievement in scholarship and professional activities, and evidence of a high level of Clinical/Professional Excellence that is validated by the professional community, as determined by the College.

Scholarship & Professional Activities	
Satisfactory	In order to be eligible for promotion, the candidate must achieve a Very Good or Excellent in Scholarship and Professional activities. Failure to meet "very good" rating indicates that a candidate is ineligible to be granted promotion.
Very Good	***To achieve a rating of "Very Good", a candidate:*** 1. Has four presentations at regional and/or national, and/or international level clinical or professional conferences; with at least one oral presentation. 2. Has two publications (book chapter, practice guideline, clinical pathway standard, peer reviewed research or scholarly/professional paper). AND ***Professional activities*** 3. Maintains specialty certification. 4. Participates in practice committees and/or boards within professional organizations. 5. Sustains committee level participation in professional organizations.
Excellent	***To achieve a rating of "Excellent", a candidate:*** 1. Has five presentations at regional and/or national and/or international level clinical or professional conferences; at least two oral presentations 2. Has three publications (book chapter, practice guideline, clinical pathway standard, peer reviewed research or scholarly/professional paper 3. Has one grant funded or submitted. **Professional Activities** 4. Maintains specialty certification. 5. Has sustained committee level participation in regional, national or international practice committees or professional organizations. 6. Has a leadership role in a regional or national professional organization.

Definitions: Scholarship

**Leadership*: Membership on a national nursing/professional committee or a designated leader role in a local or regional organization. Venues for presentation with examples: *Local*: UMass campus such as poster presented through the OFD or presentations to faculty or doctoral students, Sigma Chapter. *Regional*: Presentations at regional events such as ENRS, Practice partners, Theta Kappa or other Sigma Chapters in the region, Organization of Nurse Leaders, St. Anselm's Educator Conference **National*: Examples may include NLN, AACN, American Heart Association, Sigma Theta Tau International Biennial convention or national nursing specialty organizations *International*: Any presentation outside of the USA

Clinical Associate Professor Promotion Standards continued

Service to Academic Community	
Satisfactory	***To achieve a rating of "Satisfactory", a candidate:*** 1. Actively participates in Faculty Organization and Department Committee; takes on committee assigned task or responsibility and support of student activities.
Very Good	***To achieve a rating of "Very Good", a candidate:*** 1. Is a member in good standing of College and Department Committee demonstrated by active participation. 2. Assumes specific committee assignment/project and completes assignment in a timely manner.
Excellent	***To achieve a rating of "Excellent", a candidate:*** 1. Demonstrates a record of a significant role and contribution to the department & college. Such a record includes assuming a leadership roles in the department/college through a variety of various roles[3]

[1] recruitment events, B/P screening, pinning, graduation, White Coat ceremony
[2] attendance/provides ideas and commentary in Department and Faculty Organization meeting
[3] Examples: committee chair, project leader, task force leader, writer of reports for College
[4] Examples: Curriculum, University Studies, OFD, Faculty Senate, Senate committees, IRB

Public Services	
Satisfactory	***To achieve a rating of "Satisfactory", a candidate must have:*** 1. Active involvement in at least one community group.
Very Good	***To achieve a rating of "Very Good", a candidate must have:*** 1. Requires a record of consistent and significant service* to one or more community organizations.
Excellent	***To achieve a rating of "Excellent", a candidate must have:*** 1. Requires a record of consistent and significant service and demonstrated leadership** in one or more community organizations.

Definitions: Public Services
Involves the use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, or governmental agencies other than UMD by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise or other professional assistance. *Candidate may opt to not be rated in public service.
*Service may include member of a standing committee in town, local non-profit chapter, or community advisory group.
**Leadership may include chair of a standing town committee, sub-group chair of a local non-profit chapter, chair of a community advisory group.

College of Nursing – Standards for Promotion to Professor

Approved

For an appointment as a Professor, a candidate must possess the appropriate terminal degree (PhD), have a record of achievement sufficient to have gained substantial recognition on and off campus from scholars and professionals in his or her field, and must show significant potential for continuing professional achievement, as supported by evidence detailed in the dossier.

Promotion to the rank of Professor is based upon the understanding that achievements in the areas of teaching effectiveness and advising, scholarship, practice and professional activities, and service will be at a higher level than the expectations for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Decisions regarding promotion to the rank of Professor will include these three categories as well as Public Service and must include external reviews by peers in the field.

09/16 MOU: Faculty who were tenured/promoted to Associate Professor (through UMass Dartmouth) on or before September 1, 2013 will use the previous standards used for promotion or current practice. Faculty who were tenured/promoted to Associate Professor on or after September 1, 2014 will be subject to the approved promotion standards.

Faculty Federation Agreement – July 1, 2014 (page 71). RATINGS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS
The following ratings for the evaluation of faculty are established for promotion and tenure recommendations:
1. Recommended: An Excellent in either Teaching Effectiveness and Advising or Scholarship and Professional Activities and a Very Good in the other of these two categories and no unsatisfactory ratings.
2. Not Recommended: Failure to meet the standards under the "Recommended" rating.

Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

Candidates for promotion to Professor will have demonstrated that they are effective teachers who engage in activities that contribute to the discovery, transmission, and application of knowledge and skills in the classroom and individualized instruction at the undergraduate and/or graduate levels.

Year	Satisfactory	Very good	Excellent
Promotion **Teaching Effectiveness and Advising**	In order to be eligible for promotion to Professor, the candidate must achieve a Very good or Excellent in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising. Failure to meet "very good" criteria indicates that candidates are ineligible to be granted promotion to Professor.	To achieve a rating of "Very good" candidates must have evidence of a sustained record of teaching over the level that earned the rank of Associate Professor and includes: 1. Assumes a variety of assigned classroom and clinical course assignments to meet the CON needs. 2. Has a cumulative mean student evaluation score at benchmark or above.	To achieve a rating of "Excellent" candidates must have evidence of a sustained record of teaching over the level that earned the rank of Associate Professor, plus leadership in curricular development and mentoring faculty or the equivalent contribution and includes: 1. Assumes a variety of assigned classroom and clinical course assignments to meet the CON needs.

		3. Receives a rating of "very good" from a peer or senior faculty observer. 4. Completes course materials and evaluation of classroom/clinical learning in a timely manner. 5. Develops course materials as appropriate. 6. If applicable, uses student evaluation feedback to make changes to the course design. 7. Demonstrates the integration of a variety of teaching methods in assigned courses. 8. Participates in professional development activities to improve teaching effectiveness. **Advising** 9. Provides mentorship to an Undergraduate or Graduate student. 10. Provides mentorship to a faculty member. 11. Serves as doctoral chair and/or committee member. 12. Advises students on course selections, campus life and socialize students to professional nursing.	2. Has cumulative mean student evaluation scores above benchmark. 3. Receives a rating of "excellent" from a peer or senior faculty observer. 4. Completes course materials and evaluation of classroom/clinical learning in a timely manner. 5. Takes a leadership role in curricular development. 6. If applicable, uses student evaluation feedback to make changes to the course design. 7. Demonstrates the integration of a variety of teaching methods in assigned courses. 8. Attends and/or presents at a professional development program focused on improving teaching effectiveness; OR attends/presents at a regional/national conference focused on improving teaching effectiveness; OR completes a course, or CEU program focused on improving teaching effectiveness. **Advising** 9. Provides mentorship to an Undergraduate or Graduate student. 10. Takes a leadership role in mentoring faculty members. 11. Serves as a doctoral chair and/or committee member. 12. Advises students on course selections, campus life and socialize students to professional nursing. 13. Performs a peer-mentoring evaluation.

Candidates for promotion to Professor will have demonstrated a sustained and continuing record of contributions to the growth and dissemination of knowledge in their respective area of research. Pursuant to the Agreement between the Board of Trustees of the University of Massachusetts and the American Federation of Teachers Local 1895, AFL-CIO Faculty Federation (effective July 1, 2014) faculty or professionals external to the university who are experts in the candidate's field will review the candidate's scholarship, assessing its contribution to the field as well as his/her recognition as a scholar in the field.

It is understood that teaching or service may contribute to professional recognition, but does not substitute for evidence of sustained achievement in scholarship or practice for promotion to the rank of Professor.

Scholarship & Professional Activities

Year	Satisfactory	Very good	Excellent
Promotion **Scholarship & Professional Activities**	In order to be eligible for promotion to Professor, the candidate must achieve a Very good or Excellent in Scholarship & Professional Activities. Failure to meet "very good" criteria indicates that candidates are ineligible to be granted promotion to Professor.	To achieve a rating of "Very Good" candidates must have an increase in the number and/or quality of publication over the level that earned the rank of Associate Professor. Evidence of a continued record of scholarship and professional activities must include the following achievements since the award of tenure: 1. Five articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals and submitted at least 1 additional manuscript. 2. One published or submitted manuscript may be substituted with a peer-reviewed book chapter or monograph. 3. Receipt of one peer-reviewed funded grant and submitted for 1 external peer-reviewed grant proposal. 4. Presentation of a minimum of 4 peer - reviewed papers or posters at local,	To achieve a rating of "Excellent" candidates must amass a body of scholarly work that has earned the faculty member recognition in the field over the level that earned the rank of Associate Professor. Evidence of a sustained record of distinguished scholarship and professional activities must include the following achievements since the award of tenure: 1. Six articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals and submitted at least 1 additional manuscript. 2. One published or submitted manuscript may be substituted with a peer reviewed book chapter or monograph. 3. Receipt of one externally funded grant, and submission of 2 or more additional external peer-reviewed grant proposals. 4. Presentation of 5 or more peer-reviewed or invited papers or posters at regional, national

		regional, national, or international conferences, at least one at the national/international level. ** **AND** 5. **Professional activities** include one or more of the following activities but are not limited to: • Election to and service in a leadership role in a professional organization • Organization of regional or national meetings • Participation as a peer reviewer for manuscripts or grants • Service on editorial or review boards • Service on accrediting bodies • Consulting activity • Attainment and/or maintenance of professional certification	or international conferences, at least 2 must be at national/international venues. ** **AND** 5. **Professional activities** include two or more of the following activities but are not limited to: • Election to and service in a leadership role in a professional organization • Organization of regional or national meetings • Participation as a peer reviewer for manuscripts or grants • Service on editorial or review boards • Service on accrediting bodies • Consulting activity • Attainment and/or maintenance of professional certification

Definitions: Scholarship*_Leadership_: Membership on a national nursing/professional committee or a designated leader role in a local or regional organization. Venues for presentation with examples: *Local*: UMass campus such as poster presented through the OFD or presentations to faculty or doctoral students, Sigma Chapter. *Regional*: Presentations at regional events such as ENRS, Practice partners, Theta Kappa or other Sigma Chapters in the region, Organization of Nurse Leaders, St. Anselm's Educator Conference ****National*: Examples may include NLN, AACN, American Heart Association, Sigma Theta Tau International Biennial convention or national nursing specialty organizations *International*: Any presentation outside of the USA

Candidates for promotion to Professor will have demonstrated leadership through participation in institutional service to the university that includes work at the department, college and university level and often involves working within university governance bodies or committees that promote the mission and strategic planning of the institution.

Service to Department – College - University

Year	Satisfactory	Very good	Excellent
Promotion **Service to Department/ College/ University**	To achieve a rating of "Satisfactory" candidates must have a record of responsive, willing and effective participation in department, college, and university committees and activities over the level that earned the rank of Associate Professor. 1. Active participation in Faculty Organization and Department Committee. 2. Takes on committee assigned task or responsibility and support of student activities. 3. Continues to engage in University service.	To achieve a rating of "Very Good" candidates must have a record of sustained and timely contributions in department, college, and university committees and activities over the level that earned the rank of Associate Professor. 1. Records as member in good standing of College and Department Committee active participation. 2. Assumes specific committee assignment/project. 3. Demonstrates substantial and sustained contribution to CON activities. [4] 4. Continuing service on a university level committee/taskforce.	To achieve a rating of "Excellent" candidates must have a record of leadership in service to the department, college and/or university over the level that earned the rank of Associate Professor. 1. Demonstrates a record of having a significant role and contribution to the department & college. Such a record includes assuming a leadership role in the department/college/university through various roles[2]. 2. Represents college at recruitment events, and/or participates as chair of a search committee.[1] 3. Supports student academic activities and ceremonies.[1] 4. Sustained role in university service by serving on a committee, taskforce or advisory board.[3] 5. Assumes key leadership positions in CON activities.[4] [1]Recruitment events, B/P screening, pinning, graduation

			[2] Examples: committee chair, project leader, task force leader, writer of reports for College. [3] Examples: Curriculum, US, OFD, Faculty Senate, Senate committees, IRB [4]Examples: Scholarship Day, Open House, White Coat Ceremony, Nurses Pinning, Graduation, Orientation, CCNE accreditation, strategic planning, etc.

Public Service

Public service may involve use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies or units other than UMass Dartmouth, by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise, or other assistance to these entities pro-bono.

Year	Satisfactory	Very good	Excellent
Promotion **Public Service**	To achieve a rating of "Satisfactory" candidates must have a record of willing and effective participation in at least one community service organization.	To achieve a rating of "Very Good" candidates must have a record of sustained and timely contributions in community/public service organizations. Significant service* to one or more community organizations.	To achieve a rating of "Excellent" candidates must have a record of consistent and significant service and demonstrated leadership** in one or more community organizations.

Public Service: *Service may include membership on a standing committee in town, local non-profit chapter, or community advisory group. **Leadership may include chairing of a standing town committee, chairing a sub-group of a local non-profit chapter, chairing a community advisory group.

Approved

College of Nursing – Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

For an appointment as an Associate Professor, a candidate must possess the appropriate terminal degree, and must have had considerable academic or professional experience beyond the level which would warrant an appointment as Assistant Professor; must have a record of achievement sufficient to have gained substantial recognition on and off campus from scholars or professionals in his or her field; and must show promise of continuing professional development and achievement, as supported by evidence detailed in the dossier.

Faculty Federation Agreement – July 1, 2014 (page 71). RATINGS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS
The following ratings for the evaluation of faculty are established for promotion and tenure recommendations:
1. Recommended: An Excellent in either Teaching Effectiveness and Advising or Scholarship and Professional Activities and a Very Good in the other of these two categories and no unsatisfactory ratings.
2. Not Recommended: Failure to meet the standards under the "Recommended" rating.

Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor will have demonstrated that they are effective teachers who engage in activities that contribute to the discovery, transmission and application of knowledge and skills in the classroom and individualized instruction at the undergraduate and/or graduate levels.

Year	Satisfactory	Very good	Excellent
Tenure/ Promotion **Teaching Effective. and Advising**	In order to be eligible for tenure, the candidate must achieve a Very good or Excellent in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising. Failure to meet "very good" criteria indicates the candidate is ineligible to be granted tenure.	To achieve a rating of "Very good" candidates must have evidence of a sustained record of teaching that includes: 1. Assumes a variety of assigned classroom and clinical course assignments to meet the CON needs. 2. Has a cumulative mean student evaluation score of "very good" or better. 3. Receives a rating of "very good" from a peer or senior faculty observer. 4. Completes course materials and evaluation of classroom/clinical learning in a timely manner. 5. If applicable, uses student evaluation	To achieve a rating of "Excellent" candidates must have evidence of a sustained record of teaching that includes: 1. Assumes a variety of assigned classroom and clinical course assignments to meet the CON needs. 2. Has a cumulative mean student evaluation score of "excellent." 3. Receives a rating of "excellent" from a peer or senior faculty observer. 4. Completes course materials and evaluation of classroom/clinical learning in a timely manner, 5. If applicable, uses student evaluation

		feedback to make changes to the course design. 6. Demonstrates the integration of a variety of teaching methods in assigned courses. 7. Participates in an OFD or CITS program to improve teaching effectiveness. **Advising** 8. Provides mentorship to an Undergraduate, Graduate, or PhD student. 9. Provides mentorship to a faculty member. 10. Advises students on course campus life and socialize students to professional nursing.	feedback to make changes to the course design. 6. Demonstrates the integration of a variety of teaching methods in assigned courses. 7. Focuses on improving teaching effectiveness. 8. Attends an on-campus (OFD or CITS) program focused on improving teaching effectiveness; or attends a regional/national conference focused on improving teaching effectiveness; or completes a course, or CEU program focused on improving teaching effectiveness. 9. Provides a Scholarship Series Presentation based on the Teaching/Learning program, conference, or course attended. **Advising** 10. Provides mentorship to an Undergraduate, Graduate, or PhD student. 11. Provides mentorship to a faculty member. 12. Advises students on course selections, campus life and socialize students to professional nursing.

Scholarship & Professional Activities

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor will have demonstrated a record of contributions to the growth and dissemination of knowledge in their respective area of research. Pursuant to the Agreement between the Board of Trustees of the University of Massachusetts and the American Federation of Teachers Local 1895, AFL-CIO Faculty Federation (effective Jul1, 2014) faculty or professional external to the university who are experts in the candidate's field will review the candidate's scholarship, assessing its contribution to the field as well as his/her recognition as scholar in the field.

It is understood that teaching or service may contribute to professional recognition, but does not substitute for evidence of achievement in scholarship or practice for promotion.

Year	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Tenure and Promotion **Scholarship & Professional Activities**	In order to be eligible for tenure, the candidate must achieve a Very good or Excellent in Scholarship and Professional Activities. Failure to meet "very good" criteria indicates the candidate is ineligible to be granted tenure.	To achieve a rating of "Very good" candidates must have a demonstrated record of contributions to the growth and dissemination of knowledge in their respective area of research and engagement in professional activities. Evidence of scholarship and professional activities includes: 1. Four articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals and submitted at least 1 additional manuscript for review. 2. One manuscript submission may be substituted with a peer-reviewed book chapter or monograph. 3. Receives one peer-reviewed funded grant or submits for two peer-reviewed funded grants. 4. Presents a minimum of 4 peer-	To achieve a rating of "Excellent" candidates must have a demonstrated record of contributions to the growth and dissemination of knowledge in their respective area of research and engagement in professional activities. Evidence of scholarship and professional activities includes: 1. Five articles published or accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals and submitted at least 1 additional manuscript for review. 2. One manuscript submission may be substituted with a peer-reviewed book chapter or monograph. 3. Receives one externally funded grant or submits for two externally funded grants. 4. Presents 5 peer-reviewed or invited

		reviewed papers or posters at local, regional, national, or international conferences, at least one at the national/international level. ** **AND** 5. **Professional activities** include one or more of the following activities but are not limited to: • Election to and service in a leadership role in a professional organization • Organization of regional or national meetings • Participation as a peer reviewer for manuscripts or grants • Service on editorial or review boards • Service on accrediting bodies • Consulting activity • Attainment and/or maintenance of professional certification	papers or posters at regional, national or international conferences, at least 2 must be at national/international level. ** **AND** 5. **Professional activities** include two or more of the following activities but are not limited to: • Election to and service in a leadership role in a professional organization • Organization of regional or national meetings • Participation as a peer reviewer for manuscripts or grants • Service on editorial or review boards • Service on accrediting bodies • Consulting activity • Attainment and/or maintenance of professional certification .

Definitions: Scholarship**Leadership*: Membership on a national nursing/professional committee or a designated leader role in a local or regional organization. Venues for presentation with examples: *Local*: UMass campus such as poster presented through the OFD or presentations to faculty or doctoral students, Sigma Chapter. *Regional*: Presentations at regional events such as ENRS, Practice partners, Theta Kappa or other Sigma Chapters in the region, Organization of Nurse Leaders, St. Anselm's Educator Conference ***National*: Examples may include NLN, AACN, American Heart Association, Sigma Theta Tau International Biennial convention or national nursing specialty organizations *International*: Any presentation outside of the USA.

Service to Department-College-University

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor will have demonstrated leadership through participation in institutional service to the university that includes work at the department, college and university level and often involves working within university governance bodies or committees that promote the mission and strategic planning of the institution.

Year	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Tenure/ Promotion **Service to Department/ College/ University**	To achieve a rating of "Satisfactory" candidates must have a record of responsive, willing and effective participation in department, college, and university committees and activities. 1. Active participation in Faculty Organization and Department Committee. 2. Takes on committee assigned task or responsibility and support of student activities. 3. Continues to engage in University service.	To achieve a rating of "Very good" candidates must have a record of and timely contributions in department, college, and university committees and activities: 1. Record as member in good standing with active participation of College and Department Committee 2. Assumes specific committee assignment/project 3. Beginning service on a university level committee/taskforce.	To achieve a rating of "Excellent" candidates must have a record of leadership in service to the department, college and/or university. 1. Demonstrates a record of having a significant role and contribution to the department and college. 2. Assumes a leadership role in the department/college through a variety of roles such as but not limited to: committee chair, project leader, task force leader, writer of reports for College. 3. Represents college at recruitment events (e.g., B/P screening, pinning, graduation) 4. Participates in a search committee (one activity), supports student academic activities and ceremonies. 5. Beginning role in university service by serving on a committee, taskforce or advisory board (e.g., Curriculum, US, OFD, IRB, Faculty Senate, Senate Committees.)

Public Service

Year	Satisfactory	Very Good	Excellent
Tenure/ Promotion **Public Service**	Active Involvement in at least one community group.	Requires a record of consistent and significant service* to one or more community organizations.	Requires a record of consistent and significant service and demonstrated leadership** in one or more community organizations.

Service: Department/ College/University * During the first two contract years, new faculty are expected to limit university service to activities within the Department/College. During subsequent years, more service to the university is encouraged.

Public Service: involves the use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, or governmental agencies other than UMD by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise or other professional assistance.
*Candidate may opt to not be rated in public service.
*Service may include member of a standing committee in town, local non-profit chapter, or community advisory group.
**Leadership may include chair of a standing town committee, sub-group chair of a local non-profit chapter, chair of a community advisory group.

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS DARTMOUTH

Approved

Effective Fall 2018

The Department of Physics will use the following performance standards to evaluate the qualifications of candidates for **promotion to Full Professor** and to assign ratings of Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory, as specified by the Faculty Federation agreement. These ratings are cumulative, based on the candidate's activities record of the previous 6 years or time in rank, and are not necessarily reflective of the ratings on the candidate's annual performance evaluations.

1. Teaching Effectiveness & Advising

The Physics Department requires the following documentation in this category to support the candidate's application for promotion to Full Professor:

Documentation Collected by Chair/Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

- ***(a)*** Complete set of the candidate's annual student evaluations in all courses taught. The overall number of students providing evaluations has to be large enough to make the results statistically meaningful. This will require the faculty member to have had the opportunity to teach a reasonable number of courses to a reasonable number of students. The Chair will ensure that the candidate has had sufficient opportunity to teach courses at various levels, including 100-level, and of various sizes; if the assignment is not made, the faculty member should ask for such an assignment. (See Notes below.)
- ***(b)*** A comparison of the candidate's annual student evaluations with others who have taught similar courses of similar sizes and at similar levels.
- ***(c)*** All written comments on annual student evaluations will be included.
- ***(d)*** Complete set of annual peer teaching evaluations based on classroom visitations by members of the FEC.
- ***(e)*** Complete record of the candidate's program and research advising of undergraduate majors and graduate (M.S. and Ph.D.) students. A list of advisees assigned to the faculty member and a list of those advised on a regular basis will assist in evaluation of this activity. At the time of the promotion request, the FEC will conduct a survey of the faculty member's advisees with an appropriate questionnaire that reflects: willingness to answer program or class-related questions, availability during office hours, knowledge about the curricula, accuracy of course-planning information, service of providing letters of recommendation upon request, and effective mentoring of student researchers.
- ***(f)*** Any other contractually required materials.

Documentation Collected/Provided by Candidate

- ***(g)*** Examples of success of students advised by the candidate in regional or national competitions, undergraduate and graduate student paper presentations, or exceptional class projects. Clear evidence that these successes are directly linked to the candidate's advising.
- ***(h)*** A complete teaching portfolio, giving evidence of continuous course improvement, including the development and successful delivery of new or extensively revised lecture courses and laboratories. In addition, the candidate should show evidence of innovative or creative approaches in delivering the subject material. He/she should indicate specific ways in which courses have been enriched by the inclusion of information about relevant research advances, the use of information technology in content or delivery, or other means. The candidate must include samples of assigned student work from each course taught: course outline and goals, policy statement, exams, homework, projects, reports, etc.
- ***(i)*** Evidence should be included on candidate's knowledge of and inclusion of best instructional practices in the field.
- ***(j)*** Any other contractually required materials.

Note 1: *Numerical scores of teaching effectiveness used below are not rigid standards and the FEC may take other considerations into account – level and nature of courses taught (such as major vs. general education), number of students in the courses, implementation and testing of innovative teaching methods, etc. – to justify any deviation from these standards.*

Note 2: *The FEC will regularly compile a comparative analysis of student evaluations for courses taught in the department. Factors such as the course's level, enrollment, type (required vs. elective vs. general education), content, and faculty instructor's rank will be included in this analysis. The candidate's performance will be compared to these historically based measures.*

Subject to the conditions set out in **Notes 1** and **2** above:

• A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

- ***(i)*** An overall annual student evaluation score (weighted average over all courses taught, based on responses to the question: "Overall, I would rate this instructor as …") of ***4.00 or higher*** (on a scale of 1.00-5.00) plus ***excellent*** written comments on annual student evaluations.
- ***(ii)*** An overall average rating of ***4.00 or higher*** (on a scale of 1.00-5.00) on FEC peer teaching evaluation forms plus ***excellent*** written comments by FEC classroom observers.
- ***(iii)*** ***Excellent*** program- and research advising of undergraduate and graduate (M.S. and Ph.D.) students, including research advising of ***five or more*** students, at least ***two*** of whom have been advised to completion of the master's or Ph.D. degree.
- ***(iv)*** ***Excellent*** development and improvement of curricular materials for all courses taught, as reviewed by peers.

• A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

- ***(i)*** An overall annual student evaluation score (average over all courses taught) of ***3.50-3.99*** (on a scale of 1.00-5.00) plus ***very good*** written comments on annual student evaluations.
- ***(ii)*** An overall average rating of ***3.50-3.99*** (on a scale of 1.00-5.00) on FEC peer teaching evaluation forms plus ***very good*** written comments by FEC classroom observers.
- ***(iii)*** ***Very good*** program- and research advising of undergraduate and graduate (M.S. and Ph.D.) students, including research advising of ***four*** students, at least ***two*** of whom have been advised to completion of the master's or Ph.D. degree.
- ***(iv)*** ***Very good*** development and improvement of curricular materials for all courses taught, as reviewed by peers.

• A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

- ***(i)*** An overall annual student evaluation score (average over all courses taught) of ***3.00-3.49*** (on a scale of 1.00-5.00) plus ***satisfactory*** written comments on annual student evaluations.
- ***(ii)*** An overall average rating of ***3.00-3.49*** (on a scale of 1.00-5.00) on FEC peer teaching evaluation forms plus ***satisfactory*** written comments by FEC classroom observers.
- ***(iii)*** S***atisfactory*** program- and research advising of undergraduate and graduate (M.S. and Ph.D.) students, including research advising of ***three*** students, at least ***one*** of whom has been advised to completion of the master's or Ph.D. degree.
- ***(iv)*** ***Satisfactory*** development and improvement of curricular materials for all courses taught.

A determination of **"Unsatisfactory"** shall be made if the outcomes fail to meet the requirements for a **"Satisfactory"** rating.

2. Scholarship and Professional Activities

Evaluation of performance in this category will be based ***primarily*** on the following factors:

- ***(a)*** International reputation of the researcher in their field. Quality and well-established significance of research and publications (including any scientific software and datasets produced), as evidenced by measures such as assessments by professionals in the candidate's field, reputation of journals in which the candidate's papers appear, Citation Index data, independent reviews, referees' reports, research-based, peer-reviewed advanced books or textbooks addressing forefront topics, references, monographs, and the like. For software and datasets, information on the user community, citations and download statistics could also be used as a measure of impact. If not listed as first author on a publication, the candidate must provide documentation of his/her substantial contribution to the work.
- ***(b)*** Number of research publications in refereed professional journals.
- ***(c)*** Success in accruing external grants (including equipment grants) to bring into the UMASSD research program, in amounts gauged appropriately to the candidate's field. In the case of multiple-investigator awards, the candidate must provide evidence of the share of the funds for which he/she has spending authority.
- ***(d)*** Amount of financial support provided to undergraduate and graduate students in research to undergraduate and graduate students in research by the candidate or external sponsors.

(e) Presentation of research results and similar scholarly activity at major professional conferences.

Evaluation of performance in this category will be based ***to a lesser extent*** on the following factors:

(f) Professional activity in support of the candidate's field.
(g) Other documented accomplishments related to scholarship and professional activities.

Note 1: *The required quantity of publications may be fewer when quality of journals or impact of the publications if very high. The candidate must provide documentation or evidence to demonstrate the high quality or impact of the publications.*

Note 2: *An exception may be made to the required number of journal publications in each rating category below in the cases of a smaller number of very lengthy papers, papers that are widely regarded by external reviewers or Citation Index data as exceptionally significant to the field. In no case will such publications substitute for the majority of the required publications in a given rating category.*

Note 3: *Research papers in refereed conference publications may also be applied to the required number of publications, if the candidate provides substantial evidence that conference publications are a standard medium for dissemination of research in his/her field. The importance of the conference to the field and acceptance rates, will be used as evidence of the quality and impact of the publication.*

Note 4: *Publications and grants cited below are those based on work accomplished primarily at UMASSD. For faculty joining the university with credit towards promotion, the accomplishments will still be judged based on the work done at UMASSD but will be prorated for the number of years at UMASSD leading to the promotion application.*

Note 5: *Under no circumstances will promotion be recommended to a candidate who has no peer-reviewed publications and no external grants.*

Subject to the conditions set out in **Notes 1** through **5** above:

• A determination of "**Excellent**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(i) ***Six or more*** research publications (this may include published open source, scientific code and / or openly-distributed datasets) based on work accomplished primarily while at UMASSD, at least ***five*** of which are in refereed professional journals recognized as major journals in the candidate's field of research.
(ii) Research funding of ***$250,000***, with at least ***$200,000*** coming from external funding agencies, for which the faculty member has spending authority at UMASSD.

(iii) ***Eight or more*** student semesters of funded support from external sources, at least ***six*** of which are for graduate (M.S. and Ph.D.) students.
(iv) A record of publishing with student co-authors.
(v) ***Excellent*** record (***five or more***) of research presentations at major professional conferences over the evaluation period.

• A determination of "**Very Good**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(i) ***Five*** research publications (this may include published open source, scientific code and / or openly-distributed datasets) based on work accomplished primarily while at UMASSD, at least ***four*** of which are in refereed professional journals recognized as major journals in the candidate's field of research
(ii) Research funding of ***$150,000***, with at least ***$100,000*** coming from external funding agencies, for which the faculty member has spending authority at UMASSD.
(iii) ***Six or more*** student semesters of funded support from external sources, at least ***four*** of which are for graduate (M.S. and Ph.D.) students.
(iv) A record of publishing with student co-authors.
(v) ***Good*** record (***four or more)*** of research presentations at major professional conferences, during the evaluation period.

• A determination of "**Satisfactory**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(i) ***Four*** research publications (this may include published open source, scientific code and or openly-distributed datasets) based on work accomplished primarily while at UMASSD, at least ***three*** of which are in refereed professional journals recognized as major journals in the candidate's field of research.
(ii) Research funding of ***$100,000***, with at least ***$50,000*** coming from external funding agencies, for which the faculty member has spending authority at UMASSD.
(iii) ***Four or more*** student semesters of funded support from external sources, at least ***two*** of which are for graduate (M.S. and Ph.D.) students.
(iv) ***Satisfactory*** record of research presentations at major professional conferences.

A determination of **"Unsatisfactory"** shall be made if the outcomes fail to meet the requirements for a **"Satisfactory"** rating. Note that a rating of **"Excellent"** or **"Very Good"** is required for a recommendation for promotion.

3. University Service

If the candidate elects to be evaluated in University Service, the evaluation is based on evidence in the following categories:

(a) Active service, including demonstrated leadership on committees at the department, college, and university levels, along with documentation on the frequency of meetings.
(b) Concrete contributions to student recruitment efforts.

(c) Effective outreach programs that enhance the reputation and visibility of the department, college and university.
(d) Sustained support and mentorship of professional and non-professional student organizations.
(e) Service as director of a university center, Graduate Program Director, etc.

The candidate's rating in University Service is obtained as follows:

A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made if the candidate makes contributions in category ***(a)*** with a significant leadership role, plus meaningful contributions in one other category or substantial contributions to any three categories.

A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made if the candidate makes contributions in category ***(a)*** with a leadership role, plus meaningful contribution in any other category.

A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made if the candidate makes meaningful contributions in any two of the above categories.

A determination of **"Unsatisfactory"** is made if the minimum requirements for a "**Satisfactory**" rating are not met.

4. Public Service

If the candidate elects to be evaluated in Public Service, the evaluation is based on the evidence in the following areas:

(a) Active public service related to the candidate's area of professional expertise, including documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.
(b) Other active public service, including demonstrated leadership, along with documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.

The candidate's rating in Public Service is obtained as follows:

A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made if the candidate plays a very significant role in one of the two above areas with a very high level of activity.

A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made if the candidate plays a significant role in one of the two areas with a high level of activity.

A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made if the candidate performs some activity in one of the two areas.

A determination of **"Unsatisfactory"** shall be made if the minimum requirements for a "**Satisfactory**" rating are not met.

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT
COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS DARTMOUTH

Approved

TENURE STANDARDS

Effective Fall 2018

The Department of Physics will use the following performance standards to evaluate the qualifications of candidates for tenure and to assign ratings of Excellent, Very Good, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory, as specified by the Faculty Federation agreement.

1. Teaching Effectiveness & Advising

The Physics Department requires the following documentation in this category to support the candidate's application for tenure:

Documentation Collected by Chair/Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

- ***(a)*** Complete set of the candidate's annual student evaluations in all courses taught. The overall number of students providing evaluations has to be large enough to make the results statistically meaningful. This will require the faculty member to have had the opportunity to teach a reasonable number of courses to a reasonable number of students. The Chair will ensure that the candidate has had sufficient opportunity to teach courses at various levels, including 100-level, and of various sizes; if the assignment is not made, the faculty member should ask for such an assignment. (See Notes below.)
- ***(b)*** A comparison of the candidate's annual student evaluations with others who have taught similar courses of similar sizes and at similar levels.
- ***(c)*** Written comments on annual student evaluations and, if available, exit interview comments made by graduating seniors.
- ***(d)*** Complete set of annual peer teaching evaluations based on classroom visitations by members of the FEC.
- ***(e)*** Complete record of the candidate's program- and research advising of undergraduate majors and graduate students plus academic advising of students in the candidate's classes. A list of advisees assigned to the faculty member and a list of those advised on a regular basis will assist in evaluation of this activity. The FEC will conduct a survey of the faculty member's advisees with an appropriate questionnaire that reflects: willingness to answer program or class-related questions, availability during office hours, knowledge about the curricula, accuracy of course-planning information, service of providing letters of recommendation upon request, and effective mentoring of student researchers.
- ***(f)*** Any other contractually required materials.

Documentation Collected/Provided by Candidate

(g) The names of at least *three* alumni, holding the bachelor's or master's degree from the university, who are familiar with the faculty member's teaching and/or advising. The Chair shall solicit written comments or letters from these individuals regarding the candidate's effectiveness as an instructor, advisor, and/or mentor.

(h) Examples of success of students advised by the candidate in regional or national competitions, undergraduate and graduate student paper presentations, or exceptional class projects.

(i) A complete teaching portfolio, giving evidence of continuous course improvement, including the development and successful delivery of new or extensively revised courses. In addition, the candidate should show evidence of innovative or creative approaches in delivering the subject material. He/she should indicate specific ways in which courses have been enriched by the inclusion of information about relevant research advances, the use of information technology in content or delivery, or other means. The candidate must include samples of assigned student work from each course taught: course outline and goals, policy statement, exams, homework, projects, reports, etc.

(j) Any other contractually required materials.

Note 1: *Numerical scores of teaching effectiveness used below are not rigid standards and the FEC may take other considerations into account – level and nature of courses taught (such as major vs. general education), number of students in the courses, implementation and testing of innovative teaching methods, etc. – to justify any deviation from these standards.*

Note 2: *The FEC will regularly compile a comparative analysis of student evaluations for courses taught in the department. Factors such as the course's level, enrollment, type (required vs. elective vs. general education), content, and faculty instructor's rank will be included in this analysis. The candidate's performance will be compared to these historically based measures.*

Subject to the conditions set out in **Notes 1** and **2** above:

• A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(i) An overall annual student evaluation score (average over all courses taught) of ***4.00 or higher*** (on a scale of 1.00-5.00) plus ***excellent*** written comments on annual student evaluations.

(ii) An overall average rating of ***4.00 or higher*** (on a scale of 1.00-5.00) on FEC peer teaching evaluation forms plus ***excellent*** written comments by FEC classroom observers.

(iii) ***Excellent*** program- and research advising of undergraduate and graduate students, including research advising of ***five or more*** students, at least ***two*** of whom have been advised to completion of the master's degree.

(iv) ***Excellent*** comments/letters from alumni and graduating seniors.

(v) ***Excellent*** development and improvement of curricular materials for all courses taught.

• A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(i) An overall annual student evaluation score (average over all courses taught) of ***3.50-3.99*** (on a scale of 1.00-5.00) plus ***very good*** written comments on annual student evaluations.

(ii) An overall average rating of ***3.50-3.99*** (on a scale of 1.00-5.00) on FEC peer teaching evaluation forms plus ***very good*** written comments by FEC classroom observers.
(iii) ***Very good*** program- and research advising of undergraduate and graduate students, including research advising of ***four*** students, at least ***two*** of whom have been advised to completion of the master's degree.
(iv) ***Very good*** comments/letters from alumni and graduating seniors.
(v) ***Very good*** development and improvement of curricular materials for all courses taught.

• A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(i) An overall annual student evaluation score (average over all courses taught) of ***3.00-3.49*** (on a scale of 1.00-5.00) plus ***satisfactory*** written comments on annual student evaluations.
(ii) An overall average rating of ***3.00-3.49*** (on a scale of 1.00-5.00) on FEC peer teaching evaluation forms plus ***satisfactory*** written comments by FEC classroom observers.
(iii) S***atisfactory*** program- and research advising of undergraduate and graduate students, including research advising of ***three*** students, at least ***one*** of whom has been advised to completion of the master's degree.
(iv) ***Satisfactory*** comments/letters from alumni and graduating seniors.
(v) ***Satisfactory*** development and improvement of curricular materials for all courses taught.

A determination of **"Unsatisfactory"** shall be made if the outcomes fail to meet the requirements for a **"Satisfactory"** rating.

2. Scholarship and Professional Activities

Evaluation of performance in this category will be based ***primarily*** on the following factors:

(a) Quality and potential significance of research and publications, as evidenced by measures such as assessments by professionals in the candidate's field, reputation of journals in which the candidate's papers appear, Citation Index data, independent reviews, referees' reports, and the like. If not listed as first author on a publication, the candidate must provide documentation of his/her substantial contribution to the work.
(b) Number of research publications in refereed professional journals.
(c) Success in accruing external grants (including equipment grants) to bring into the UMASSD research program, in amounts gauged appropriately to the candidate's field. In the case of multiple-investigator awards, the candidate must provide evidence of the share of the funds for which he/she has spending authority.
(d) Amount of financial support provided by candidate to undergraduate and graduate students in research.
(e) Presentation of research results and similar scholarly activity at major professional conferences.

Evaluation of performance in this category will be based ***to a lesser extent*** on the following factors:

(f) Professional activity in support of the candidate's field.
(g) Other documented accomplishments related to scholarship and professional activities.

Note 1: *The required quantity of publications may be fewer when quality of journals or impact of the publications if very high. The candidate must provide documentation or evidence to demonstrate the high quality or impact of the publications.*

Note 2: *An exception may be made to the required number of journal publications in each rating category below in the cases of a smaller number of very lengthy papers, papers that are widely regarded by external reviewers or Citation Index data as exceptionally significant to the field, or extensive contributions to monographs or textbooks. In no case will such publications substitute for the majority of the required publications in a given rating category. Appropriate monographs or textbooks are those of the highest scholarly value in the candidate's research area that have undergone a formal and rigorous peer review process and appear through a major, internationally-recognized publishing house.*

Note 3*:* *Research papers in refereed conference publications may also be applied to the required number of publications, if the candidate provides substantial evidence that conference publications are a standard medium for dissemination of research in his/her field.*

Note 4: *Publications and grants cited below are those based on work accomplished primarily at UMASSD during the six years preceding the tenure application. For faculty joining the university with credit towards tenure, the accomplishments will still be judged based on the work done at UMASSD but will be prorated for the number of years at UMASSD leading to the tenure application.*

Note 5: *Under no circumstances will tenure be granted to a candidate who has no peer-reviewed publications or no external grants.*

Subject to the conditions set out in **Notes 1** through **5** above:

• A determination of "**Excellent**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(i) ***Five or more*** research publications based on work accomplished primarily while at UMASSD, at least ***four*** of which are in refereed professional journals recognized as major journals in the candidate's field of research.
(ii) Research funding of ***$200,000***, with at least ***$150,000*** coming from external funding agencies, for which the faculty member has spending authority at UMASSD.
(iii) ***Eight or more*** student semesters of funded support, at least ***six*** of which are for graduate students.
(iv) ***Excellent*** record of research presentations at major professional conferences.

• A determination of "**Very Good**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(i) ***Four*** research publications based on work accomplished primarily while at UMASSD, at least ***three*** of which are in refereed professional journals recognized as major journals in the candidate's field of research

(ii) Research funding of ***$100,000*** with at least ***$75,000*** coming from external funding agencies, for which the faculty member has spending authority at UMASSD.
(iii) ***Six to seven*** student semesters of funded support, at least ***four*** of which are for graduate students.
(iv) ***Very good*** record of research presentations at major professional conferences.

• A determination of "**Satisfactory**" shall be made upon the following outcomes:

(i) ***Three*** research publications based on work accomplished primarily while at UMASSD, at least ***two*** of which are in refereed professional journals recognized as major journals in the candidate's field of research.
(ii) Research funding of ***$60,000*** with at least ***$40,000*** coming from external funding agencies, for which the faculty member has spending authority at UMASSD.
(iii) ***Four to five*** student semesters of externally funded support, at least ***two*** of which are for graduate students.
(iv) ***Satisfactory*** record of research presentations at major professional conferences.

A determination of **"Unsatisfactory"** shall be made if the outcomes fail to meet the requirements for a **"Satisfactory"** rating.

3. University Service

If the candidate elects to be evaluated in University Service, the evaluation is based on evidence in the following categories:

(a) Active service, including demonstrated leadership on committees at the department, college, and university levels, along with documentation on the frequency of meetings.
(b) Meaningful contributions to open houses, orientations, and other major university-based events.
(c) Effective outreach programs that enhance the reputation and visibility of the university.
(d) Sustained support of professional and non-professional student organizations.
(e) Service as director of a university center, Graduate Program Director, etc.

The candidate's rating in University Service is obtained as follows:

A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made if the candidate makes contributions in category ***(a)*** with a significant leadership role, plus meaningful contributions in one other category or substantial contributions to any three categories.

A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made if the candidate makes contributions in category ***(a)*** with a leadership role, plus meaningful contribution in any other category.

A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made if the candidate makes meaningful contributions in any two of the above categories.

A determination of **"Unsatisfactory"** is made if the minimum requirements for a "**Satisfactory**" rating are not met.

4. Public Service

If the candidate elects to be evaluated in Public Service, the evaluation is based on the evidence in the following areas:

(a) Active public service related to the candidate's area of professional expertise, including documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.

(b) Other active public service, including demonstrated leadership, along with documentation on the nature and extent of the activity, and the frequency of meetings, contributions, etc.

The candidate's rating in Public Service is obtained as follows:

A determination of **"Excellent"** shall be made if the candidate plays a very significant role in one of the two above areas with a very high level of activity.

A determination of **"Very Good"** shall be made if the candidate plays a significant role in one of the two areas with a high level of activity.

A determination of **"Satisfactory"** shall be made if the candidate performs some activity in one of the two areas.

A determination of **"Unsatisfactory"** shall be made if the minimum requirements for a "**Satisfactory**" rating are not met.

Approved

Department of Portuguese
Faculty Evaluation Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate and to Full Professor

Categories of Evaluation

All faculty members are evaluated annually, for contract renewal, and for promotion and tenure in four categories: 1) teaching and advising, 2) scholarship and professional activities, 3) university service, and 4) public service. Evaluation is mandatory in the categories of teaching and advising and of scholarship and professional activities. Faculty may opt not to be evaluated in either the category of university service or the category of public service, but must be evaluated in at least three categories. The standards listed below apply to the recommendations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, normally made during the candidate's sixth year of service to the university, as well as to promotion to Professor. The contractual requirement for a decision of "Recommended" for tenure and promotion is an evaluation of "Excellent" in either Teaching Effectiveness and Advising or Scholarship and Professional Activities and a "Very Good" in the other of these two categories, and no "Unsatisfactory" ratings.

Standards for Teaching and Advising

The successful candidate will demonstrate a sustained record of effective teaching as evidenced by peer review, student evaluations, innovative teaching practices, and efforts that indicate the candidate is using the annual process of peer and self-evaluation as a springboard for subsequent teaching improvements. Additional information that demonstrates teaching effectiveness may be presented. Additional materials may include, but are not limited to, a statement of teaching philosophy, information about course tools, the use of teaching strategies appropriate to the course context and size, engagement in professional development to enhance teaching effectiveness, development of new classes, and teaching innovations adopted.

Advising effectiveness will be evaluated on the basis of evidence of academic progress of advisees. Such evidence may include, but is not limited to, records of meetings with advisees, graduate student progress in thesis or dissertation, graduate student participation in academic meetings, undergraduate research samples, and reference letters.

Besides annual self and peer review, teaching effectiveness will also be evaluated on the basis of student evaluations of teaching and evaluations by the FEC and Chair. The Department of Portuguese uses the university's standard form for student evaluation of teaching. The FEC and Chair evaluations will be based on the materials submitted by the faculty member. Faculty must submit, at a minimum, student evaluations, peer review, a reflective statement, and evidence of advising effectiveness. Additional materials may be used to provide context about performance in any of these areas.

In order to be evaluated as "Excellent" in this category, faculty must present evidence of positive results in three of these four sets of materials. To be rated "Very Good", positive results must be demonstrated in two out of these four categories. A faculty member will receive a "Satisfactory" rating upon demonstrating positive results in at least one of these categories. A rating of "Unsatisfactory" will be given if no positive results are

presented. The FEC and the Chair will have discretion in assigning evaluations of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Satisfactory," or "Unsatisfactory." However, these decisions shall be based on the criteria outlined above and shall provide a rationale for their rating. These criteria shall apply both to tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and to promotion to Full Professor.

Standards for Scholarship and Professional Activities

The successful candidate for tenure, promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Professor will have an active research agenda and will have produced a body of scholarship that is recognized for contributing to the growth of knowledge in the area of specialization. The evaluation of the quality of the candidate's scholarship shall be based primarily on publications. The greatest weight will be placed upon single-author monographs, textbooks, edited or co-edited scholarly volumes, articles in refereed journals, chapters in refereed books, and articles in prestigious non-refereed professional outlets. Additional indicators of successful scholarship shall include: letters from external reviewers; other kinds of publications (such as book reviews); serving as editor of a major scholarly journal or a book series in the field of Luso-Afro-Brazilian studies; a record of seeking and securing external grant support; a consistent record of delivering papers or presenting posters at national and international meetings; honors, awards, and invitations to speak at meetings or at other institutions; organizing conferences, professional panels, and lecture series; and/or serving as manuscript reviewer or board member for a scholarly journal or a book series. Other indicators of professional activities, e.g. service to professional organizations or academic consulting, will also be considered.

To be rated "Satisfactory" the candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will demonstrate the publication (or acceptance for publication) of either (a) a minimum of two articles or chapters in refereed journals, refereed edited volumes or other prestigious professional outlets; or (b) one article and a Portuguese language textbook or equivalent book-length publication. In addition, the candidate will have submitted either (a) two article-length manuscripts or (b) one book-length manuscript for consideration and possible publication. An externally funded research grant may be substituted in lieu of one of the two submitted articles.

To be rated "Very Good" the candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will demonstrate the publication (or acceptance for publication) of either (a) a minimum of three articles in refereed journals, refereed edited volumes, or other prestigious professional outlets; (b) two articles and a Portuguese language textbook or equivalent publication; or (c) a refereed book-length manuscript. In addition, the candidate will have submitted either (a) two article-length manuscripts or (b) one book-length manuscript for possible publication. Externally funded research grants may be substituted in lieu of up to one of the published or accepted articles and one of the submitted articles.

To be rated "Excellent" the candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will demonstrate the publication (or acceptance for publication) of either (a) a minimum of four articles in refereed journals, refereed edited volumes, or other prestigious professional outlets; (b) three articles and a Portuguese language textbook or equivalent publication; or (c) a refereed book-length manuscript and at least one article published in a refereed journal, refereed edited volume, or other prestigious outlet. In addition, the

candidate will have submitted either (a) two article-length manuscripts or (b) one book-length manuscript for possible publication. Externally funded research grants may be substituted in lieu of up to one of the published or accepted articles and one of the submitted articles.

Candidates for promotion to Full Professor will be evaluated in the period since promotion to Associate Professor. A "Satisfactory" rating will be given if the candidate demonstrates the publication (or acceptance for publication) of either (a) a minimum of three articles or chapters in refereed journals, refereed edited volumes or other prestigious professional outlets; or (b) two articles and a Portuguese language textbook or equivalent book-length publication. In addition, the candidate will have submitted either (a) two article-length manuscripts or (b) one book-length manuscript for consideration and possible publication. An externally funded research grant may be substituted in lieu of one of the two submitted articles.

To be rated "Very Good" the candidate for promotion to Full Professor will demonstrate the publication (or acceptance for publication) of either (a) a minimum of four articles in refereed journals, refereed edited volumes, or other prestigious professional outlets; (b) three articles and a Portuguese language textbook or equivalent publication; or (c) a refereed book-length manuscript. In addition, the candidate will have submitted either (a) two article-length manuscripts or (b) one book-length manuscript for possible publication. Externally funded research grants may be substituted in lieu of up to one of the published or accepted articles and one of the submitted articles.

To be rated "Excellent" the candidate for promotion to Full Professor will demonstrate the publication (or acceptance for publication) of either (a) a minimum of five articles in refereed journals, refereed edited volumes, or other prestigious professional outlets; (b) four articles and a Portuguese language textbook or equivalent publication; or (c) a refereed book-length manuscript and at least two articles published in a refereed journal, refereed edited volume, or other prestigious outlet. In addition, the candidate will have submitted either (a) two article-length manuscripts or (b) one book-length manuscript for possible publication. Externally funded research grants may be substituted in lieu of up to one of the published or accepted articles and one of the submitted articles.

Standards for University Service

Faculty are expected to report their service activities. Each activity listed should be accompanied by a brief description of what that activity entailed. Fundraising in support of academic programs in Portuguese at the BA, MA, and PhD levels shall be considered as service to the university.

A faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as some university activity outside the department to be ranked "Satisfactory" in this category of evaluation. To be ranked "Very Good," a faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as participate in multiple college and/or university activities or in a single university activity of particular significance. To be ranked "Excellent," a faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as assume a leadership role in at least one department, college and/or university activity. Examples

include, but are not limited to, serving as chair of a major committee or leadership of an academic program (including Portuguese).

If a faculty member receives a course release or other compensation for university service, this shall *not* reduce the service value of the activity.

Standards for Public Service

Public service involves use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit local, regional, or national communities and organizations. A faculty member must demonstrate a sustained record of service to one or more external entities to be ranked "Satisfactory" in this category of evaluation. A ranking of "Very Good" requires a record of consistent and significant service to one or more external entities. A ranking of "Excellent" in public service requires a record of demonstrated leadership in addition to providing consistent and significant service.

APPROVED

Department of Political Science – University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
Tenure/Promotion and Promotion to Full Professor Standards
Effective September 1, 2016
Approved July 2016

Standards for Teaching and Advising

Candidates are expected to compile teaching records that indicate that they are excellent teachers and advisors and that they will continue to improve and grow in these roles. The assessment of teaching effectiveness is likely to be most reliable when it is based on multiple sources of evidence or methods of collecting information. The successful candidate will demonstrate a sustained record of effective teaching as evidenced by student evaluations, various kinds of peer review (including annual observations by tenured faculty members), and efforts that indicate the candidate is using his/her annual reflections about their work as a springboard for subsequent teaching improvements. Discussion of student evaluations of teaching should provide context for the student ratings, including comparisons to other classes of similar type and level.

Furthermore, faculty may include additional information to demonstrate effective teaching. These additional materials may include, but are not limited to, information about: course tools, the use of teaching strategies appropriate to the course context and size, engagement in professional development to enhance teaching effectiveness, development of new classes, the number of students taught, the variety and types of courses assigned to the instructor, the intellectual challenge presented to students (as evidenced by peer review of syllabi and exams), and/or teaching innovations adopted.

Academic advisors for the Political Science Department are expected to serve as academic advisor to a proportional share of majors in the department, be proactive in contacting students about advising policies, be accessible during the registration period, and maintain a record of advising appointments and documentation for each advisee that is accessible to other advisors in the department. Files and records need not be presented for FARs, although the FEC may request this if it chooses. These records should be made available for personnel actions.

A brief paragraph outlining the advisor's approach to advising is expected for annual review and personnel actions. Additional evidence of advising effectiveness may be offered at an advisor's discretion. Examples of additional evidence can include, but are not limited to: letters of references for jobs or graduate school, undergraduate research samples, if the faculty member serves as a mentor, and evidence of engagement in professional development activities that contribute to advising effectiveness, such as attendance at a teaching development workshop.

The FEC and Chair evaluations will be based the materials submitted by the faculty member. Faculty must submit, at a minimum, student evaluations, peer review, a reflective statement, and evidence of advising effectiveness. Additional materials may be used to provide context about performance in any of these areas.

In order to receive an **excellent** rating, faculty must present evidence of positive results in three of these four sets of materials. To be rated **very good**, positive results must be demonstrated in two out of these four categories. A faculty member will receive a **satisfactory** rating upon demonstrating positive results in at least one of these categories; an unsatisfactory rating will be given with no positive results. The FEC and Chair will have discretion in assigning evaluations of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Satisfactory," or "Unsatisfactory," but they shall base these decisions on the above criteria and provide a rationale for their rating. While the FEC and Chair shall consider evidence related to teaching and advising in assigning evaluations, greater weight shall be given to teaching in making these determinations. For tenure and promotion and promotion beyond associate, greater weight will be placed upon the years closest to the tenure or promotion decision.

Standards for Scholarship and Professional Activities

The successful candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor and promotion beyond associate professor will have established and maintained an active research agenda and a body of scholarship that is recognized as making significant contributions to the growth of knowledge. The evaluation of the candidate's scholarship shall be based primarily on publications. The greatest weight will be placed upon refereed books, articles in refereed journals, chapters in refereed books, and articles in prestigious non-refereed professional outlets. Additional indicators of successful scholarship shall include: publications in other venues; a record of seeking and securing external grant support; a consistent record of delivering papers or presenting posters at national meetings; honors, awards, and invitations to speak at other institutions; organizing conferences, professional panels, and lecture series; and/or serving as editor, reviewer, or board member for a scholarly journal.

An "active research agenda" will be indicated primarily by the candidate's number of original peer-reviewed publications. Externally funded research grants may be substituted in lieu of one published or accepted article. It should be noted that co-authored publications are very common in political science, and they generally should be considered as significant as solo-authored publications, but candidates ought to provide a description of their contributions to co-authored publications. Candidates may count research that has been accepted for publication, but must demonstrate that these works are substantially complete. For journal articles, revisions must be complete, and the article must be in queue for publication. For book manuscripts, the entire manuscript must be submitted and accepted by the publisher, with minor revisions outstanding, in order to count as accepted.

In assessing whether the candidate has made "significant contributions to the growth of knowledge," the members of the evaluation committee shall exercise their judgment based on the letters of external reviewers as well as their own independent evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, and shall take into account the originality, quality and professional impact of the candidate's work. In situations where the candidate's scholarship has had truly exceptional impact and is of outstanding quality, the evaluation committee may consider providing a rating higher than the one merited by the number of publications as outlined in the paragraphs

below. The scholarship evaluation criteria shall be proportionally adjusted for those candidates who join the department with years of credit toward tenure and promotion and promotion beyond associate professor.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In order to be rated as "**Satisfactory**," the candidate must demonstrate the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a minimum of two articles in refereed journals, refereed books, or other prestigious professional outlets. IN ADDITION, the candidate must have submitted either (a) two article-length manuscripts or (b) one book-length manuscript for possible publication. In order to be rated as "**Very Good**," the candidate must demonstrate either (a) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a minimum of three articles in refereed journals, refereed edited volumes, or other prestigious professional outlets; or (b) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a refereed book-length manuscript. IN ADDITION, the candidate must have submitted either (a) one article-length manuscript or (b) one book-length manuscript for possible publication. . In order to be rated as "**Excellent**," the candidate must demonstrate either (a) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a minimum of four articles in refereed journals, refereed edited books, or other prestigious professional outlets; or (b) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a refereed book-length manuscript AND at least one article published in a refereed journal, refereed edited book, or other highly prestigious outlet.

Promotion Beyond Associate Professor

For promotion beyond associate professor, the standards for evaluation shall be adjusted upward. In order to be rated as "**Satisfactory**," the candidate must demonstrate the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a minimum of two articles in refereed journals, refereed books, or other prestigious professional outlets. IN ADDITION, the candidate must have submitted either (a) two article-length manuscripts or (b) one book-length manuscript for possible publication. In order to be rated as "**Very Good**," the candidate must demonstrate either (a) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a minimum of four articles in refereed journals, refereed edited volumes, or other prestigious professional outlets; or (b) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a refereed book-length manuscript. IN ADDITION, the candidate must have submitted either (a) one article-length manuscript or (b) one book-length manuscript for possible publication. In order to be rated as "**Excellent**," the candidate must demonstrate either (a) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a minimum of five articles in refereed journals, refereed edited books, or other prestigious professional outlets; or (b) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a refereed book-length manuscript AND at least two articles published in a refereed journal, refereed edited book, or other highly prestigious outlet.

Annual Review

For the purpose of regular annual reviews, the evaluation committee shall consider whether the faculty member has maintained an active research agenda in the period since the prior

annual review. Scholarly activity shall include: the publication of scholarship; the submission of scholarly manuscripts for review at a journal or press; external grant submissions; professional conference presentations; the drafting of manuscripts or book chapters; the collection and analysis of data related to a scholarly project; invited talks or presentations; organizing conferences, professional panels or lecture series; and serving as editor, reviewer or board member for a scholarly journal or academic press.

To be rated "**Satisfactory**" during annual review, the faculty member must have engaged in some amount of scholarly activity. To be rated "**Very Good**," the faculty member must have engaged in a moderate amount of scholarly activity. To be rated "**Excellent**," the faculty member must have been engaged in extensive scholarly activity or have had published, or had accepted for publication, an article in a refereed journal or a refereed book-length manuscript (with the understanding that the final publication can only be used as evidence of scholarly activity once, either at acceptance or publication, if the two events fall into different annual review periods).

It is important to note that annual reviews evaluate scholarly activity as well as scholarly production, and faculty members may merit a high rating even without a publication during the year. These standards recognize that scholarly projects often take several years to be completed, and considerable activity takes place in the years prior to publication. In contrast, the standards for tenure and promotion and promotion beyond associate require publications. As a consequence, annual review ratings in scholarship may not necessarily predict the evaluation committee's ratings during tenure and promotion and promotion beyond associate (as, for example, in the case where a faculty member has engaged in much scholarly activity in each year but has few or no refereed publications).

Standards for University Service

Faculty are expected to report all of their service activities. Each activity listed should be accompanied by a brief description of what that activity entailed.

A faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as at least one college and/or university activity outside the department to be ranked "**Satisfactory**" in this category of evaluation.

To be ranked "**Very Good**," a faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as participate in multiple college and/or university activities or in a single university activity of unusual importance or intensity.

To be ranked "**Excellent**," a faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as assume a leadership role in at least one college and/or university activity. Examples include, but are not limited to, chairship of a major committee and leadership of an academic program (including Political Science).

If a faculty member receives a course release or other compensation for university service, this shall *not* reduce the service value of the activity.

Standards for Public Service

The department defines public service as the application of professionally related expertise or skills that enrich local, regional, or national communities. Faculty members who choose to be evaluated in public service must provide evidence of the nature of their public service as well as evidence of the benefit of this public service to the university and the community.

A faculty member must participate in multiple instances of limited duration in order to be ranked "**Satisfactory**" in this category of evaluation.

To be ranked "**Very Good**," a faculty member must participate in one sustained activity of significant benefit to the community.

To be ranked "**Excellent**," a faculty member must participate in multiple instances of limited duration and one sustained activity of significant benefit to the community OR multiple instances of sustained activity of significant benefit to the community.

Expectations for Promotion to Full Professor
Psychology Department
For faculty tenured on or after September 1, 2014

Expectations Concerning Scholarship and Professional Activities

Candidates for promotion to Full Professor are expected to have produced a body of research demonstrating that they are established in their careers. Thus, candidates for promotion are expected to publish in peer-reviewed venues, though publication of books and edited books are also appropriate. Candidates are also expected to have made important substantive contributions to those publications that they co-author with colleagues. Candidates are also encouraged to pursue grant opportunities in support of their research and graduate students. Candidates are encouraged to publish with graduate students with whom they have had a mentoring relationship, with recognition that some of these efforts involve more work than reflected by placement of authorship.

Demonstrating that candidates have established their careers and are active scholars can be accomplished in several ways:

- Continued record of scholarship: Such scholarship could include such things as: The publication of at least five articles since being promoted to Associate Professor in peer reviewed journals or scholarly equivalents including items such as a monograph by a university or other first line publisher, chapters in peer reviewed edited books, the receipt of external grants from sources other than the University and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and peer-reviewed conference proceedings, abstracts, and papers are some examples.

Additionally, professional activities that demonstrate direct impact on the community, promote psychological health in the region, and enhance the reputation of UMASS Dartmouth in the community will also be considered (such as program development, workshops to professionals in the local community, and/or establishing a network of professional consulting activities - specifically work that impacts or broadly disseminates information to a wider public group or audience). Such activities are consistent with goals of the scientist-practitioner model of training used by the top APA doctoral programs and speak to the use of scholarship in professional activities as a clinician. Artifacts that speak to such efforts could be testimonial letters or letters of recommendation/accommodation from specific agencies. By way of example, one of our former faculty members developed a screening tool that is regularly used by the Bristol County Family Courts in assessing a specific type of custody case. This tool is not published research but has real world impact on a daily basis and stems from the former faculty member's expertise in family systems. A testimonial from a judge or agent of the court would be an appropriate artifact that could be used to demonstrate impact.

Other examples include activities relating to active clinical practice and promotion of psychological health in the region that increase the faculty member's professional standing, and enhance the reputation of UMASS Dartmouth in the community and also improve the effectiveness of the undergraduate and graduate clinical programs. It should be stressed that the activities included here should have a demonstrable component of peer review, through testimonial letters or some other outside agency or reviewer capable of speaking to the impact of such work. Special emphasis is given when a clinical faculty develops a regional expertise for a particular population (e.g. eating disorders or ADD) or when consultation provides meaningful contributions to human service agencies and/or public health

promotion. Examples of activities that may be expected of clinical faculty include: consultation for clinical, educational, social service, medical or mental health agencies within the guidelines of the current contract. The nature of the consultation must assist the agency or its members to: 1) achieve the mission of the agency, 2) enhance the training of staff or, 3) assure quality of service to clients or patients. Any extensive or consistent work relating to training, supervision, or review of treatment plans could be considered. For example, someone having a role at the Schwartz Center where he or she were supervising and training staff as the staff members worked toward qualification for licensure.

- Scholarly metrics: The recent availability of scholarly indices such as Google Scholar h-index, number of citations, and personal impact factors, allows for some comparison across diverse types of research. Indices that focus on recent history should be employed. Metrics that demonstrate the scholar is comparable to Full Professors at similar institutions are expected.
- Involvement in the editorial process: Invitations to edit books, journals, special issues of journals, or to be a member on an editorial board are some examples and would all be indications of scholarly impact. Similarly, appointment as a conference organizer for a large conference should also indicate that candidates have achieved significant recognition in their field.
- Impact in the community: Candidates who have worked in the community and who have shaped how organizations operate through their scholarly work or expertise or develop policies that reach a large number of individuals have contributed through direct impact. Testimonials or recommendations from sufficiently large organizations or from government officials would serve as reliable evidence.

The department will take seriously the assessments of impartial outside reviewers in rating candidates' contributions to their field.

A rating of "Excellent" would be judged as a strong configuration of either breadth or depth of the above points. For example, five publications of good quality since being awarded tenure or appointed as Associate Professor at UMass Dartmouth, more than what is required for tenure, would be meeting this criterion through depth. As with promotion to associate professor and tenure, the department understands that some journal publications are of greater value than others; that some work has more impact than others; that a monograph published by a university or other first order publisher may have greater value than a number of journal articles; that chapters in peer reviewed, edited volumes may make contributions; that funded grant proposals indicate positive peer reviews of one's work; and that peer reviewed conference papers may be important opportunities to engage in scholarly conversations with colleagues and to contribute to knowledge. For example, five quality publications along with having scholarly metrics comparable to full professors at comparable universities and being actively involved in the editorial process would be meeting this criterion through breadth. In addition, the activities associated with clinical practice which were outlined above may also be considered as part of the larger evaluation of professional activities included in this rating. Thus, having 3 or 4 publications, external funding, and some impactful professional activity could also qualify for a rating of excellent

A rating of "Very Good" would be judged as having made sizable contributions and impact on several of the above described points. Four publications would warrant a rating of "Very Good." Three publications, along with scholarly metrics consistent or just below those at comparable universities and either involvement in the editorial process or demonstration of impact in the community or a funded external grant would qualify for a rating of "Very Good"

A rating of "Satisfactory" would be judged as having made contributions on one or more of the above described points.

Expectations Concerning Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

Candidates who have received tenure and promotion to Associate Professor have already demonstrated effective teaching. While student ratings are important, candidates for promotion to Full Professor are also expected to demonstrate a continued commitment to teaching through development of more effective classroom techniques, willingness to attend workshops to improve teaching, efforts to include assessment in their teaching, as well as their own scholarly work and service in their teaching. Candidates should be invested in growing and upholding the department's curricular standards.

The evidence will show "Excellent" sustained performance or a trend of increasingly effective instruction before a tenure decision. Evidence of such a rating could be supported by a number of the following criterion: positive overall teaching evaluations, positive peer observations, changes generated in response to student feedback, changes in assignments and updating syllabi, a commitment to improving pedagogy through workshops and professional development activity, creating new courses or updating courses to align with assessment and new curricular requirements (i.e. University Studies), or mentoring student projects (experiential learning, independent studies, honors theses, masters theses, or high impact pedagogical experiences).

Candidates will receive a tenure rating of "Very Good" if their teaching records demonstrate a sustained record of effective teaching and a willingness to adapt their pedagogy for better results. Very good teaching complimentary observation with evidence of regular and appropriate updates of courses to keep curriculum in line with the current state of the field and any specific curricular requirements..

Candidates will receive a tenure rating of "Satisfactory" if their teaching records demonstrate a sustained record of average or a trend toward above average teaching and a commitment to keeping their courses in line with the overall pedagogy of the department (i.e. courses aligned with APA pedagogical guidelines used in departmental assessment processes and evaluation of curricular proposals).

Expectations Concerning University or Public Service

Faculty members are expected to contribute their expertise and time in service of the university, and/or, upon their preference, to the public. Designation of which service is to be evaluated and a description of impact of service is to be articulated by the faculty member.

University Service

After receiving tenure, faculty members are expected to take on a leadership role in some aspect of the department and/or university's efforts for self-governance, or engagement with the community. The number and importance of these roles will be related to their evaluation in the area of service. Description of impact of service is expected to be articulated by the faculty member or when appropriate demonstrated by letters from outside agencies, particularly in the case of public service.

Faculty who receive a rating of "Excellent" exhibit exemplary level and type of service. They will typically have at least one role of leadership or innovation plus participation on both departmental and extra-departmental activities. The extent of the work is also considered, through either detailed description of service work or written statements from fellow committee members or administrative authorities.

Faculty who receive a rating of "Very Good" typically have several activities, but no leadership or innovative roles and none that require sustained, intense work.

Faculty who receive a rating of "Satisfactory" typically have one or two minor contributions.

Public Service

The department defines public service as the application of professionally related expertise or skills that enrich local, regional, or national communities. Examples of such public service include but are not limited to sitting on local area boards, running a school intervention program, or otherwise offering professional services or expertise pro-bono or at reduced rates. Faculty members who choose to be evaluated in public service must provide evidence of the nature of their public service as well as evidence of the benefit of this public service to the university and the community.

To be ranked **"Excellent,"** a faculty member must participate in multiple instances of limited duration and one sustained activity of significant benefit to the community OR multiple instances of sustained activity of significant benefit to the community.

To be ranked **"Very Good,**" a faculty member must participate in one sustained activity of significant benefit to the community.

A faculty member must participate in multiple instances of limited duration in order to be ranked **"Satisfactory"** in this category of evaluation.

Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
Psychology Department
For Faculty Hired in September 1, 2016

To be recommended for tenure, faculty must achieve an excellent rating in either Teaching Effectiveness and Advising OR Scholarship and Professional Activities and at least satisfactory ratings in the other performance categories.

Expectations Concerning Scholarship and Professional Activities

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to have produced a body of research that has contributed to the research literature of their fields to an extent that suggests they will continue to make substantial contributions during the course of their careers. Thus, candidates for tenure are expected to publish in peer-reviewed venues. Candidates are also expected to have made important substantive contributions to those publications that they co-author with colleagues. That is, candidates should be able to show that they have developed their own research agendas and that their contributions are, in fact, *their* own.

While the department believes the number of peer-reviewed publications of a candidate is important, it does not believe quantity of such publications is all. The department understands that the time required to do different kinds of psychological research varies greatly, depending upon what researchers do and how they do it. Likewise, the department understands that some journal publications are of greater value than others; that a monograph published by a university or other first order publisher may have greater value than a number of journal articles; that chapters in peer reviewed, edited volumes may make contributions; that funded grant proposals indicate positive peer reviews of one's work; and that peer reviewed conference papers may be important opportunities to engage in scholarly conversations with colleagues and to contribute to knowledge.

Thus, the scholarly contributions to be considered:

· The publication of at least four articles in peer reviewed journals or equivalent scholarly productivity, including such items as the publication of a monograph by a university or other first line publisher, chapters in peer reviewed edited books, the receipt of external grants from sources other than the University and Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and peer-reviewed conference papers.

· Additionally, professional activities that demonstrate direct impact on the community, promote psychological health in the region, and enhance the reputation of UMASS Dartmouth in the community will also be considered (such as program development, workshops to professionals in the local community, and/or establishing a network of professional consulting activities - specifically work that impacts or broadly disseminates information to a wider public group or audience). Such activities are consistent with goals of the scientist-practitioner model of training used by the top APA doctoral programs and speak to the use of scholarship in professional activities as a clinician. Artifacts that speak to such efforts could be testimonial letters or letters of recommendation/accommodation from specific agencies. By way of example, one of our former faculty members developed a screening tool that is

regularly used by the Bristol County Family Courts in assessing a specific type of custody case. This tool is not published research but has real world impact on a daily basis and stems from the former faculty member's expertise in family systems. A testimonial from a judge or agent of the court would be an appropriate artifact that could be used to demonstrate impact.

Other examples include activities relating to active clinical practice and promotion of psychological health in the region that increase the faculty member's professional standing, and enhance the reputation of UMASS Dartmouth in the community and also improve the effectiveness of the undergraduate and graduate clinical programs. It should be stressed that the activities included here should have a demonstrable component of peer review, through testimonial letters or some other outside agency or reviewer capable of speaking to the impact of such work. Special emphasis is given when a clinical faculty develops a regional expertise for a particular population (e.g. eating disorders or ADD) or when consultation provides meaningful contributions to human service agencies and/or public health promotion. Examples of activities that may be expected of clinical faculty include: consultation for clinical, educational, social service, medical or mental health agencies within the guidelines of the current contract. The nature of the consultation must assist the agency or its members to: 1) achieve the mission of the agency, 2) enhance the training of staff or, 3) assure quality of service to clients or patients. Any extensive or consistent work relating to training, supervision, or review of treatment plans could be considered. For example, someone having a role at the Schwartz Center where he or she were supervising and training staff as the staff members worked toward qualification for licensure.

The department will take seriously the assessments of impartial outside reviewers in rating candidates' contributions to their field.

Candidates who have fulfilled the first area of scholarship with the publication of at least four articles in peer reviewed journals will be deemed "Excellent." Candidates who have three publications may be deemed "Excellent" if they have comparable contributions in the professional activities category or external grant funding.

To achieve a rating of "Very Good," candidates will have at least three articles (or equivalents noted above) published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals and will have submitted at least one additional and different manuscript for possible publication. Candidates who have fewer publications may be deemed "Very Good" if they have comparable contributions in the professional activities category or external grant funding.

.

To achieve a rating of "Satisfactory," candidates will have at least two articles (or equivalents noted above) published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals and will have submitted at least two additional and different manuscripts for possible publication. Candidates who have fewer publications may be deemed "Satisfactory" if they have comparable contributions in the professional activities category.

Expectations Concerning Teaching Effectiveness & Advising

On the basis of teaching effectiveness and advising, candidates for tenure are expected to exhibit teaching records that indicate that they are excellent teachers and advisors and that they will continue to improve and grow as teachers. Candidates must exhibit excellence by presenting evidence: student course evaluations; peer reviews of syllabi, class assignments, graded student work, classroom visits, and annual

reflective essays. They are expected to build over time (during the course of annual performance reviews and contract renewals) a file that includes a teaching portfolio that documents their instructional effectiveness with evidence itemized above.

It is expected that candidates will cultivate the habit of examining indicators of the quality of their work to enhance their performance. Indicators will include student evaluation data, peer observation, portfolios of pedagogical techniques tried and their assessment of the effectiveness of those techniques, presentations given, workshops conducted, and publications about teaching in refereed venues.

The evidence will show "Excellent" sustained performance or a trend of increasingly effective instruction before a tenure decision. Evidence of such a rating could be supported by a number of the following criterion: positive overall teaching evaluations, changes generated in response to student feedback, changes in assignments and updating syllabi, a commitment to improving pedagogy through workshops and professional development activity, creating new courses or updating courses to align with assessment and new curricular requirements (i.e. University Studies), or mentoring student projects (experiential learning, independent studies, honors theses, masters theses, or high impact pedagogical experiences).

Candidates will receive a tenure rating of "Very Good" if their teaching records demonstrate a sustained record of effective teaching and a willingness to adapt their pedagogy for better results. Very good teaching evaluations, complimentary peer observations, with evidence of regular and appropriate updates of courses to keep curriculum in line with the current state of the field and any specific curricular requirements.

Candidates will receive a tenure rating of "Satisfactory" if their teaching records demonstrate a sustained record of average or a trend toward above average teaching and a commitment to keeping their courses in line with the overall pedagogy of the department (i.e. courses aligned with APA pedagogical guidelines used in departmental assessment processes and evaluation of curricular proposals).

Expectations Concerning University or Public Service

Faculty members are expected to contribute their expertise and time in service of the university, and/or, upon their preference, to the public. Designation of which service is to be evaluated and a description of impact of service is to be articulated by the faculty member.

University Service

Faculty who receive a rating of "Excellent" exhibit exemplary level and type of service. They will typically have at least one role of leadership or innovation plus participation on both departmental and extra-departmental activities. The extent of the work is also considered, through either detailed description of service work or written statements from fellow committee members or administrative authorities.

Faculty who receive a rating of "Very Good" typically have several activities, but no leadership or innovative roles and none that require sustained, intense work.

Faculty who receive a rating of “Satisfactory” typically serve on at least one department committee every year and make at least one contribution to the academic community beyond the department for every three years of service.

Public Service

The department defines public service as the application of professionally related expertise or skills that enrich local, regional, or national communities. Examples of such public service include but are not limited to sitting on local area boards, running a school intervention program, or otherwise offering professional services or expertise pro-bono or at reduced rates. Faculty members who choose to be evaluated in public service must provide evidence of the nature of their public service as well as evidence of the benefit of this public service to the University and the community.

To be ranked **“Excellent,”** a faculty member must participate in multiple instances of limited duration and one sustained activity of significant benefit to the community OR multiple instances of sustained activity of significant benefit to the community.

To be ranked **“Very Good,**” a faculty member must participate in one sustained activity of significant benefit to the community.

A faculty member must participate in multiple instances of limited duration in order to be ranked **“Satisfactory”** in this category of evaluation.

APPROVED

UMass | Dartmouth

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC POLICY

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC POLICY
STANDARDS FOR:

ANNUAL EVALUATION
CONTRACT RENEWAL
TENURE
PROMOTION

PREPARED BY:

THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC POLICY

EFFECTIVE DATE:

JULY 2016

Table of Contents

1.0 Preamble **Page 2**
2.0 Annual Evaluation **Page 3**
3.0 Contract Renewals **Page 7**
4.0 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor **Page 8**
5.0 Promotion to Full Professor **Page 12**
6.0 Rules of Counting Scholarship **Page 16**

1.0 Preamble

The purpose of these standards is to provide guidance when evaluating department members. The goal is to balance the standards for evaluation and promotion as described in the currently in-force collective bargain agreement (as they may change from time-to-time), the strategic goals of the university (as they may change from time-to-time), and the goals of the Department of Public Policy, represented by its mission and the programs it offers (as they may change from time-to-time).

The guidelines identified below seek to identify the unique circumstances of faculty working in the Department of Public Policy. Numerical standards provide faculty members a roadmap of the kind of output expected of them to achieve identified benchmarks. However, the numerical standards are not absolute, but rather guidelines. Qualitative measures, such as the impact of the activity undertaken or intellectual pursuit, will influence the assessment of the faculty member's performance. For example, in scholarship and professional activities, exceeding the numerical guidelines with low impact scholarship may provide a basis for a lower evaluation than the numerical standard alone might warrant. At the same time, low quantitative output with high impact scholarship may provide a basis for a higher evaluation than the numerical standard alone might warrant.

These standards, to become effective, have to be approved in accordance with the currently in-force collective bargaining agreement between faculty and administration.

Once approved, these standards will apply to each faculty member for a minimum duration of six (6) years. If the standards are changed and approved prior to six (6) years from the date of approval, current faculty members have the right to be judged by these standards in lieu of the new standards until the six (6) year period has expired.

END OF SECTION.

2.0 Annual Evaluation

Each individual shall be evaluated in accordance with the currently in-force faculty federation collective bargaining agreement (as it may change from time-to-time).

2.1 Teaching Effectiveness and Advising.

Teaching effectiveness in the Department of Public Policy shall be evaluated on the basis of many criteria, but great weight (50%) shall be given to student evaluations. The Program's student evaluations will measure teaching performance on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest possible rating and 5 being the highest possible rating.

The assessment of teaching effectiveness is likely to be most reliable when it is based on multiple sources of evidence or methods of collecting information. The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee (DFEC) will also take into account the following considerations, measured through direct peer evaluation where applicable:

- Online development, deployment, and redevelopment of courses;
- Course materials in alignment with the program's mission;
- The use of teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content;
- The specification of course goals;
- The demonstration of knowledge, competence, and currency in course presentations;
- Engages in professional development and/or research to enhance his/her teaching effectiveness;
- The complexity of the subject matter and its level of difficulty for students;
- The research and preparation for the classroom;
- Class size;
- Course linkage with the instructor's research/publication and Public Policy Center Projects;
- Instructor's availability to students; and
- Student advising, both formal and informal, for students in and outside department programs.

To be ranked **Excellent**, a faculty member should receive an average student evaluation rating of 4.0 or higher *and* also demonstrate a high level of teaching effectiveness on the basis of other considerations taken into account by the DFEC as noted above.

To be ranked **Very Good**, a faculty member should receive an average student evaluation rating of 3.5 or higher *and* also demonstrate a high level of teaching effectiveness on the basis of other considerations taken into account by the DFEC as noted above.

To be ranked **Satisfactory**, a faculty member should receive an average student evaluation rating of 3.0 or higher *and* also demonstrate teaching effectiveness on the basis of other considerations taken into account by the DFEC as noted above.

To be ranked **Unsatisfactory**, a faculty member must fail to meet the standards for a "Satisfactory" rating as identified above.

The quantitative evaluation measures noted above can vary where clear evidence is provided that other factors are influencing the averages noted in the course evaluation (low participation rate, course rigor, etc.).

2.2 Scholarship and Professional Activities.

The quantitative standards identified below are meant to provide clear guidance for major academic career milestones (tenure and promotion to associate professor and promotion to full professor). The goal is to ensure that, on average, the faculty member is producing scholarship and professional activities in a way that will result in favorable outcomes during promotional periods (as they are described in further detail under *tenure and promotion to associate professor* and *promotion to full professor*). The criteria stated in this section assume a faculty member who is producing average scholarship and professional activities in a quantity that is described below (on average one publication per year and one professional activity about every two years). Production of higher quantity and/or quality scholarship and professional activities in a given year must be taken into account during any single annual evaluation. For example, two publications in one year reduce the expectation of a publication in a subsequent year.

To be ranked **Excellent**, a faculty member must produce evidence of work resulting in or imminently leading to at least one finished written project (e.g., book, article, policy report) *and* document completed or imminent professional activities of finite duration (e.g., conference presentations, invited talks) or limited professional activities of high quality (i.e., with external recognition by academic peers, the media, or the public, expert roles in governmental media or non profit projects, academic/expert lectures).[1]

To be ranked **Very Good**, a faculty member must produce evidence of a written project that is in progress and provide evidence that it is reasonably leading to publication within a year. In addition, the faculty member must document work towards professional activities of finite duration (e.g., conference presentations, invited talks) or limited professional activities of high quality (i.e., with external recognition by academic peers, the media, or the public, expert roles in governmental media or non profit projects, academic/expert lectures).

To be ranked **Satisfactory**, a faculty member must demonstrate research intended to result in the publication of *bona fide* books or peer-reviewed articles or research that results in a written product with a public policy impact at some terminable point within the next few years.

---

[1] The term "imminently leading" in this context means there is proof the manuscript has been accepted for publication, but publication has not occurred by the time of evaluation. Note that any single publication can only be given credit once. Thus, if a faculty member seeks credit for a publication in an academic year before actual publication under this standard, the publication cannot be used for credit in a subsequent *annual evaluation*. As noted in the *Rules of Counting Scholarship* at the end of these standards, galley proofs or copy-edited manuscripts must be received no later than May 15th for the purposes of counting them in an annual evaluation.

To be ranked **Unsatisfactory**, a faculty member must fail to meet the "Satisfactory" standard as identified above.

Publication within a reasonable interval after research and writing has commenced will be considered a key standard for evaluation. Peer review and the prestige of the publishing outlet will be an important factor in judging quality-impact and will be weighted more heavily than other types of research. Self published and vanity press or classroom reproduction will have no value on the qualitative scale.

2.3 University Service.

To be ranked **Excellent**, a faculty member must make a significant contribution to the Department of Public Policy, the Public Policy Center, the College of Arts & Sciences, or the University by documenting participation in multiple activities of limited duration or participation in multiple Department of Public Policy activities of extended duration, high intensity, or outstanding quality.

To be ranked **Very Good**, a faculty member must make a multiple contributions to the Department of Public Policy, the Public Policy Center, the College of Arts & Sciences, or the University by documenting participation in more than one activity of limited duration or participation in more than one Department of Public Policy activity of extended duration, high intensity, or outstanding quality.

To be ranked **Satisfactory**, a faculty member must actively participate in at least one Department of Public Policy committee or other significant activity, including the further development of the academic programs within the department.

To be ranked **Unsatisfactory**, a faculty member must fail to meet the "Satisfactory" standard as identified above.

A "significant contribution" or "contribution" as stated above refers to evidence the faculty member has been an active participant in the service indicated, and also that the contribution by the faculty member has impact in the service being claimed.

2.4 Public Service.

To be ranked **Excellent** a faculty member must document sustained involvement in an activity or service with a demonstrable positive impact on an identifiable organization or multiple activities of shorter duration with similar impact. The quality and intensity of the service provided must be at a high level.

To be ranked **Very Good** a faculty member must document sustained involvement in an activity or service with a demonstrable positive impact on an identifiable organization or multiple activities of shorter duration with similar impact. The quality and intensity of the service provided must be at a moderate to high level.

To be ranked **Satisfactory** a faculty member must be involved in one sustained activity or multiple activities of limited duration.

To be ranked **Unsatisfactory**, a faculty member must fail to meet the "Satisfactory" standard as identified above.

The Department of Public Policy recognizes that public service activities can overlap with scholarship and professional activities, but the standard of producing a defined service to a defined non-academic public will be the cornerstone of this category, in contrast to scholarly activities that may have no immediate or demonstrable public impact.

Excluded from this category are involvements and activities where the faculty member is merely a citizen participant or is acting in a role that does not derive from his/her expertise or professional skills (e.g., leading a church group, serving on a fundraising committee at a local library, or serving on a town committee, union committee, or political action committee). Also excluded are activities where the main purpose is pecuniary in nature, i.e., payment for services rendered regardless of the public nature of the work.

END OF SECTION.

3.0 Contract Renewals

Contract renewals (3rd & 4th year and 5th & 6th year) shall require evidence of professional achievement and professional development as noted in the currently in-force collective bargaining agreement. The individual must document a level of professional achievement and professional development in each contract renewal that demonstrates incremental advancement toward tenure and promotion sufficient to warrant a conclusion that the individual is likely to be awarded tenure and promotion to Associate Professor at the conclusion of their sixth year of service in the Department of Public Policy. The basis for such an assessment will be the tenure and promotion standards currently in-force by the Department of Public Policy.

END OF SECTION.

4.0 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

A vote of tenure is made in accordance with the standards as described in the currently in-force collective bargain agreement (as they may change from time-to-time). Previous evaluations will provide a basis for the tenure evaluation, but they are not in themselves determinative. The requirements set forth below provide the cumulative framework for evaluating a tenure and promotion to associate professor application.

4.1 Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

Teaching effectiveness in the Department of Public Policy shall be evaluated on the basis of many criteria, but great weight (50%) shall be given to student evaluations. The Program's student evaluations will measure teaching performance on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest possible rating and 5 being the highest possible rating.

The assessment of teaching effectiveness is likely to be most reliable when it is based on multiple sources of evidence or methods of collecting information. The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee (DFEC) will also take into account the following considerations, measured through direct peer evaluation where applicable:

- Online development, deployment, and redevelopment of courses;
- Course materials in alignment with the program's mission;
- The use of teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content;
- The specification of course goals;
- The demonstration of knowledge, competence, and currency in course presentations;
- Engages in professional development and/or research to enhance his/her teaching effectiveness;
- The complexity of the subject matter and its level of difficulty for students;
- The research and preparation for the classroom;
- Class size;
- Course linkage with the instructor's research/publication and Public Policy Center Projects;
- Instructor's availability to students; and
- Student advising, both formal and informal, for students in and outside department programs.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Excellent** in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising by meeting the following minimum standard:

- Maintaining an average rating on student evaluations of 4.0 or higher as measured on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest possible rating and 5 being the highest possible rating *and* also demonstrate a high level of teaching effectiveness on the basis of other considerations taken into account by the DFEC as noted above;

- Teaching courses in the core curriculum and specialization areas of the program(s) offered by the department; and

- Contributing to the department's curriculum development with a new course offering, the introduction of innovative curriculum, or the introduction of new teaching methods and/or technologies, including online course development, deployment, and redevelopment.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Very Good** in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising by meeting the following minimum standard:

- Maintaining an average rating on student evaluations between 3.5 and 4.0 higher as measured on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest possible rating and 5 being the highest possible rating *and* also demonstrate a high level of teaching effectiveness on the basis of other considerations taken into account by the DFEC as noted above;

- Teaching courses in the core curriculum and specialization areas of the program(s) offered by the department; and

- Contributing to the department's curriculum development with a new course offering, the introduction of innovative curriculum, or the introduction of new teaching methods and/or technologies, including online course development, deployment, and redevelopment.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Satisfactory** in teaching effectiveness and advising if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Maintaining an average rating on student evaluations between 3.0 and 3.5 as measured on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest possible rating and 5 being the highest possible rating *and* also demonstrate a high level of teaching effectiveness on the basis of other considerations taken into account by the DFEC as noted above; and

- Teaching courses in the core curriculum and specialization areas of the program(s) offered by the department.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Unsatisfactory** in teaching effectiveness and advising if they fail to meet the standard for "Satisfactory" above.

The quantitative evaluation measures noted above can vary where clear evidence is provided that other factors are influencing the averages noted in the course evaluation (low participation rate, course rigor, etc.).

4.2 Scholarship and Professional Activities

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Excellent** in Scholarship and Professional Activities if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Publishing 5 peer reviewed journal articles, or the equivalent;
- Presenting 5 papers at academic conferences, or the equivalent; and
- Delivering at least 1 invited talk to an academic or professional audience.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Very Good** in Scholarship and Professional Activities if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Publishing 4 or more, but less than 5, peer reviewed journal articles;
- Presenting 4 papers at academic conferences, or the equivalent; and
- Delivering at least 1 invited talk to an academic or professional audience.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Satisfactory** in Scholarship and Professional Activities if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Publishing 3 or more, but less than 4, peer reviewed journal articles; and
- Presenting 3 papers at academic conferences, or the equivalent.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Unsatisfactory** in Scholarship and Professional Activities if they fail to meet the standard for "Satisfactory" above.

The DFEC will take into account the quantity and quality of the individual's scholarship and, may waive the minimum quantitative standards in recognition of the exceptional quality or impact of the individual's scholarship in a particular area.

4.3 University Service

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Excellent** in University Service if they make a substantial contribution to sustaining, developing, or advancing the Department of Public Policy, the Public Policy Center, the College of Arts & Sciences, or the University. This contribution may be a single activity with a significant impact or it may be in the cumulative impact of numerous activities.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Very Good** in University Service if they make a significant contribution to sustaining, developing, or advancing the Department of Public Policy, the Public Policy Center, the College of Arts & Sciences, or the University. This contribution may be a single activity with a significant impact or it may be in the cumulative impact of numerous activities.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Satisfactory** in University Service if they participate in sustaining, developing, or advancing the Department of Public Policy, the Public Policy Center, the College of Arts & Sciences, or the University. This

contribution may be a single activity with an identifiable impact or it may be in the cumulative impact of numerous activities.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Unsatisfactory** in University Service if they fail to meet the standard for "Satisfactory" above.

4.4 Public Service

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Excellent** in Public Service if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Make 3 invited talks or presentations to non-academic audiences; and
- Evidence of other forms of public service.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Very Good** in Public Service if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Make 2 invited talks or presentations to non-academic audiences; and
- Evidence of other forms of public service.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Satisfactory** in Public Service if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Make 1 invited talk or presentation to a non-academic audience.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, an individual will be ranked **Unsatisfactory** in Public Service if they fail to meet the standard for "Satisfactory" above.

The Department of Public Policy recognizes that public service activities can overlap with scholarship and professional activities, but the standard of producing a defined service to a defined non-academic public will be the cornerstone of this category, in contrast to scholarly activities that may have no immediate or demonstrable public impact.

Excluded from this category are involvements and activities where the faculty member is merely a citizen participant or is acting in a role that does not derive from his/her expertise or professional skills (e.g., leading a church group, serving on a fundraising committee at a local library, or serving on a town committee, union committee, or political action committee). Also excluded are activities where the main purpose is pecuniary in nature, i.e., payment for services rendered regardless of the public nature of the work.

END OF SECTION.

5.0 Promotion to Full Professor

5.1 Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

Teaching effectiveness in the Department of Public Policy shall be evaluated on the basis of many criteria, but great weight (50%) shall be given to student evaluations. The Program's student evaluations will measure teaching performance on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest possible rating and 5 being the highest possible rating.

The assessment of teaching effectiveness is likely to be most reliable when it is based on multiple sources of evidence or methods of collecting information. The Department Faculty Evaluation Committee (DFEC) will also take into account the following considerations, measured through direct peer evaluation where applicable:

- Online development, deployment, and redevelopment of courses;
- Course materials in alignment with the program's mission;
- The use of teaching strategies appropriate to the students and course content;
- The specification of course goals;
- The demonstration of knowledge, competence, and currency in course presentations;
- Engages in professional development and/or research to enhance his/her teaching effectiveness;
- The complexity of the subject matter and its level of difficulty for students;
- The research and preparation for the classroom;
- Class size;
- Course linkage with the instructor's research/publication and Public Policy Center Projects;
- Instructor's availability to students; and
- Student advising, both formal and informal, for students in and outside department programs.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Excellent** in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising by meeting the following minimum standard:

- Maintaining an average rating on student evaluations of 4.0 or higher as measured on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest possible rating and 5 being the highest possible rating *and* also demonstrate a high level of teaching effectiveness on the basis of other considerations taken into account by the DFEC as noted above;

- Teaching courses in the core curriculum and specialization areas of the program(s) offered by the department; and

- Contributing to the department's curriculum development with a new course offering, the introduction of innovative curriculum, or the introduction of new teaching methods and/or technologies, including online course development, deployment, and redevelopment.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Very Good** in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising by meeting the following minimum standard:

- Maintaining an average rating on student evaluations between 3.5 and 4.0 higher as measured on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest possible rating and 5 being the highest possible rating *and* also demonstrate a high level of teaching effectiveness on the basis of other considerations taken into account by the DFEC as noted above;

- Teaching courses in the core curriculum and specialization areas of the program(s) offered by the department; and

- Contributing to the department's curriculum development with a new course offering, the introduction of innovative curriculum, or the introduction of new teaching methods and/or technologies, including online course development, deployment, and redevelopment.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Satisfactory** in teaching effectiveness and advising if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Maintaining an average rating on student evaluations between 3.0 and 3.5 as measured on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the lowest possible rating and 5 being the highest possible rating *and* also demonstrate a high level of teaching effectiveness on the basis of other considerations taken into account by the DFEC as noted above; and

- Teaching courses in the core curriculum and specialization areas of the program(s) offered by the department.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Unsatisfactory** in teaching effectiveness and advising if they fail to meet the standard for "Satisfactory" above.

The quantitative evaluation measures noted above can vary where clear evidence is provided that other factors are influencing the averages noted in the course evaluation (low participation rate, course rigor, etc.).

5.2 Scholarship and Professional Activities

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Excellent** in Scholarship and Professional Activities if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Publishing 10 peer reviewed journal articles, or the equivalent;

- Presenting 10 conference papers (total), or the equivalent, with at least 2 of the papers delivered at interdisciplinary conferences or other special conferences that bring the individual into contact with scholars from multiple disciplines; and

- Delivering at least 5 invited talks to an academic or professional audience.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Very Good** in Scholarship and Professional Activities if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Publishing 8 peer reviewed journal articles (total), or the equivalent;
- Presenting 8 papers (total) at academic conferences, or the equivalent; and
- Delivering at least 3 invited talks to an academic or professional audience.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Satisfactory** in Scholarship and Professional Activities if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Publishing 6 peer reviewed journal articles (total); and
- Presenting 6 papers (total) at academic conferences, or the equivalent.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Unsatisfactory** in Scholarship and Professional Activities if they fail to meet the standard for "Satisfactory" above.

The DFEC will take into account the quantity and quality of the individual's scholarship and, may waive the minimum quantitative standards in recognition of the exceptional quality or impact of the individual's scholarship in a particular area.

5.3 University Service

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Excellent** in University Service if they make a substantial contribution to sustaining, developing, or advancing the Department of Public Policy, the Public Policy Center, the College of Arts & Sciences, or the University. This contribution may be a single activity with a significant impact or it may be in the cumulative impact of numerous activities.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Very Good** in University Service if they make a significant contribution to sustaining, developing, or advancing the Department of Public Policy, the Public Policy Center, the College of Arts & Sciences, or the University. This contribution may be a single activity with a significant impact or it may be in the cumulative impact of numerous activities.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Satisfactory** in University Service if they participate in sustaining, developing, or advancing the Department of Public Policy, the Public Policy Center, the College of Arts & Sciences, or the University. This contribution may be a single activity with an identifiable impact or it may be in the cumulative impact of numerous activities.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Unsatisfactory** in University Service if they fail to meet the standard for "Satisfactory" above.

5.4 Public Service

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Excellent** in Public Service if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Make 5 (total) invited talks or presentations to non-academic audiences; and
- Evidence of other forms of public service.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Very Good** in Public Service if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Make 4 (total) invited talks or presentations to non-academic audiences; and
- Evidence of other forms of public service.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Satisfactory** in Public Service if they meet the following minimum standard:

- Make 3 (total) invited talks or presentation to a non-academic audience.

For promotion to Full Professor, an individual will be ranked **Unsatisfactory** in Public Service if they fail to meet the standard for "Satisfactory" above.

The Department of Public Policy recognizes that public service activities can overlap with scholarship and professional activities, but the standard of producing a defined service to a defined non-academic public will be the cornerstone of this category, in contrast to scholarly activities that may have no immediate or demonstrable public impact.

Excluded from this category are involvements and activities where the faculty member is merely a citizen participant or is acting in a role that does not derive from his/her expertise or professional skills (e.g., leading a church group, serving on a fundraising committee at a local library, or serving on a town committee, union committee, or political action committee). Also excluded are activities where the main purpose is pecuniary in nature, i.e., payment for services rendered regardless of the public nature of the work.

END OF SECTION.

6.0 Rules of Counting Scholarship

The following rules of counting shall be applied in evaluating whether an individual meets the minimum quantitative standards for tenure, promotion, or contract renewal:

Article. An article must be published in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal. The individual under review must submit evidence documenting that the article manuscript was peer-reviewed. Articles will have quantitative value as follows:

- *Single Author* = 1 article

- *Co-author* = 2/3 article if the individual is the lead author and 1/3 if the individual is second author, unless evidence is submitted to document that both co-authors made an equal contribution to its research and authorship, in which case the coauthored article will equal 1⁄2 article.

- *Tri-author or more* = 1/3 article unless evidence submitted to document that an individual is the lead author with a substantially greater contribution than the other authors in which case a tri-authored article will = 1⁄2 article.

Note: The same rules of counting that apply to articles shall apply to books, edited books, book chapters, and conference papers (see below).

Book. A bona fide book must be peer-reviewed and published by a university press or by a commercial press recognized for its scholarly publications. The individual under review must submit evidence documenting that the book manuscript was peer-reviewed. A book equals 4 to 7 peer-reviewed articles depending on the length and number of chapters.

Book Chapter. A book chapter equals 1 peer-reviewed article if it is published in a bona fide edited book.

Edited Book. An edited book must be a bona fide book. An edited book shall receive credit as follows:

- 1 article for editing; and

- 1 article for each authored chapter, including an introduction.

Article in a Trade or Popular Publication = 1/2 article.

Conference Paper. A conference paper must be delivered at a recognized regional, national, or international disciplinary association, interdisciplinary “studies” association, professional association, or at a special topics conference, seminar, or colloquium sponsored by a recognized academic or professional organization:

- Conference Panel Discussant = 1⁄2 conference paper.
- Conference Roundtable Panelist = 1⁄2 conference paper.
- Conference Panel Chair or Moderator = 1⁄4 conference paper.

Note: Mere attendance at a scholarly conference or professional meeting shall not carry credit toward annual evaluation, contract renewal, tenure, or promotion.

Galley Proofs. Galley proofs or copy-edited manuscripts from a journal or book publisher is considered sufficient proof of an immanent publication so long as they are received no later than May 15th for purposes of annual evaluation and no later than October 30th of the year that an individual applies for tenure or promotion.

END OF SECTION.

END OF DOCUMENT.

Approved

Department of Women's and Gender Studies – University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
Tenure/Promotion and Promotion to Full Professor Standards
November 3, 2016

Categories of Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated annually, for contract renewal, for promotion and tenure, and for promotion to full professor in the categories of teaching and advising, scholarship and professional activities, and either university service or public service. The standards listed below apply to the recommendations for tenure and promotion and for promotion to full professor. The standards also apply to annual evaluations. The contractual requirement for a positive recommendation for tenure and promotion by the Department is an evaluation of "Excellent" in either teaching or scholarship, "Very Good" in the other category, and no "Unsatisfactory" ratings.

Standards for Teaching and Advising

Candidates are expected to compile teaching records that indicate that they are excellent teachers and advisors and that they will continue to improve and grow in these roles. The assessment of teaching effectiveness is likely to be most reliable when it is based on multiple sources of evidence or methods of collecting information. The successful candidate will demonstrate a sustained record of effective teaching as evidenced by student evaluations, various kinds of peer review (including annual observations by tenured faculty members), and efforts that indicate the candidate is using his/her annual reflections about their work as a springboard for subsequent teaching improvements.

Furthermore, faculty may include additional information to demonstrate effective teaching. These additional materials may include, but are not limited to, information about: course tools, the use of teaching strategies appropriate to the course context and size, engagement in professional development to enhance teaching effectiveness, development of new classes, the number of students taught, the variety and types of courses assigned to the instructor, the intellectual challenge presented to students (as evidenced by peer review of syllabi and exams), and/or teaching innovations adopted.

Academic advisors for the Women's and Gender Studies department are expected to serve as academic advisor to a proportional share of majors in the department, be proactive in contacting students about advising policies, be accessible during the registration period, and maintain a record of advising appointments and documentation for each advisee that is accessible to other advisors in the department. Files and records need not be presented for FARs, although the FEC may request this if it chooses. These records should be made available for personnel actions.

A brief paragraph outlining the advisor's approach to advising is expected for annual review and personnel actions. Additional evidence of advising effectiveness may be offered at an advisor's discretion. Examples of additional evidence can include, but are not limited to: letters of references for jobs or graduate school, undergraduate research samples, if the faculty member serves as a mentor, and evidence of engagement in professional development activities that contribute to advising effectiveness, such as attendance at teaching development workshops.

The FEC and Chair evaluations will be based on the materials submitted by the faculty member. Faculty must submit, at a minimum, student evaluations, peer review, a reflective statement, and evidence of advising effectiveness. Additional materials may be used to provide context about performance in any of these areas.

In order to receive an **excellent** rating for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Full Professor, faculty must present evidence of positive results in three of these four sets of materials. To be rated **very good**, positive results must be demonstrated in two out of these four categories. A faculty member will receive a **satisfactory** rating upon demonstrating positive results in at least one of these categories; an unsatisfactory rating will be given with no positive results. The FEC and Chair will have discretion in assigning evaluations of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Satisfactory," or "Unsatisfactory," but they shall base these decisions on the above criteria and provide a rationale for their rating. While the FEC and Chair shall consider evidence related to teaching and advising in assigning evaluations, greater weight shall be given to teaching in making these determinations. For tenure and promotion, greater weight will be placed upon the years closest to the tenure or promotion decision.

Standards for Scholarship and Professional Activities

The successful candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion beyond associate professor will have established and maintained an active research agenda and a body of scholarship that is recognized as making significant contributions to the growth of knowledge. The evaluation of the candidate's scholarship shall be based primarily on publications. The greatest weight will be placed upon refereed books, articles in refereed journals, chapters in refereed books, and articles in prestigious, non-refereed professional outlets. Additional indicators of successful scholarship shall include: publications in other venues; a record of seeking and securing external grant support; a consistent record of delivering papers or presenting posters at national meetings; honors, awards, and invitations to speak at other institutions; organizing conferences, professional panels, and lecture series; and/or serving as editor, reviewer, or board member for a scholarly journal.

An "active research agenda" will be indicated primarily by the candidate's number of original peer-reviewed publications. Externally funded research grants may be substituted in lieu of one published or accepted article. Candidates may count research that has been accepted for publication, but must demonstrate that these works are substantially complete. For journal articles, revisions must be complete, and the article must be in the queue for publication. For

book manuscripts, the entire manuscript must be submitted and accepted by the publisher, with minor revisions outstanding, in order to count as accepted. Co-authored publications should be considered as significant as solo-authored publications provided that the candidate has made a significant intellectual contribution to the work. Candidates ought to provide a description of their contributions to co-authored publications.

In assessing whether the candidate has made "significant contributions to the growth of knowledge," the members of the evaluation committee shall exercise their judgment based on the letters of external reviewers as well as their own independent evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, and shall take into account the originality, quality and professional impact of the candidate's work. In situations where the candidate's scholarship has had truly exceptional impact and is of outstanding quality, the evaluation committee may consider providing a rating higher than the one merited by the number of publications as outlined in the paragraphs below. The scholarship evaluation criteria shall be proportionally adjusted for those candidates who join the department with years of credit toward tenure and promotion and promotion beyond associate professor.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

In order to be rated as **"Satisfactory,"** the candidate must demonstrate the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a minimum of two articles in refereed journals, refereed books, or other prestigious professional outlets. IN ADDITION, the candidate must have submitted either (a) two article-length manuscripts or (b) one book-length manuscript for possible publication.

In order to be rated as **"Very Good,"** the candidate must demonstrate either (a) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a minimum of three articles in refereed journals, refereed edited volumes, or other prestigious professional outlets; or (b) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a refereed book-length manuscript. IN ADDITION, the candidate must have submitted either (a) one article-length manuscript or (b) one book-length manuscript for possible publication.

In order to be rated as **"Excellent,"** the candidate must demonstrate either (a) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a minimum of four articles in refereed journals, refereed edited books, or other prestigious professional outlets; or (b) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a refereed book-length manuscript AND at least one article published in a refereed journal, refereed edited book, or other highly prestigious outlet. Externally funded research grants may be substituted in lieu of up to two published or accepted articles

Promotion Beyond Associate Professor

For promotion beyond associate professor, the standards for evaluation shall be adjusted upward. In order to be rated as **"Satisfactory,"** the candidate must demonstrate the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a minimum of two articles in refereed journals, refereed

books, or other prestigious professional outlets. IN ADDITION, the candidate must have submitted either (a) two article-length manuscripts or (b) one book-length manuscript for possible publication.

In order to be rated as **"Very Good,"** the candidate must demonstrate either (a) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a minimum of four articles in refereed journals, refereed edited volumes, or other prestigious professional outlets; or (b) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a refereed book-length manuscript. IN ADDITION, the candidate must have submitted either (a) one article-length manuscript or (b) one book-length manuscript for possible publication.

In order to be rated as **"Excellent,"** the candidate must demonstrate either (a) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a minimum of five articles in refereed journals, refereed edited books, or other prestigious professional outlets; or (b) the publication (or acceptance for publication) of a refereed book-length manuscript AND at least two articles published in a refereed journal, refereed edited book, or other highly prestigious outlet.

Annual Review

For the purpose of regular annual reviews, the evaluation committee shall consider whether the faculty member has maintained an active research agenda in the period since the prior annual review. Scholarly activity shall include: the publication of scholarship; the submission of scholarly manuscripts for review at a journal or press; external grant submissions; professional conference presentations; the drafting of manuscripts or book chapters; the collection and analysis of data related to a scholarly project; invited talks or presentations; organizing conferences, professional panels or lecture series; and serving as editor, reviewer or board member for a scholarly journal or academic press.

To be rated **"Satisfactory"** during annual review, the faculty member must have engaged in some amount of scholarly activity. To be rated **"Very Good,"** the faculty member must have engaged in a moderate amount of scholarly activity. To be rated **"Excellent,"** the faculty member must have been engaged in extensive scholarly activity or have had published, or had accepted for publication, an article in a refereed journal or a refereed book-length manuscript (with the understanding that the final publication can only be used as evidence of scholarly activity once, either at acceptance or publication, if the two events fall into different annual review periods).

It is important to note that annual reviews evaluate scholarly activity as well as scholarly production, and faculty members may merit a high rating even without a publication during the year. These standards recognize that scholarly projects often take several years to be completed, and considerable activity takes place in the years prior to publication. In contrast, the standards for tenure and promotion and promotion beyond associate require publications. As a consequence, annual review ratings in scholarship may not necessarily predict the evaluation committee's ratings during tenure and promotion (as, for example, in the case

where a faculty member has engaged in much scholarly activity in each year but has few or no refereed publications).

Standards for University Service

Faculty are expected to report all of their service activities. Each activity listed should be accompanied by a brief description of what that activity entailed. For tenure and promotion and for promotion beyond associate, the activity should span all or most of the period considered for review.

A faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as at least one college and/or university activity outside the department to be ranked **"Satisfactory"** in this category of evaluation.

To be ranked **"Very Good,"** a faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as participate in multiple college and/or university activities or in a single university activity of unusual importance or intensity.

To be ranked **"Excellent,"** a faculty member must participate actively in departmental affairs as well as assume a leadership role in at least one department, college, or university activity. Examples include, but are not limited to, chairship of a major committee or leadership of an academic program (including Women's and Gender Studies).

If a faculty member receives a course release or other compensation for university service, this shall *not* reduce the service value of the activity.

Standards for Public Service

The department defines public service as the application of professionally related expertise or skills that enrich local, regional, or national communities. Faculty members who choose to be evaluated in public service must provide evidence of the nature of their public service as well as evidence of the benefit of this public service to the university and the community.

A faculty member must participate in multiple instances of limited duration in order to be ranked **"Satisfactory"** in this category of evaluation.

To be ranked **"Very Good,"** a faculty member must participate in one sustained activity of significant benefit to the community.

To be ranked **"Excellent,"** a faculty member must participate in multiple instances of limited duration and one sustained activity of significant benefit to the community OR multiple instances of sustained activity of significant benefit to the community.

APPROVED

University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
Department of Foreign Literature & Languages
Faculty Evaluation Standards for
Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
For Faculty Hired on or after September 1, 2016

The Department of Foreign Literature & Languages at UMass Dartmouth is a composite of disciplines and sub-specialties that in many large universities would be separate departments—French, Spanish, Linguistics, and Foreign Language Education. Standards for tenure and promotion must therefore reflect this diversity and respect differences in background, education, pedagogy, and scholarly productivity among its members. Despite these differences, our members share several common pursuits united by our overarching interest in cultural studies, literature, language, and learner development.

Categories of Evaluation and Ratings

Faculty are evaluated annually for contract renewal, and for promotion and tenure in the four categories of: Teaching and Advising, Scholarship and Professional Activities, University service, and Public Service.

Candidates shall be evaluated in at least three categories that must include both the categories of Teaching and Advising and Scholarship and Professional Activities.

According to Article VII, Section E of the UMass Board of Trustees and Faculty Federation Local 1895 Collective Bargaining Agreement (p. 71 in the 2012 contract), in order to receive a rating of "Recommended" for tenure, the candidate must earn ratings of "An Excellent in either Teaching Effectiveness and Advising or Scholarship and Professional Activities and a Very Good in the other of these two categories and no unsatisfactory ratings." A rating of "Not Recommended" results from "Failure to meet the standards under the 'Recommended' rating."

The standards listed below apply to the recommendations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, ordinarily made during the candidate's sixth year of service or its equivalent. Candidates should be thoroughly conversant with **Article VII, Personnel Actions,** in the faculty contract, which governs this document.

Narrative: The candidate must write a detailed report, ordinarily not exceeding 10 pages, summarizing a dossier (see below) of records documenting his/her accomplishments during the tenure/promotion period. This should be a stand-alone statement aimed at helping the FEC, department chair, humanities academic council, dean, provost, and external reviewers understand why this work and the documents referenced deserve the highest possible ratings toward tenure and promotion. This report serves as an executive summary and narrative of the candidate's record and accomplishments with greatest attention devoted to the **categories of evaluation** explained above. Candidates should explain how their efforts contribute to the mission, vision, values, and goals of the university, CAS, and department as articulated in the relevant strategic plans as well as to their individual career paths, professional development, scholarship, and teaching.

Dossier: With guidance and mentoring from the Department Chair and other senior faculty, candidates will be responsible for supplying a professional dossier of their work with annotation suitable for non-experts to evaluate the quality of the work. Candidates should include documentation of how courses taught relate to the mission, vision, and values of the university and CAS as articulated in their strategic plans, to the FLL Mission statement, to content specified in FLL learning outcomes and rubrics documents, as well as to any other departmental policy documents that may be in place at the time of dossier submission. Candidates are responsible for supplying documentation for each category of evaluation that includes: annual review and FEC contract renewal reports, syllabi, student evaluation summaries, performance samples of student work, copies of published work, reviews, letters, and other tangible evidence of accomplishments. The candidate must explain the competitive environment and professional background related to publishers, publications, reviewers, conferences, producers, and/or venues where their scholarly works have appeared. Evidence should be assembled and presented to indicate the extent to which the candidate's published work has influenced scholarship in the discipline, with evidence on the number of citations of each work, the acceptance rate or other indicators of quality of the journal or press, and any other available evidence that identifies the impact of the candidate's scholarship. The dossier should include a table of contents and be presented with great care and professionalism in a suitable binding.

I. Standards for Teaching and Advising

Teaching. The dossier should include a summary of the courses and sections taught by the candidate for each semester of the review period, with the number of students enrolled and any available summary of student ratings for the section. The list should include course number, section, and course title for each course for each semester. The successful candidate will demonstrate a sustained record of effective teaching as evidenced by annual observations by tenured faculty members, innovative teaching practices, development of courses in varied face to face, blended, and/or online formats, development of course materials that facilitate engagement and interaction, student ratings, performance samples of student work (papers, projects, video and/or audio samples, multimedia projects), adherence to sound pedagogical practices recognized by the profession, use of both formative and summative assessments in courses, and written reflection about his or her teaching in response to the university mission, vision, values, and goals, annual peer evaluation reports, departmental learning outcome statements, rubrics, and mission statements, and student evaluations.

Advising. Special weight in advising effectiveness will be given to chairing and participation in student projects, theses, honors' projects, experiential learning, teaching internships, independent studies, interdisciplinary studies, student recommendations, and helping solve challenging student problems. Special weight will also be given to advising majors within a given program in terms of assistance with portfolio preparation, portfolio submission, and capstone project completion. Candidates should demonstrate their sustained effort in implementing departmental advising documents such as the document on "Best Advising Practices." Candidates should also describe the nature of the advising work and specify the amount of time devoted to each project. As specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article VII, A, 1 and 3, the category of Teaching Effectiveness and Advising includes "The quantity and quality of academic advising of students majoring in the department, graduate student research advising, and advising of students enrolled in the faculty member's own classes" (The category of University Service includes

"participation in structured programs such as freshman advising, transfer student advising, advising centers, interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary program advising, and advising student organizations and clubs" and so is not considered in the Teaching Effective and Advising category).

The FEC and Chair evaluations will consider student ratings; syllabi; assignments; examinations, course requirements, teaching materials; performance samples of student work; classroom observation by senior faculty once yearly; advising effectiveness; the candidate's annual self-evaluation statements; and compiled student evaluations, paying special attention to comments germane to teaching behaviors judged especially effective by the profession for student learning such as workshopping, peer learning, active learning, service learning, task-based instruction, guidance of student inquiry-based work and project work, discussion leadership, and/or effective lecturing. Included will be an assessment of how these courses contribute to the mission, vision, and values of the university and to the learning goals (mission, outcome, and rubric documents) of the FLL department. Substantial weight will be given to the variety and types of courses assigned to the candidate and successfully implemented by the candidate, the candidate’s conception of courses (as evidenced by syllabi and the depth and/or breadth of course materials and assessments), the varied assessments, tasks, formats, and participation structures used both within and/or across courses, teaching innovations adopted, formative and summative assessments of student work, and the candidate’s reflections on his or her pedagogical growth and the impact of these reflections upon learner development and growth across courses taught.

In sum, the evaluation shall be based on the following four criteria.

First, the evaluation shall be based on the degree to which the candidate’s documented teaching effectiveness and advising support the mission, vision, values, and goals of the university.

Second, the evaluation shall be based on classroom performance comprised of (a) syllabi, materials, and innovations; performance samples of student work, the variety and types of courses assigned to the candidate and successfully implemented by the candidate, the candidate’s conception of courses (as evidenced by syllabi and the depth and/or breadth of course materials and assessments), the varied formats, formative and summative assessments, tasks, formats, and participation structures used both within and/or across courses, and the degree to which course materials and classroom practices facilitate student engagement and interaction, (b) student ratings (both quantitative summaries or means and written student comments) including a comparison of evaluations for individuals teaching similar courses at similar levels in the Department, and (c) faculty peer evaluation reports including classroom observation of at least one class per year.

Third, the evaluation shall be based on the candidate’s ability to demonstrate and reflect on his or her pedagogical growth as well as the way in which these reflections have positively impacted learner development and growth across courses.

Fourth, the evaluation shall be based on the candidate’s implementation of successful advising practices, as defined above.

Evaluations of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Satisfactory," or Unsatisfactory" by the FEC and Chair will be made based on the above criteria. In general greater weight will be placed upon the years closest to the tenure decision, thus allowing candidates time to adjust to and to grow within the context of UMass Dartmouth.

For an Excellent rating, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial, and sustained innovation, contribution, and impact in all the four areas of teaching effectiveness and advising outlined above as the basis for the evaluation.

For a Very Good rating, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial and sustained, contribution, or impact in at least three of the four areas of teaching effectiveness and advising outlined above as the basis for the evaluation. An unfavorable previous rating that leads to remediation and improved teaching effectiveness does not disqualify the candidate from this rating.

For a Satisfactory rating in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial and sustained innovation, contribution, and impact in at least two of the four areas of teaching effectiveness and advising outlined above as the basis for the evaluation. An unfavorable previous rating that leads to remediation and improved teaching effectiveness does not disqualify the candidate from this rating.

For an Unsatisfactory rating, the candidate will fail to demonstrate and/or document significant, substantial and sustained innovation, contribution, and impact in ways that meet minimum expectations for a Satisfactory rating in this category.

II. Standards for Scholarship and Publication

The scholarship and professional activity of faculty in the Department of Foreign Literature and Languages at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth falls into the following fields, broadly defined: French and Francophone Literature and Culture, Hispanic Literatures and Cultures, Pedagogy, and Linguistics. Scholarship and Professional Activity recognizes creative work, research, scholarly writing, and pedagogical writing in our various disciplines. Standards for each area are outlined below followed by specific productivity ranges that apply to our specialties. No matter what their specialty or specialties within these fields, candidates for tenure and promotion must demonstrate an ongoing, high-quality research and publication record as well as consistent, high-quality professional activity. In all cases, a candidate's work will be evaluated on the basis of quality, importance, originality, artistic merit, insight, depth of investigation, level of difficulty or challenge, and the level of prestige of the publications, publishers, and organizations involved in such projects.

The university strategic plan stresses the importance of the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth's faculty members using their expertise to contribute to the advancement of knowledge through its development research and academic programs that combine innovation and relevance at the international, national, regional, state, and local levels. The standards of quality and quantity outlined below align with the university, CAS, and department mission statements and strategic plans.

A. Definitions of Scholarship and Professional Activity
Candidates must demonstrate distinction and value in

Peer-reviewed scholarly publications
or pedagogical writing (e.g. textbooks)
or grant writing
or a suitable combination of 1, 2, and/or 3
or conference organization or professional presentations at international, national, and regional conferences or published conference proceedings or other professional activity
or creative publications, presentations and performances, or literary translations
or book or journal editing or actively participating in an editorial, organizational, or advisory board or serving as a reviewer or evaluator of books and journal articles

As technologies of publishing continue to evolve, we recognize that electronic publications are increasingly a part of many candidates' dossiers. As long as such publications undergo the same rigorous process of external scholarly peer evaluation, the Department of Foreign Literature and Languages is committed to weighing them equally with print publications, following the MLA's lead in recognizing the growing importance of e-sources with respect to print publications as the publishing industry continues to evolve.

Works in progress will be taken into account as they demonstrate continued professional growth, progress, recognition, and promise in the field.

Peer-Reviewed Scholarly Publications (French and Francophone Literature and Culture, Hispanic Literatures and Cultures, Pedagogy, and Linguistics)
These include peer-reviewed monographs, peer-reviewed journal articles, pedagogical or linguistics books or articles that advance the discipline, scholarly translations and editions, peer-reviewed book chapters, and substantive peer-reviewed reference articles in either print or electronic format.

The Scholarship of Translations and Critical Editions
Scholarly translations and critical editions play a vital role in increasing accessibility to important texts for students and researchers. As such, they are significant examples of research and scholarship. The Department of Foreign Literature and Languages defines "scholarly translation" as the translation of a text from one language into another, accompanied by the critical apparatus needed to introduce and contextualize the text for an audience of students and/or researchers. Publishers determine which elements will be included as the critical apparatus for a translation. In general, we assume that a scholarly translation will include a critical introduction to the text, notes regarding the text and the translation, and a bibliography. The Department of Foreign Literature and Languages defines as "scholarly edition" the preparation, for publication, of an accurate, reliable edition of a text, accompanied by the critical apparatus appropriate to a text designed for use in classrooms and/or for research. Publishers determine the critical apparatus and form of an edition. In general, we assume that a scholarly edition includes a critical introduction, notes where appropriate, and a bibliography.

Scholarship in the Fields of Pedagogy and Linguistics

Pedagogy of second-language acquisition has long been regarded as a distinct field of scholarly inquiry, just as the varieties of linguistics have their own areas of scholarly research and expertise. We expect that some candidates for tenure and promotion to be active in publishing and presenting work in these areas.

We encourage publication in the area of pedagogy and/or linguistics—whether theoretical or applied—to relate directly to the teaching fields of the candidate (including courses currently taught and those under preparation). We also recognize the likelihood that contributors to these areas of study may also be contributing to another field (e.g., literary criticism, women's and gender studies, African and African-American studies, or any of a number of possible specialties).

We encourage candidates to combine the scholarship of pedagogy with other fields of inquiry. To give just one of many possible examples, a candidate might submit a dossier with two articles on pedagogical theory or practice with two substantial pieces of literary criticism, with two articles in linguistics journals, or with two important contributions to the field of cultural studies.

A candidate may not double-count pedagogical scholarship in his or her tenure dossier. In other words, the same work cannot be listed under both Scholarship and Professional Activities and Teaching and Advising. Similarly, work performed as part of the routine preparation of UMass Dartmouth classes will not ordinarily qualify for Scholarship and Professional Activities.

In this category of evaluation, an applicant may qualify for tenure or promotion based exclusively on Peer-Reviewed Scholarly Publication or may include a mix of this work with pedagogical scholarship.

Pedagogical Writing

Due to the nature of pedagogy and/or linguistics as practical endeavors, another method exists to disseminate scholarship in these areas: the publication of textbooks and related works for use by classroom practitioners. Though not peer-reviewed in the traditional sense, these works undergo rigorous editorial examination by both commercial and academic reviewers. Contributions in this area include: writing and/or editing textbooks, writing supplementary materials to accompany textbooks or pedagogical programs, contributing substantial material to textbooks (or their electronic equivalents), presenting on classroom practice at national or regional conferences, and reviewing of textbooks and other vehicles of practical pedagogy (either for publishing houses or academic journals).

The authorship of a textbook will therefore have equal weight with the authorship of a scholarly monograph.

Grant Writing

The candidate should provide evidence demonstrating the importance, competitive nature, and prestige of grant proposals and awards. S/he should explain why each merits consideration by the FEC and how each compares or should be weighted relative to published work.

Conference Organization, Professional Presentations at Conferences, and Other Professional Activities

Scholarly and professional conferences are extremely important venues for faculty participation and development. Organization of conferences in ways that advance the discipline, conference presentations, and professional development workshops attended (whether on or off campus), poster sessions, and interviews qualify as professional activities and should be given significant weight, especially if the faculty member is involved in the very development, organization, and running of a conference. Given the enormously competitive nature of regional and national conferences and many performance venues, these activities are often equal in stature and prestige to publications. Hence the candidate should provide evidence demonstrating the importance, competitive nature, and prestige of each presentation, explaining why it merits consideration by the FEC and how it compares or should be weighted relative to published work.

Creative Work, Presentations, and Performances

Faculty in the Department of FLL may be engaged in a wide range of creative activity, professional productions, and discipline-related performance arts. To fulfill the equivalent of advancing knowledge in these creative or performance-based contexts, faculty may contribute creative works directly into the professional venues related to their specialty. Some of these works, such as fiction, poetry, drama, performance art, literary nonfiction, documentary production and media editing require great skill, imagination, and discipline to carry out at a level of excellence. Whether rooted primarily in art, craft, or a combination of both, the department refers to these as “creative” works.

Unlike more traditional scholarship largely confined to the academy, creative work must compete with massive numbers of practitioners around the world under rapidly changing conditions. Evaluation is sometimes very difficult, but is based largely on the same principles as in the other categories. The candidate in creative work has a special burden to explain the nature of these venues and their competitive conditions, selectivity, claims to quality, and relevance to one’s specialty. Factors that the candidate may consider include reviews, press quality, and readership numbers.

Book or Journal Editing; Active Participation in an Editorial, Organizational, or Advisory Board; Professional Consultation Activities; Reviewer or Evaluator of Books or Journal Articles

Serving as the editor of a book or scholarly journal or actively participating as a member of an editorial, organizational, or advisory board, or actively participating in professional consultation activities, or reviewing or evaluating books or journal articles is a sign of recognition and acceptance by one’s peers in the field. Candidates for promotion and tenure should document their work in this capacity.

B. Quality Expectations

The candidate’s scholarship and professional activity will be evaluated on the basis of quality, importance, originality, craft, artistic merit, insight, depth of investigation, level of difficulty or

challenge, and the level of prestige of the publications, publishers, and organizations involved in such projects.

Considerations of quality will always take precedence over quantity, and the FEC will assess the quality of both the contribution to the field and the source of its dissemination. An article in a prestigious national peer-reviewed journal will therefore count for more than one in a smaller, more local publication. A lengthy study involving primary research will thus weigh more heavily than a brief note on a classroom activity, even if they appear in the same journal.

In all cases, the work will be evaluated on the basis of quality and significance to the field and documentation for this is needed. Published reviews, remarks by editors, comments by publishers, letters of acceptance, contract offers, independent peer evaluations, peer remarks, and peer testimonials will be important measures of these qualitative criteria. Work accepted for publication that has not yet appeared counts, but requires documentation. For work that is re-published, revised, re-titled, or in any way derivative from previously published work, the extent of the new work must be described in detail and its extent explained.

Task-oriented professional activities, such as editing publications, peer reviewing, organizing panels, providing organizational leadership, and such, require detailed explanation in keeping with the "Quality Expectations" clause above.

C. Quantitative Expectations

We offer this section with reference to our earlier comments about our emphasis on quality rather than on quantity. Having reiterated this point, we agree on the following:

To be considered for an EXCELLENT rating in the category of Scholarship and Professional Activities, a candidate will demonstrate original research and scholarship in terms of the following criteria or a combination of these criteria (listed in order of descending importance) with at least four substantive publications between (a) and (b) with at least one publication in (a) and some activity in (c) or (d):

a) Peer-reviewed monographs, peer-reviewed journal articles (either one substantive journal article or several equivalent shorter articles in either print or electronic format), significant textbook publications that advance the discipline, scholarly translations, scholarly editions, edited volumes, significant successful grant writing, substantive peer-reviewed book chapters
b) Significant peer-reviewed creative work, literary translation, or conference proceedings related to the faculty member's discipline and/or area of expertise or substantive peer-reviewed reference articles
c) Substantial and significant book or journal reviews or evaluations, published in major scholarly journals, which contribute to an understanding of the conversations taking place in the faculty member's field; or book or journal editing or actively participating in an editorial, organizational, or advisory board
d) Other professional activities

A candidate must also have a least two additional manuscripts or creative works or presentations submitted for peer review at the time of his/her tenure application.

To be considered for an VERY GOOD rating in the category of Scholarship and Professional Activities, a candidate will demonstrate original research and scholarship in terms of the following criteria or a combination of these criteria (listed in order of descending importance) with at least three substantive publications between (a) and (b) with at least one article from (a) and some activity in (c) or (d):

a) Peer-reviewed monographs, peer-reviewed journal articles (either one substantive journal article or several equivalent shorter articles in either print or electronic format), significant textbook publications that advance the discipline, scholarly translations, scholarly editions, edited volumes, significant successful grant writing, substantive peer-reviewed book chapters
b) Significant peer-reviewed creative work, literary translation, or conference proceedings related to the faculty member's discipline and/or area of expertise or substantive peer-reviewed reference articles
c) Substantial and significant book or journal reviews or evaluations, published in major scholarly journals, which contribute to an understanding of the conversations taking place in the faculty member's field; or book or journal editing or actively participating in an editorial, organizational, or advisory board
d) Other professional activities

A candidate must also have a least one additional manuscripts or creative works or presentations submitted for peer review at the time of his/her tenure application.

To be considered for an SATISFACTORY rating in the category of Scholarship and Professional Activities, a candidate will demonstrate original research and scholarship in terms of the following criteria or a combination of these criteria (listed in order of descending importance) with at least three substantive publications between (a), (b), and (c) with not more than one from (c) and some activity in (d):

a) Peer-reviewed monographs, peer-reviewed journal articles (either one substantive journal article or several equivalent shorter articles in either print or electronic format), significant textbook publications that advance the discipline, scholarly translations, scholarly editions, edited volumes, significant successful grant writing, substantive peer-reviewed book chapters
b) Significant peer-reviewed creative work, literary translation, or conference proceedings related to the faculty member's discipline and/or area of expertise or substantive peer-reviewed reference articles
c) Conference presentation (that has not been published as conference proceedings); Substantial and significant book or journal reviews or evaluations, published in major scholarly journals, which contribute to an understanding of the conversations taking place in the faculty member's field; or book or journal editing or actively participating in an editorial, organizational, or advisory board
d) Other professional activities

A candidate must also have a least two additional manuscripts or creative works or presentations submitted for peer review at the time of his/her tenure application.

Candidates who fail to demonstrate and/or document significant, substantial and sustained leadership in ways that meet minimum expectations for a Satisfactory rating in this category will receive and UNSATISFACTORY rating.

In the humanities, major works and projects often require several years to develop and include many steps and stages. Because tenure is cumulative and evaluations are on-going, the department recognizes the importance of works in progress. To justify a rating of Excellent, Very Good, or Satisfactory in on-going work in this category, candidates should document their activities carefully and thoroughly each year, including a description of the stage, the work involved, the challenges faced, and letters or communications commenting on the progress from editors or others familiar with the work and the genre in question.

Given that use of impact factors to measure research quality is a) highly problematic and b) not common in our fields, the FEC will not use such a measure. Other factors such as number of citations of published work may be considered. The DFEC will take into account the quantity and quality of the individual's scholarship and, may waive the minimum quantitative standards in recognition of the exceptional quality or impact of the individual's scholarship in a particular area.

D. Productivity Expectations

Our core expectation is for quality work carried out steadily and consistently over the probationary period. Where numbers of publications are specified, they are offered to indicate our estimate of what is reasonable and possible given the teaching load in our department, and given what has been accomplished by others while maintaining effective teaching and service on the road to tenure. They are offered to answer the candidate's common question: how much are we talking about?

In 2006, the Modern Language Association (MLA), the principal professional organization of scholars in literature and languages, urged recognition of the difficult state of publishing in our disciplines. The 2006 *Report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion* cited steep declines in library budgets for books in the humanities as well as journals.[1] Academic presses tend to prefer textbooks, which generate income, to book length studies in the humanities. Journals in the field are thus being overwhelmed with article submissions, a situation that often leads to an article being held by a journal editorial board for more than one year before a publishing decision is made. During this yearlong period, journal guidelines prevent us from sending articles to other journals for consideration. Thus, increasingly, it is becoming more and more difficult to place an article in a timely fashion. The situation has not improved since the 2006 MLA report was published.

Meanwhile, the commercial publishing world has undergone massive consolidation. Today there are only five major publishers of fiction and nonfiction books, each part of huge corporate

[1] https://www.mla.org/content/download/3362/81802/taskforcereport0608.pdf

conglomerates seeking profits in celebrity and blockbuster works, much of dubious quality. Similar trends have occurred in newspaper and magazine journalism, TV, radio, theater, and film. The federal and state governments have reduced funding for the arts, thus hurting literary and arts publishers. Competition is ferocious. One bright spot is the appearance of more small, high quality independent publishers, comparable to independent filmmakers. Competition is very stiff because these publishers can only afford to publish a few books a year, often fewer than a half dozen, while turning away hundreds and often thousands of submissions. New electronic technologies have reduced publishing costs but the jury is still out on reader acceptance.

Applicants must provide significant detail about these smaller venues, and evaluators must respect that publishing in our field has never been more difficult.

III. Standards for University Service

University Service is an umbrella term that describes the wide range of faculty contributions that transform the physical plant and campus grounds into a vibrant university where students, faculty, staff, and researchers engage together in the pursuit and advancement of knowledge in a shared space characterized by excellence, diversity, transparency, student-centeredness, accountability, innovation, engagement, collaboration, collegiality, and safety. Faculty members play a key role in ensuring the operational excellence of the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, by creating a safe, collaborative, and collegial environment consonant with the mission and vision of this institution. The university specifically defines its mission as distinguishing "itself as a vibrant, public research university dedicated to engaged learning and innovative research resulting in personal and lifelong student success. The University serves as an intellectual catalyst for economic, social, and cultural transformation on a global, national, and regional scale." It defines its vision of itself as "a globally recognized premier research university committed to inclusion, access, advancement of knowledge, student success, and community enrichment". Faculty work directed at supporting the operations, oversight, and development of the university constitutes university service. University service includes, but is not limited to, committee work, participation in Senate or union activities, cultural programming, recruitment, university events, alumni/fundraising events, commencement, convocation, orientation, university social programming, co-curricular events, program development, curriculum review/development, assessment, peer-evaluation/review, accreditation, department/program self-study, university boards. Faculty participation in these areas creates a trusting and engaged community in which students and research may thrive. As a doctoral research university dedicated to excellence in both undergraduate and graduate education, UMass Dartmouth depends on the university service of its faculty in order to meet goals outlined in the University and CAS's strategic plans.

Evaluation of service will be based on a clear statement of the nature and extent of the activities cited. The narrative should give a sense of the scope of the faculty member's university service activities and how these contribute to the university's mission. Faculty members should list all the committees and boards on which they served. They should describe their specific role as well as their contributions. They should detail all other work that qualifies as university service. They should frame the importance of their work by indicating impact and outcomes of the activities. The evaluation will consider the list of committees and other activities, but the principal basis for evaluation will be the nature of the faculty member's participation and the outcomes of the service. Evidence of either a qualitative or quantitative nature should be provided and interpreted. Such evidence is a stronger basis of evaluation than the offering of opinion or speculation.

Service activities without evidence of substantive outcomes will carry less significant weight in the evaluation.

In order to earn a rating of "Excellent", a faculty member must demonstrate a record of significant, substantial, and sustained leadership at the Departmental, College, and/or University level.

A rating of "Very Good" requires demonstration of sustained significant service to the Department, College, and/or University.

A rating of "Satisfactory" requires a modest but sustained level of involvement in service functions, at least at the Departmental level.

It should be noted that while faculty may opt to be not rated in university service, they must be evaluated in at least three of the four categories (teaching, scholarship, university service, and public service) and two of the three areas must be teaching and scholarship.

IV. Standards for Public Service

Public service involves use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies or units other than the UMass Dartmouth by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise, or other assistance to these external entities, pro bono or substantially below market rates. Compensated professional work is consulting and does not fall within the category of Public Service.

Public service as here defined promotes several of the guiding principles outlined in the University's strategic plan. Public service promotes the mission of the University to serve as an intellectual catalyst for economic, social, and cultural transformation, particularly at the regional level. Likewise, the University's vision of being a globally recognized premier research university committed to student success and community engagement is supported by public service activities. Public service aligns with the University values of diversity, student-centeredness, engagement, and collaboration, which are essential to the fulfillment of the University's mission.

Public service also contributes to promoting highly productive collaborations, partnerships, and community engagement. Through public service, the University continues to support and expand collaborations that enable a mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity, making contributions to economic development and the social and cultural well-being of the South Coast. Public service enables the combination of the faculty’s expertise, student involvement and University resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and, in general, contribute to the public good.

Evaluation of service should be based on a clear statement of the nature and extent of the activities cited. While the evaluation should include a list of the activities engaged in, it should also include an assessment of the significance and impact of the service, as well as its compatibility with the University's strategic goals and guiding principles. Evidence of either a

qualitative or quantitative nature should be provided and interpreted. Such evidence is a stronger basis of evaluation than the offering of opinion or speculation. In addition, for each activity listed, there should be a clear statement that the work was either not compensated or was compensated at below-market rates.

A rating of "Excellent" requires a demonstrated record of significant, substantial, and sustained service to one or more external entities as well as substantial leadership in the provision of the service.

To be rated "Very Good" in public service, a record of consistent and significant service to one or more external entities must be demonstrated.

A rating of "Satisfactory" requires a modest but sustained level of involvement in the service functions of some external entity.

It should be noted that faculty may opt to be not rated in public service but must be evaluated in at least three of the four categories, including Teaching & Scholarship.

Approved

University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
Department of Foreign Literature & Languages
Faculty Evaluation Standards for
Promotion to Full Professor
For Faculty Promoted on or after September 1, 2014

Overview of the Process

Application for promotion to Professor follows procedures defined in the Trustees/Faculty Federation *Agreement*, Article VII, Personnel Recommendations. Anyone intending to apply for promotion is urged to read carefully the sections of Article VII that describe the process. In particular, please note the materials that must be included in the promotion dossier, the definition of the categories of evaluation, the ratings in the categories and for the overall recommendation, and the timetable. Because external evaluators are required for consideration of an application for promotion and because the first level of evaluation requires that the Department Faculty Evaluation Committee make a recommendation to the Department Chair by October 15, selection of the external evaluators must be initiated during July or August of the year preceding the academic year in which the application will be considered. If there are any questions concerning timing or procedure, applicants are strongly encouraged to consult with the Dean prior to considering an application for promotion.

Narrative

The candidate must write a detailed report, ordinarily not exceeding 10 pages, summarizing a dossier (see below) of records documenting his/her accomplishments during the promotion period. This should be a stand-alone statement aimed at helping the FEC, department chair, humanities council, dean, provost, and external reviewers understand the context, innovation, value and impact of the candidate's scholarship. This report serves as an executive summary and narrative of the candidate's record and accomplishments with greatest attention devoted to the **categories of evaluation** explained below. Candidates should explain how their efforts contribute to the mission, vision, values, and goals of the university and to their individual career paths, professional development, scholarship, and teaching.

Categories of Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated for all personnel actions in the categories of teaching and advising, scholarship and professional activities, and either in university service or public service, although candidates may choose to be evaluated in all four categories. The standards listed below apply to the recommendations for promotion to Professor, made typically after 6 or more years of service in the rank of Associate Professor. The standards are interpreted for faculty in each Department against the background of that Department's approved standards for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

Promotion to Professor is a significant milestone in an academic career. The Professor designation is intended to express to the academic community that an individual has achieved the highest rank and implies a distinguished and sustained record in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Standards for Teaching and Advising

The successful candidate for promotion to Professor will document that he or she has demonstrated significant, substantial, and sustained leadership, contribution, and impact on the basis of teaching and advising done at UMass Dartmouth since the last period of promotion.

In addition, the candidate will be rated on contribution, and impact with respect to the following types of evidence: (1) teaching innovations that pedagogical research shows to be effective in enhancing student learning (2) syllabi and teaching activities with which the candidate has engaged since his/her promotion to Full Professor and the currency of these syllabi and activities in terms of content and methodology within the field (3) contributions to existing curriculum development or to the creation of new programs and developing teaching methodologies that accommodate the wide diversity of backgrounds, abilities, and motivations that exist among UMD students (4) the breadth and depth of these activities in terms of planning, design, implementation and the extent to which these activities develop students' skills in critical thinking, written communication, oral communication, information literacy, and creativity (5) assessment of activities in ways that embrace a continuous improvement approach to teaching and response to colleague and/or student feedback (6) alignment of teaching activities with other departmental or college documents related to teaching and portfolio assessment and with the department, program, and university mission statements (7) commitment to student success including effective student advising and mentoring within and outside of course work (honors theses; independent or directed studies; undergraduate research; thesis chairing, organization of portfolio processes for the major) that demonstrates superior academic and/or professional progress of students (8), and the outcomes of these activities on students, student evaluations (evaluations of instructor’s contribution to the class, overall quality, amount students have learned), peer evaluations, the program, the department and, ideally, on other institutions, professional associations, and policy formulation. Student evaluations are expected to have numeric scores above 3.0 on the typical 5-point scale subsequent to promotion to Associate Professor. They should include a copy of the evaluation form and an interpretation of the responses that students provide. There should be a comparison of the candidate’s student evaluations with those of other faculty in the Department who teach courses similar in content, size, level of offering, and difficulty. Evidence of student demand for the candidate’s courses is also considered. Peer review should occur during the period leading up to the promotion recommendation from one to two different faculty colleagues. Peer review should happen at least three times in the six-year period prior to application for promotion. Reviewers should be provided with full portfolios of the course being reviewed, including a statement of course objectives and philosophy. In the case of interdisciplinary courses, it is useful to have peer reviews by faculty in different disciplines. Constructive criticism is expected in such reviews and should not detract from the overall evaluation of the candidate.

Evaluations of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Satisfactory," or Unsatisfactory" will be made based on the above evidence. There is an expectation of significant, substantial, and sustained effective performance in teaching and advising, especially during the period leading up to the promotion recommendation.

For an Excellent rating, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial, and sustained contribution and impact in at least six of the measures of teaching effectiveness and advising outlined above.

For a Very Good rating, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial and sustained contribution and impact in at least five of the measures of teaching effectiveness and advising outlined above.

For a Satisfactory rating in Teaching Effectiveness, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial and sustained contribution and impact in at least four of the measures of teaching effectiveness and advising outlined above.

For an Unsatisfactory rating, the candidate will fail to demonstrate and/or document significant, substantial and sustained contribution and impact in ways that meet minimum expectations for a Satisfactory rating in this category.

Standards for Scholarship and Publication

The successful candidate for promotion to Professor will document that he or she has demonstrated significant, substantial, and sustained leadership, contribution, and impact on the basis of scholarship and publication since the last period of promotion. Quality is more important than quantity but there must be sufficient quantity to provide evidence of a significant level of scholarly productivity and impact.

In addition, the candidate will be rated on leadership, contribution, and impact with respect to the following types of evidence: (1) Established recognition as a major researcher, scholar, and/or creative artist at the national and/or international level resulting in peer-reviewed publications.[1] (2) An intellectual agenda and/or research that reflects a mature formulation of questions and a rich exploration resulting in publication. (3) Ability to engage in major integrative work. (4) Evidence of quality of research and/or scholarship can include either citations, prestige of journal or presses or exhibits or performance venues, outside funding of research from prestigious foundations and institutes, evaluations from outside reviewers, personal statements provided by the candidate that detail the significance of each scholarly piece and their connections to each other. (5) Participation in collaborative scholarship and publication; however, a portion of the scholarly record should include works to which the candidate has made the primary contribution. (6) Conference participation or performance and exhibitions that demonstrate scholarly engagement and attainment. Invited presentations to talk at other universities and prestigious event are important but play a lesser role independent of other measures of scholarly record. (7) Impact of one's scholarly work on other scholars and on one's field of expertise; examples of this might include external letters of reference, a documented collegial exchange of ideas over time; or a record of successful grants (8) Sustained involvement in the life of national organizations related to one's areas of expertise and/or increased activity in professional service roles (service on editorial boards, more activity in professional associations) at the national level.

[1] Examples of this include peer-reviewed monographs, peer-reviewed journal articles (either one substantive journal article or several equivalent shorter articles in either print or electronic format), significant textbook publications that advance the discipline, scholarly translations, scholarly editions, edited volumes, significant successful grant writing, substantive peer-reviewed book chapters, significant peer-reviewed creative work, conference proceedings, or conference presentations related to the faculty member's discipline and/or area of expertise or substantive peer-reviewed reference articles.

For an Excellent rating, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial, and sustained leadership, contribution, and impact in at least six of the measures of scholarship and publication outlined above, one of which must be measure number 1 and a minimum of five peer-reviewed publications.

For a Very Good rating, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial and sustained leadership, contribution, or impact in at least five of the measures of scholarship and publication outlined above, one of which must be measure number 1 and a minimum of four peer-reviewed publications.

For a Satisfactory rating in Teaching Effectiveness, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial and sustained leadership in at least four of the measures of scholarship and publication outlined above, one of which must be measure number 1 and a minimum of three peer-reviewed publications.

For an Unsatisfactory rating, the candidate will fail to demonstrate and/or document significant, substantial and sustained leadership in ways that meet minimum expectations for a Satisfactory rating in this category.

Standards for University Service

The successful candidate for promotion to Professor will document that he or she has demonstrated significant, substantial, and sustained leadership, contribution, and impact on the basis of university service since the last period of promotion.

In addition to the expectations and types of activity for university service seen as standard for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor will be rated on leadership, contribution, and impact with respect to the following types of evidence: (1) the degree to which the service activities performed result in substantive outcomes (2) mentoring of faculty colleagues in teaching, scholarship, and/or service (3) demonstrated support of the effective operations of the department and/or college (4) increased participation in administrative roles (5) participation in advising programs that benefit students outside of one's academic department (6) the development of university service and/or online courses that benefit students outside of one's academic department (7) contributions to university websites in ways that enhance the university's mission and image (8) other creative initiatives that benefit faculty and/or students across the college and the university.

For an Excellent rating, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial, and sustained leadership, contribution, and impact in at least seven of the measures of university service outlined above.

For a Very Good rating, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial and sustained leadership, contribution, or impact in at least five of the measures of university service outlined above.

For a Satisfactory rating, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial and sustained leadership in at least four of the measures of university service.

For an Unsatisfactory rating, the candidate will fail to demonstrate and/or document significant, substantial and sustained leadership in ways that meet minimum expectations for a Satisfactory rating in this category.

Standards for Public Service

Public service involves use of professional knowledge and experience to benefit individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, governmental agencies or units other than the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth by providing instruction, applied research, technical expertise, or other assistance to these external entities, pro bono or substantially below market rates. The successful candidate for promotion to Professor will document that he or she has demonstrated significant, substantial, and sustained leadership, contribution, and impact on the basis of public service since the last period of promotion.

In addition, the candidate will be rated on leadership, contribution, and impact with respect to the following types of evidence: (1) the degree to which the public service activities performed result in substantive outcomes that benefit the community (2) increased participation in public service roles since the last period of promotion (3) activities and initiatives that benefit the community and/or connections between the university and the community.

For an Excellent rating, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial, and sustained leadership, contribution, and impact on all of the measures of public service outlined above.

For a Very Good rating, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial and sustained leadership, contribution, or impact on at least two of the measures of public service outlined above.

For a Satisfactory rating, the candidate will demonstrate and document significant, substantial and sustained leadership on at least one of the measures of public service outlined above.

For an Unsatisfactory rating, the candidate will fail to demonstrate and/or document significant, substantial and sustained leadership in this category in ways that meet minimum expectations for a Satisfactory rating.

UMass | Dartmouth
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

Mohammad A. Karim, Ph.D.
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
for Academic and Student Affairs
Chief Operating Officer

April 26, 2018

TO: Kenneth Oliveira, Chair, Department of Biology

APPROVED BY

FROM: Mohammad Karim, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic & Student Affairs and Chief Operating Officer

CC: Amy Shapiro, Interim Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
Catherine Curran, President, Faculty Federation

RE: Expectations for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

In accordance with the Faculty Federation Agreement Article VII.A, I have received and reviewed the Promotion to Senior Lecturer standards approved by the faculty and chair of the Biology Department.

VII.A CATEGORIES OF EVALUATION FOR PERSONNEL ACTIONS

> Each department/school shall develop written evaluation standards for tenure and for each level of promotion, taking into account the mission of the University, and specifying the types of items that will be considered within each of the categories of evaluation. While certain aspects of a single project may be considered under different categories, no single item or activity may be evaluated in more than one category. Each department's written standards must be approved by a majority of the department's tenured faculty, the Department Chairperson, the College or School Dean, and the Provost. The department and the administrators identified in the preceding sentence will review department standards every six years. Existing standards remain in effect until revised standards have been approved.

I thank you and the faculty for your excellent efforts to review and/or revise the department standards. Having received Dean Shapiro's approval as well, I approve the Promotion to Senior Lecturer standards for the Biology Department. These new standards will go into effect on April 27, 2018 and be reviewed again in academic year AY2021-2022 for renewal in September 2022.

Office of the Provost ▪ www.umassd.edu
University of Massachusetts Dartmouth ▪ 285 Old Westport Road ▪ Dartmouth ▪ MA 02747-2300
Ph: 508.999.8024 ▪ Fax: 508.999.8375

Approved

UMass Dartmouth College of Nursing and Health Sciences:
Senior Lecturer Standards for the Departments of Adult Nursing and Community Nursing

For an appointment as a Senior Lecturer, a candidate must possess the appropriate degree, and have considerable academic and professional experience beyond the level which would warrant an appointment as Full Time Lecturer; must have a record of sustained achievement in teaching and advising, and service that meets the goals of their department, the college, and university.

In accordance with the Faculty Federation contract (effective July 1, 2017, p. 168-170), promotion to Senior Lecturer from the rank of Full-Time Lecturer requires at least ten (10) years at that level, or its equivalent, and evidence of demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the university. Promotion and renewal shall be based on the lecturer's performance and institutional needs. Professional criteria will be primarily teaching excellence, but also departmental and college service. Renewal of appointments at the rank of Senior Lecturer may be for a period of up to five years.

1. Recommended: An Excellent in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising, and an Excellent or Very Good in–University Service. Candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer are *not required* to perform scholarship or professional activities or public service.
2. Not Recommended: Failure to meet the standards under the "Recommended" rating.

Teaching Effectiveness and Advising	
Satisfactory	In order to be eligible for promotion, the candidate must achieve Excellent in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising. Falure to meet "Excellent" rating indicates the candidate is ineligible to be granted promotion to Senior Lecturer.
Very Good	In order to be eligible for promotion, the candidate must achieve Excellent in Teaching Effectiveness and Advising. Falure to meet "Excellent" rating indicates the candidate is ineligible to be granted promotion to Senior Lecturer.
Excellent	***To achieve a rating of"Excellent," a candidate:*** 1. Assumes a variety of assigned classroom and clinical course assignments to meet the College needs. 2. Has a cumulative mean student evaluation score of excellent. 3. Receives at least one rating of "excellent" from a senior faculty observer. 4. Completes course materials and evaluation of classroom/clinical learning in a timely manner. 5. Demonstrates ability to teach across learning modalities. 6. Uses self-reflection, peer evaluation suggestions, and constructive comments from student evaluation feedback to make changes to course design, course assignments, and teaching/learning strategies. 7. Demonstrates the integration of a variety of teaching methods in assigned courses. 8. Focuses on improving teaching effectiveness demonstrated by annual attendance at on-campus (OFD or CITS) program focused on improving teaching effectiveness; or attending a regional/national conference focused on improving teaching effectiveness; or completing a course or CEU program focused on improving teaching effectiveness. 9. Creatively utilizes evidence-based and innovative strategies to improve student outcomes in the classroom and clinical environment.

	10. Additional evidence may include: development and instruction of new course offerings, peer-reviewed or invited publication describing course innovations or instructional approaches, awards recognizing teaching excellence, and certification (e.g. Certified Nurse Educator). ***Advising*** 1. Engages in the College advising processes designed to maximize student retention and progression, including but not limited to advising students on course selections and campus life, and socializing students to professional nursing 2. Provides mentorship to an undergraduate or graduate student. 3. Provides mentorship to a new faculty member focused on improving teaching effectiveness and advising (if available).

Candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer *are required* to be evaluated in Service to the Academic Community. Evaluation of service will be based on a clear statement of the nature and extent of the activities cited in the candidate's dossier. The evaluation will consider the degree of participation in each service activity and the impact and outcomes of the service.

Service to the Academic Community	
Satisfactory	In order to be eligible for promotion, the candidate must achieve Excellent or Very Good in Service to the Academic Community. Falure to meet "Excellent"or "Very Good" rating indicates the candidate is ineligible to be granted promotion to Senior Lecturer.
Very Good	***To achieve a rating of "Very Good," a candidate participates in the following activities:*** 1. Regularly attends and contributes to the work of assigned committees. 2. Completes responsibilities of the lecturer role in a timely manner to meet needs of the Department and the College of Nursing and Health Sciences. 3. Attends a *minimum* of two (2) formal college events annually (e.g. Open Houses or Discovery Day, Scholarship Day, Pinning or Graduation Ceremonies). 4. Contributes to special projects or task force activities (e.g. performing an end-of-course report audit; participating in reviews required by the SPEP, Ad hoc committees). 5. Completes the equivalent of one (1) additional workload responsibility per year beyond the lecturer role requirements to meet needs of the department or CNHS (e.g. active participation in work groups and/or special projects; faculty advisor to a campus organization; working in advising center, etc.).

Excellent	***To achieve a rating of "Excellent," the candidate must meet the very good service requirements listed above, and demonstrate consistent participation in 4 or more of the following activities:*** 1. Chairs or co-chairs a nursing committee or ad hoc project committee, or; is a member of a university committee, or; accomplishes significant committee work (e.g. leads curriculum revision work group; leads CCNE standards review/revision work group; responsible for one Evaluation Committee survey process, participates in a Search and Screen Committee for the CNHS or at the university level) (if available).

*Note: Work paid as Additional Compensation may not be included as evidence for promotion review unless it is deemed by the Dean to directly serve the College needs. Non-traditional work will be reviewed and evaluated by the Dean.