WEST CHESTER UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

STATEMENT OF PROMOTION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The attached Statement of Promotion Policies and Procedures is herewith approved:

Greg Weisenstein
President, West Chester University

Date: 05/28/10

Clifford Johnston
President, Local APSCUF

Date: 5/28/2010

WEST CHESTER UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

STATEMENT OF PROMOTION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The attached Statement of Promotion Policies and Procedures is herewith approved:

Greg Weisenstein
President, West Chester University

Date: 05/28/10

Clifford Johnston
President, Local APSCUF

Date:

WEST CHESTER UNIVERSITY PROMOTION POLICY
Fall 2010

PHILOSOPHY OF EVALUATION

The process of faculty evaluation is intended to promote continuing professional growth and academic excellence. In addition, it provides information on which to base personnel decisions. Evaluation shall give greater weight to the quality of performance than to the quantity in the areas of teaching and professional responsibilities, scholarly growth, and service. While activities intended to improve one's performance are valued, they cannot be evaluated. It is expected that the benefit of such activities will be realized by improved performance ratings.

Summative evaluation, the purpose of which is making promotion decisions, is a process of accumulating data that is evaluated by competent observers. Peer review is the cornerstone of faculty evaluation. Recognizing that evaluation is inherently subjective, the goal of the evaluation system is to control subjectivity by maximizing consistency and minimizing bias. To this end, the assessment of performance quality must be rendered first-hand from the most qualified observer. If sufficient data exists, informed observers will come to the same conclusions.

While measures of performance quality will vary with discipline, there are guideposts that apply to all. For example, in the area of scholarship, there is an established hierarchy of peer review. Peer review in a national or international forum carries greater weight than that in a local or regional forum. Evaluation instruments both specify the criteria on which judgments are made and assure that the evaluation procedure is conducted equitably. It must be remembered that numerical ratings are subjectively assigned and do not denote nor imply precision.

Promotion occurs as a function of the judgment of designated peers and the President, giving greater weight to the quality than the quantity of the performance of an applicant. The promotion criteria go beyond considerations of either longevity or minimal statutory requirements. These and all other decisions related to faculty evaluation are made irrespective of race, creed, color, gender (including discrimination by sexual harassment), age, disability, national origin, sexual orientation, life style, family status, APSCUF membership or activity or lack thereof, political views or affiliations, or religious views or affiliations.

I. PROMOTION COMMITTEES

A. Promotion and Tenure Workshop Committee (PTW)

The PWT Committee concerns itself with issues related to evaluation, tenure, and promotion and is charged with providing advice, training, and assistance to individual faculty members, departments, and the TeP Committee. The PTW Committee consists of five to seven members including a past member of TeP, a representative from APSCUF, a representative from the Academic Affairs Council, and 2-4 constituency members as needed. No more than one member from any department may serve on the PTW Committee. PTW will provide workshops for the campus community on Tenure and Promotion, review Department Teacher Scholar Models, and make recommendations for improvement of the Tenure and Promotion processes. More information on the PTW Committee is included in Appendix 1.

B. Tenure and Promotion Committee (TeP)

1. TeP Committee Composition and Election

The TeP Committee will consist of nine tenured faculty members from the university's academic units. Committee membership will include one each from the Colleges of Business and Public Affairs, Education, Health Sciences, and Visual and Performing Arts; four from the College of Arts and Sciences; and one from the faculty in Counseling and Psychological Services, the Library, and Educational Development. No more than one member from any department may serve on TeP.

Members of the committee will be nominated by their respective constituencies for two-year terms, one half of the classroom faculty to be elected each year. The non-classroom member will be elected in the odd numbered years. Elections for each member will be University-wide. New members will be elected in April to take office on August 1. A vacancy will be filled by a new election. This election will comply with paragraph 1 of Section I. B. of this document.

The APSCUF campus elections committee will insure that all regular faculty are eligible to participate in the nomination and election process for the TeP Committee. Election to the committee will be effected upon an absolute majority vote of the appropriate electing unit and not upon a mere plurality. A majority will be calculated upon the total number of votes cast in the electing unit in that election. Other election procedures will conform to the procedures of the APSCUF Nominations and Elections Committee.

2. Chair of the TeP Committee

The Committee will elect a Chairperson from committee members who have completed at least one year of service of one or more consecutive terms. The election of the Chairperson for the following academic year will take place during the preceding Spring term. The Chairperson will assume responsibilities on August 1. The Chairperson will be eligible to vote. The Chairperson will be granted the equivalent of one quarter release time during the Spring semester. The duties of the chairperson will include but not be limited to:

a. convening the Committee. The first meeting will be a training session with the PTW Committee and will occur during the week preceding the start of the Fall semester;
b. conducting all meetings;
c. organizing procedures, preparing the committee calendar, and scheduling all discussion meetings;
d. overseeing the publication and distribution to all members of the bargaining unit the approved tenure policy and the approved statement of promotion policies and procedures;
e. requesting and receiving all pertinent additional information, testimony, or other evidence requested by the University-wide committee;
f. normally, acting as the individual responsible for reviewing applicants' official personnel files, when necessary. (This does not preclude the other members of the committee from reviewing personnel files if they so desire.);
g. notifying applicants of their right to appear before the committee and organizing the applicants' interview meetings;
h. receiving and tabulating all committee members' individual scores;
i. communicating to each applicant his/her scores and then conveying the ranked list of applicants to the President or his/her designee and the APSCUF Chapter President; and
j. meeting with applicants desiring further information.

The committee will be provided with adequate secretarial support by the University.

3. Responsibilities, Restrictions, Rights, and Duties of the TeP Committee

a. The TeP Committee will be responsible for considering and making recommendations to the President or her/his designee on all tenure and promotion applications.
b. No member of the TeP Committee may declare or apply for promotion upon election to or while serving on the committee. In addition, no member of the TeP Committee may consider any application of a member of his/her immediate family (spouse, child, step-child, parent, step-parent, parent-in-law, brother, sister, brother-in-law or sister-in-law), or a person residing in his/her household. If one of the above conflicts should arise, a committee member must resign and not simply recuse him/herself.

c. A faculty member may serve in only one role as part of another faculty member's evaluation process. If a faculty member has been elected to TeP and is also on the department recommendation committee or is the department chair he/she must not participate in TeP discussions and recommendation for that particular faculty member. They are not required to resign from TeP.
d. The members of the TeP Committee will be under obligation to review carefully and in detail only those materials for promotion submitted under Section III of this document. In addition, the official application form for promotion, as approved by Meet and Discuss, will contain a signature line below the options for the applicant to choose between permitting and not permitting the TeP Committee to review the applicant's official personnel file.
e. The TeP Committee will review only those applications and supporting materials specified under Section III of this document and received from the departments/units and will judge each application on the basis of the degree to which the applicant has met the criteria appropriate to the rank to which promotion is sought. The TeP Committee will notify every applicant for promotion of his/her right to meet with the committee. The TeP Committee will offer any applicant who wants such a meeting a list of proposed dates.
f. Applicants will have access to copies of all documents reviewed by the TeP Committee relevant to the applicant's own case and to a list of sources of information considered by the committee relevant to the applicant's case.
g. If the TeP committee is not satisfied with the justification of any party making a recommendation, it will ask for clarification, consistent with Section III. A.14 and 15 of this document. TeP will evaluate all recommendations and responses and make its own evaluation.
h. The deliberations of the TeP Committee will be held in private. Members of the TeP Committee shall respect the confidentiality of the information to which they have access.

4. Operation of the TeP Committee

The TeP Committee will review applications for promotion by rank according to the criteria specified. Individual committee members will read each application. The members of the committee will meet to discuss and compare their analysis of each applicant. The TeP Committee will notify each applicant of his/her right to meet with the committee and provide a list of proposed dates. Following the applicant meetings, the members of the TeP Committee will meet again to discuss each applicant. After this meeting, each faculty member will be evaluated within each of the three performance review categories within the following constraints:

a. Because the level of performance varies for each rank (Section II. D. of this document), promotion applications for a given rank will be rated together according to the criteria for that rank. The maximum possible rating for each rank is 100. Each committee member will assign a quality rating for each category on a one hundred point scale (100 = highest quality). Applicants will be rated according to the criteria for the current rank (for tenure applications) or the rank to which application for promotion is being made.
b. The chairperson will calculate a median score for each category for each applicant.
c. The median score in each category will be multiplied by the percentage weighting factor specified in the applicant's Statement of Expectations (or, in the case of probationary faculty or faculty members who did not specify weightings, 50%, 35%, 15% for teaching, scholarly growth and service, respectively). The sum of these weighted factors will become the final score.
d. Applicants for promotion receiving a final score of 85 or above for the rank to which application for promotion is made will be recommended for promotion to that rank. The TeP Committee will submit a ranked-in-group list specifying those applicants who are recommended for promotion, and those who are not. The final recommendations on promotion will be submitted to the President or her/his designee and the APSCUF

Chapter President. The applicant must be apprised in writing of the TeP Committee's recommendation prior to the submission of the recommendation to the President or her/his designee. That statement must include his/her scores for each category.

e. At the President's or his/her designee's request, the recommendations given to him/her will be supported in sufficient detail to enable him/her to know the grounds upon which TeP reached its conclusion in each case. In the event the President or his/her designee rejects a recommendation of the TeP Committee, that committee will be notified in writing and will be given an opportunity to discuss the matter with the President. The President or his/her designee will meet with the TeP Committee at least once after May 1 for the purpose of fulfilling this exchange. Promotions will be made by the President effective as of the beginning of the next academic semester and announced to the faculty by July 15th.

C. Department Recommendation Committee

1. Department/Unit Recommendation Committee Composition and Election

a. Whenever any faculty member of a department/unit has announced an intention to seek promotion, that department/unit must identify a recommendation committee to consider the application(s) for promotion. This committee must be selected by October 15 of the academic year in which the application(s) is to be submitted.

b. In all department/units, any recommendation committee will have at least three members selected according to department policy, from the tenured faculty.

c. The following are eligible to serve on the department/unit recommendation committee:
   1). Full-time tenured faculty members of the department/unit. The department chair shall not be a member of the committee.
   2). Full-time tenured faculty members of other departments of the University or from other institutions selected in accordance with Article 12.C.1.a.

d. No faculty member who has announced his/her intention to seek promotion will serve on a department recommendation committee.

e. No faculty member shall serve on a department recommendation committee when he/she or a member of his/her immediate family or a person residing in his/her household is an applicant for promotion. Immediate family is defined as spouse, child, step-child, parent, step-parent, parent-in-law, brother, sister, brother-in-law or sister-in-law.

2. Application Procedures

Each department/unit recommendation committee will operate consistent with department evaluation procedures and all relevant procedures outlined in Section III of this document.

3. Responsibilities of the Department/Unit Recommendation Committee

a. To meet prior to the deadline for submission of applications for promotion to the TeP Committee and consider all applications for promotion;

b. To notify each applicant of his/her right to appear before the committee prior to submitting its recommendation to TeP, inform each applicant of the recommendation of the committee, and provide each applicant with the reasons for the recommendation.

c. To establish the authenticity and validity of any evidence submitted by the applicant and to prepare a summary statement on the merits of these for inclusion with its recommendation.

d. To review all of the evidence available and submit a detailed recommendation, entitled the Department Committee Promotion Recommendation, for each applicant in writing to the TeP Committee that shall contain specific references to the evidence considered by the committee on the basis of which the recommendation was made.

e. To deliver, by hand, to the Provost's Office by December 15, all materials submitted by the applicant, all evidence considered by the committee, and the recommendation of the committee; and
f. To submit a full list of applicants from the department/unit to the Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager and the chair of TeP.

D. Department Chairperson

1. Responsibilities of the Department Chairperson

a. To ensure that a department recommendation committee is in place for all promotion applicants by October 15 of the year the applications will be submitted.
b. To ensure that each department recommendation committee has met and chosen a chair prior to November 1 of the year the applications will be submitted.
c. To ensure that, by November 1, the applicant is aware of the name of the chair of the department recommendation committee reviewing his or her application.
d. To receive the promotion applications and supporting documentation from department faculty members and immediately notify the department recommendation committee.
e. To review all of the evidence available and submit a detailed recommendation, entitled the Department Chairperson Promotion Recommendation, for each applicant in writing to the TeP Committee that shall contain specific references to the evidence considered by the department chairperson on the basis of which the recommendation is made.
f. To advise each applicant of his/her right to request a meeting with the department chairperson prior to the chairperson making his/her recommendation;
g. To provide all applicants with a copy of his or her recommendation and provide them with the reasons for his or her recommendation; and
h. To submit the full list of applicants from the department/unit to the Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager and the chair of TeP.

2. Restrictions on the Department Chairperson

a. No department chairperson shall evaluate his/her own application for promotion or the application of a member of his/her immediate family or a person residing in his/her household. Immediate family is defined as spouse, child, step-child, parent, step-parent, parent-in-law, brother, sister, brother-in-law, or sister-in-law.
b. In the event that the chairperson becomes ineligible to write a recommendation(s) for promotion, a replacement for the chair (usually the assistant chair, a chair from a related department, or a previous chair) will be selected according to the procedure in Article 12.C.1.a of the CBA.

II. CRITERIA

A. Statutory Requirements

The minimum requirements for ranks as specified in Act 182 and other applicable laws are:
Professor--an earned doctorate (including the JD and MFA equivalency degrees with 60 graduate credits for faculty in the studio or performing arts); at least seven years of teaching experience.
Associate Professor--minimum of an earned doctorate (including the JD and MFA equivalency degrees with 60 graduate credits for faculty in the studio or performing arts); or a master's degree plus forty semester hours of graduate credit or a total of seventy semester hours of graduate credit including a master's degree or all course work completed toward a doctorate as certified by the university where the work is being taken; at least five years of teaching experience.

Assistant Professor--minimum of master's degree plus ten semester hours of graduate credit; at least four years of teaching experience.

No additional time requirements (e.g. time in rank, years of teaching experience, length of service to the University) beyond those mandated by statute shall constitute criteria for promotion. The initial appointment to the faculty shall be made within the rank advertised at a level appropriate to the appointee's experience. No departures from the normal promotion procedure will be offered as a condition of employment. No promotions shall be granted prior to two years of teaching experience at the University. No promotion shall be granted prior to the achievement of tenure.

B. Statement of Expectations

1. Prior to employment, a Statement of Expectations will be developed by the department chair and approved by the dean or appropriate manager that outlines both conditions of employment (e.g. obtain terminal degree) and expectations for performance. The initial Statement of Expectations should reflect the faculty responsibilities as described in the position announcement and be consistent with the CBA. Acceptance of these terms and conditions is indicated by the future employee's signature.
2. The Statement of Expectations is intended to guide the faculty member in carrying out her/his professional work and meeting his/her responsibilities. Consequently, the Statement of Expectations should indicate criteria by which the quality of the faculty member's performance can be evaluated. Statements of Expectations should generally avoid setting too specific or numerically determined goals such as the number of committees served in a given period.
3. The Statement of Expectations should be considered in evaluating the individual faculty member. The statement will indicate individual expectations and weightings in the areas of evaluation on which the faculty member is being evaluated.
4. Faculty members may establish relative weights following tenure (see II.C.3 University-wide Model for ranges of weights). The entire probationary period will be evaluated 50% teaching /primary responsibility, 35% scholarship, and 15% service. Relative weights may be modified by mutual agreement between the faculty member, chair, and Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager upon achievement of tenure and/or thereafter upon modification of the Statement of Expectations. A Statement of Expectations that does not explicitly provide weights shall have the assigned weights used for the probationary period.
5. Minimally, when a faculty member achieves tenure and at five year intervals thereafter, his/her Statement of Expectations will be reviewed, reaffirmed or modified by joint agreement of the faculty member, the department chair , and the dean or appropriate manager. Faculty members are encouraged to review their Statement of Expectations annually. The Statement of Expectations should be modified as changes in responsibilities and/or changes in life circumstances occur, as long as there is mutual agreement among the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean or appropriate manager. Each modified Statement of Expectations should note areas where the quality of performance will be maintained, lowered, or expanded commensurate with the faculty member's rank, expertise, and experience or change of circumstances.
6. If there is a disagreement and a faculty member's Statement of Expectations can not be agreed upon, mediation will be provided through Human Resources. Referral to Human Resources will be initiated by the dean or appropriate manager. After referral, mediation shall be concluded within 8 weeks during the academic year. If mediation is not successful and the parties are unable to come to resolution, the issue will be referred to Meet and Discuss by either the dean/appropriate manager or the faculty member within 9 weeks of the initial referral to HR. Failure of the dean/appropriate manager or the faculty member to refer the issue to M&D will be considered approval of the unmodified SOE.

7. This section is not intended to diminish the Administration's CBA rights or obligations in accordance with law to direct the faculty. Nor is this section intended to diminish the CBA rights of a faculty member or the requirement that a modification of the Statement of Expectations be a joint agreement acceptable to the faculty member.
8. Each SOE will contain the following language under the heading of Teaching/Primary Responsibility:

   > Nothing in the Statement of Expectations can interfere with the right of management to direct the faculty in accordance with law and, in particular, to assign courses and duties as allowed by the CBA consistent with the faculty member's area of expertise.

   This language will apply to every current SOE without regard to the appearance of the language in the signed SOE.
9. The faculty member, department chair, and the dean or appropriate manager will each be responsible to keep a copy of the current, valid Statement of Expectations, which will be provided by the dean/appropriate manager to APSCUF upon request.

C. Promotion Criteria

Promotion decisions for all faculty will be based on the quality of performance in the areas of Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional responsibilities, Scholarly Growth, and Service as defined in the University-wide Role Model.

The quality of performance in the area of Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional responsibilities shall constitute the most important criterion. For faculty members whose basic responsibilities lie in the classroom, effective teaching and advising (if appropriate) is of primary importance.

For faculty members whose basic responsibilities lie outside the classroom:

a. In addition to the required minimum qualifications, categories for promotion of these faculty shall include:
   1. the duties and responsibilities of the position
   2. fulfillment of professional responsibilities
   3. continuing scholarly growth
   4. service contributions to the University/community
b. Faculty members who have mixed workloads of teaching and non-teaching responsibilities should be evaluated on both effective teaching and the duties and responsibilities of the non-teaching assignment(s).

1. Minimum criteria

a. Failure to fulfill the conditions of employment specified in the Statement of Expectations may result in the denial of promotion.
b. In addition, there are minimum expectations which, if not met, may affect a faculty member's evaluation for promotion. These minimum expectations are contained in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and include:
   1. Preparing for and meeting assigned classes/primary assignment;
   2. Conferring with and advising students;
   3. Holding office hours at least five hours per week on no fewer than three different days of the week;
   4. Evaluating students fairly and reporting promptly on their achievements;
   5. Participating in group deliberations which contribute to the growth and development of students and the University; and
   6. Accepting those reasonable duties assigned within the field of competence.

2. Achievement of Tenure

Promotion to any higher rank will be predicated upon achievement of tenure in the department/administrative faculty unit or achievement of tenure as of the effective date of the promotion.

3. University-wide Faculty Role Model

The following provides the areas of evaluation, definitions, and criteria for the University-wide faculty role model:

Minimum		Maximum
48 %	**Effective Teaching & Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities**	**65%**

Definition

This category encompasses a faculty member's primary assignment and shall constitute the main criterion on which promotion decisions are based. In most instances, evaluation in this area consists of effective teaching and advising, administrative assignments, and professional responsibilities.

Teaching is defined as the interaction that occurs between a faculty member and a student during which the student has the opportunity to learn, the student is enabled to learn, and/or the student is motivated to learn.

Administrative assignments include elected department posts and temporary assignments in administrative offices that carry release time, and administrative positions that constitute a faculty member's primary assignment as specified in the Statement of Expectations. Professional responsibilities are those secondary tasks/duties that are part of the primary assignment and support and enhance department, division, or university operation and goals.

When faculty hold positions for which they receive an Alternate Work Assignment, the duties of that position that are administrative in nature and that contribute to the operation of the university should be considered under the category of primary assignment. Other activities shall be considered under scholarship and/or service as appropriate. It is the responsibility of the applicant to differentiate these responsibilities as part of the application narrative.

Areas of evaluation

Effective Teaching, advising, or performance of primary assignment

1. *Delivery* will be evaluated based on the quality of those skills and characteristics that a) make for clear communication of information, concepts, and techniques; and b) promote or facilitate learning by creating an appropriate learning environment.
2. *Design* will be evaluated based on the quality of those skills and competencies required to a) design effective instructional experiences and strategies necessary to properly sequence and present those experiences so as to induce learning in the student, and b) design and develop valid means to accurately measure and confirm that learning has indeed occurred.
3. *Expertise* will be evaluated based on the quality of the skills, competencies, and knowledge in the specific subject area that the faculty member has received advanced training or education.
4. *Management* will be evaluated based on the quality of execution of logistic and record keeping duties involved with teaching and timely distribution of feedback to the student.

Administrative duties will be evaluated based on the quality of performance in the areas of planning/organization, direction, control, and communication.

1. *Planning/organization* will be evaluated based on the timeliness of task/goal development, adequacy of planning, and the degree to which tasks/goals are accomplished.
2. *Direction* will be evaluated based on the efficiency of department/unit/program operation, the fairness and equitability of leadership, and the quality of staff supervision.
3. *Control* will be evaluated based on the quality of fiscal, human, and physical resource management.
4. *Communication* will be evaluated based on the quality of written and oral communications, the clarity and timeliness of directives, and the efficiency of information transfer to and from the department/unit/program.

Professional Responsibilities will be evaluated based on the quality of performance and degree to which these secondary tasks and duties are willingly accepted, conducted in a conscientious and collegial fashion, and completed in a timely manner.

25% **Continuing Scholarly Growth** **42%**

Definition

Scholarly activity is valued in that it enhances the educational experience, enlivens the intellectual climate on campus, provides external funding to support the educational mission of the institution, and provides opportunities for students, especially undergraduates, to participate in scholarly research. Scholarship is defined as the discovery, application, and/or advancement of knowledge through research, creative accomplishment, or professional endeavor and sharing the results of those activities. Scholarship should be designed to enhance the educational experience within the discipline and/or the faculty member's teaching/professional responsibilities. Scholarship also includes professional growth and recognition.

All scholarly activity listed in the CBA (Article 12.B.2) is valued at all ranks; however, a hierarchy of scholarly evidence clearly exists. In this hierarchy, peer-reviewed works offer the strongest evidence; active contributions in scholarship through professional publications, presentations, organizational leadership, reviews, and other public displays offer solid evidence; and participation in activities such as attendance at professional conferences offers some evidence, but generally not sufficient within itself. All these forms must be considered within the context of the discipline and with the recognition that this hierarchy may not apply in all cases.

Areas of evaluation-Scholarship in one or more of the following areas will be evaluated based on the quality of accomplishments in that area of endeavor.

1. *Application of knowledge through research, creative accomplishment, or professional endeavor*--evidence of accomplishment in this area includes reviewed reports of on-going research; participation in one-person or invitational shows; juried shows and premier performances; reviewed musical, dance, literary, or theatrical performances; exhibition, production, and/or publication of electronic media; submission of grant applications or proposals (external, SSHE, internal); significant peer reviewed contributions to the pedagogy of the discipline in the form of new methods of teaching or innovative curriculum structures; activities in which there is significant use of one's expertise (consultantships to government agencies, professional and industrial organizations and associations, and educational institutions); development of distance education programs.
2. *Sharing information*--evidence of accomplishment in this area includes published peer-reviewed articles, monographs, news articles, books, and parts of books; delivered papers, invitational lectures, and participation in panels; manuscripts accepted for publication as substantiated by letters of acceptance; articles published in non-refereed

journals, technical reports, research reports to the sponsoring agency; peer reviewed articles, performances, productions, and exhibitions produced by students under the supervision of the faculty member;

3. *Professional growth and recognition*--evidence of accomplishment in this area includes additional graduate coursework where the coursework is related to the faculty member's scholarly agenda; regional, national, and international awards for scholarship or professional activity in the discipline; invitations to review journal articles or grant proposals, elected and invited offices held in professional organizations; editorships of professional journals; demonstrated contributions to the professional growth of one's peers
4. *Teacher-Scholar activities*—evidence of accomplishment in this area includes joint research with students; joint faculty and student presentations and publications; mentoring students in scholarly activities, research projects and presentations; curriculum development based on research experience;-and leading scholarly seminars involving faculty and students

10% **Service** **27%**

Definition
Service is defined as voluntary activities that contribute to the profession, the university, and/or the community.

Areas of evaluation
1. *Faculty Service* evidence of accomplishment in this area includes the quality of voluntary service on department, college, and/or university committees; participation in college or university governance; or on APSCUF committees.
2. *Professional Service* evidence of accomplishment in this area includes the quality of voluntary service to professional organizations such as committee work and other responsibilities that contribute to the function, advancement, and/or maintenance of the organization; service to governmental agencies related to the area of expertise;.
3. *Community Service* evidence of accomplishment in this area includes voluntary contributions to off-campus organizations that are related to one's discipline.

D. Criteria for Promotion by Rank

Promotion is an academic reward for demonstrated quality of professional performance and promise for the future. Thus, it is the responsibility of the applicant and the department to provide empirical evidence documenting the quality of past performance and future promise. The burden of responsibility is on the applicant and the department to provide appropriate documentation.

Promotion is granted in recognition of the quality of a faculty member's demonstrated performance since the last promotion or since hiring and the promise of continued quality of performance in the future. Time is required to document the quality of performance, however, promotion is not granted for longevity. In order to be granted promotion, a faculty member must demonstrate performance consistent with the rank to which promotion is sought as specified below consistent with the faculty members Statement of Expectations and the department Teacher/Scholar Model.

1. Assistant Professor

Assistant Professors must demonstrate that they have the potential for a successful career in academia. Teaching and advising effectiveness or competence in the primary assignment must be established commensurate with experience. The Assistant Professor teaches assigned courses or performs assigned duties, shows sound professional judgment, performs advising duties (if assigned), and performs professional responsibilities in a competent manner. Assistant Professors must demonstrate that they are beginning to build the foundation for a record of continued scholarship, research, or other creative activities. Tangible scholarly products such as refereed publications; regional or national conference presentations, exhibits, or performances; and/or successful internal or external grant awards must be part of this foundation. Assistant Professors are expected to perform service primarily at the departmental level in a competent and professional manner, though service at other levels (college or university) may be appropriate.

2. Associate Professor

Associate Professors must demonstrate that they have established the foundation for a successful career. The Associate Professor must demonstrate the ability to go beyond teaching effectively or performing the primary assignment in a competent fashion by demonstrating improvements in their primary responsibilities. This may be evidenced through the introduction of new materials, techniques, or programs; student mentorship; or excellence in advising (if applicable). There should be no evidence of significant weakness or areas of repeated concern in the performance of teaching or primary assignment. Associate Professors must show a record of scholarship, research, or other creative activity evidenced by steady growth and productivity including scholarly, peer-reviewed products, and an established presence within his/her discipline. The record must demonstrate enough continuity, of sufficient quality, to suggest increased or at least continued productivity in the future. Associate Professors must demonstrate that they can be relied on for critical service activities at the department, College, and University levels.

3. Full Professor

Full Professors must demonstrate continuous and substantial contributions to the University and their discipline through time. Full Professors must demonstrate a sustained and solid commitment to teaching and advising (if applicable) or the performance of the primary assignment. They should have assumed a leadership role in program improvement and/or improving the delivery of education to students. Again, there should be no evidence of significant weakness or areas of repeated concern in the performance of teaching or primary assignment. They can be relied on to provide guidance for junior faculty and help to improve the overall quality of teaching at the institution. Full Professors should have a steady and significant record of productive scholarship or creative activity including peer-reviewed works and displayed leadership within his/her discipline via such activities as service on committees of professional organizations; providing reviews for scholarly journals, granting agencies, or creative works; and/or invitations for speaking engagements. In exceptional cases, a long-term, substantial contribution in service to the university or the discipline may be recognized as partial replacement for a significant body of peer-reviewed work. Full Professors must have assumed a leadership role and/or made exceptional contribution in some area of service at the University level.

E. Department expectations--Departmental Teacher-Scholar Model (DTSM)

1. The faculty of each department/unit will develop a Department Teacher-Scholar Model(s) (DTSM) that identifies the value of teacher-scholar activities within the discipline(s) of the department. The model should provide a general framework of what the department values in the three areas of faculty evaluation (teaching, scholarship and service) and allow for various faculty experiences in each area. The model may also address the intersection/integration of the three areas. It should provide relevant examples such as valued pedagogical methods and scholarly activities, integration of student learning with scholarship and service, and inclusion of students in faculty research. It may also include other components for student success (e.g. advising, ongoing assessment, revision of academic programs and student mentoring). It may address accreditation activities, if applicable. The Department Teacher-Scholar Model(s) is designed to provide guidance to faculty.
2. The Department Teacher-Scholar Model does not supersede an individual's Statement of Expectations and is not construed as a checklist of faculty expectations or necessary accomplishments.
3. The Department Teacher-Scholar Model(s) must be consistent with the university-wide role model and the CBA.
4. Department Teacher-Scholar Model(s) originate in the department and must be approved by the department (by consensus or majority vote in a secret ballot) following the opportunity for input from all department faculty members. If within a single department, different faculty expertise exists, the Department Teacher-Scholar Model must be inclusive of all faculty expertise, or the department may choose to have different DTSMs reflecting those differences. In the case where a department has multiple DTSMs, an applicant for promotion may choose which DTSM(s) is relevant to their expertise to include in their application.
5. When a Department Teacher-Scholar Model is created or modified, a copy of the created/modified Department Teacher-Scholar Model with the date of departmental approval will be sent to local Meet and Discuss. The DTSM becomes official when received at local Meet and Discuss. Existing Department Teacher Scholar Models will continue to be a part of the promotion process and must be submitted to Meet and Discuss by January 30, 2011.
6. The Department Teacher-Scholar Model will be used by the TeP Committee and others in the process as needed to facilitate evaluation of promotion applications from that department.
7. Faculty who believe that their department's DTSM(s) is not inclusive of their particular expertise may forward their concern to the PTW committee.
8. The Department Teacher-Scholar Model will continue to be a required item in the promotion application dossier until the time when all Department Teacher Scholar Models are publicly available (e.g. in the library, on websites, etc.).
9. Appendix 2 addresses the process for review of Department Teacher-Scholar Models.

III. PROCEDURES

A. Application procedure for promotion

1. Application for promotion is a two year process. A faculty member announces his/her intention to apply for promotion three semesters in advance of the Spring semester in which TeP will review the application. To announce his/her intention, the faculty member, henceforth referred to as the applicant, will submit a statement of intent to apply for promotion to the chair of the department/unit by the end of the second week of the Fall semester of the first year of the promotion review period. Applicants also applying for tenure are exempt from the promotion declaration requirement and may apply for promotion in the same year as they apply for tenure with a joint tenure and promotion application.
2. Year 1 Evaluation (not required for joint tenure and promotion applicants): In accordance with CBA Article 12 Performance Review and Evaluation, the department evaluation committee and department chair shall conduct independent evaluations. As part of these reviews, a minimum of two peer observations (one in each semester) and one chair

observation are performed. If the applicant is a department chair or has other administrative assignments, the dean/appropriate manager provides a written assessment of the applicant's performance of administrative duties during the first year of the promotion review period.

3. Student rating data will be collected in all classes during the Fall and Spring semester of the first year.
4. At the beginning of the second year (or the last probationary year for joint tenure and promotion applications), the applicant assembles an application in the standard format (see Section III. B. 6. of this document). Four copies (Labeled A, B, C and D) of the application dossier are made with one supplemental binder if desired. The applicant provides three copies of the dossier--binders A, B, and C--and the supplemental binder to the department chair and one copy--binder D--to the faculty member's Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager by November 1. The department chair will provide Copies A, B, and the supplemental binder to the department recommendation committee. Applicants may elect to continue the evaluation process (as noted above in A.1, 2, &3) in the second year in the event her/his promotion application is unsuccessful.
5. The department recommendation committee, department chair and Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager review the application and write independent recommendations. In the event the applicant is a department chairperson, a faculty member will be chosen to fulfill the chair's role according to Section I.D.2.b of this policy.
6. The chair will submit a full list of applicants to the appropriate dean or manager and the chair of TeP at the time application materials are submitted (by November 1). The dean or other appropriate manager will notify the Provost's office of the names submitted.
7. The department recommendation committee chair submits the Department Committee Promotion Recommendation with detailed rationale and two copies (A and B) of the dossier to TeP by December 15. The supplemental binder will be given to the Department Chair by December 15, and will be shared as needed between the Department Chair and the Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager. The Department Committee Promotion Recommendation shall be provided simultaneously to the applicant who may submit a written statement to TeP addressing the committee's recommendation by January 15. Unless the applicant specifies differently, the written response will be provided to the Provost for his/her review.
8. The Department Chair and the Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager shall submit independent, detailed recommendations for promotion of the applicant. In making his/her independent recommendation, the Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager is not permitted to review the Department Committee Promotion Recommendation or the Department Chairperson Promotion Recommendation prior to submitting his/her recommendation to TeP.
9. The Department Chair submits the Department Chairperson Promotion Recommendation and the dossier (labeled C) to TeP by December 22. The Department Chairperson Promotion Recommendation shall be simultaneously provided to the applicant, who may submit a written statement to TeP addressing the chair's recommendation by January 15. Unless the applicant specifies otherwise, the written response will be provided to the Provost for her/his review.
10. The Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager submits his/her recommendation, the dossier (labeled D), and the supplemental binder to TeP by December 22. The detailed recommendation for promotion by the Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager shall be simultaneously provided to the applicant, who may submit a written statement to TeP addressing the recommendation by January 15. Unless the applicant specifies otherwise, the written response will be provided to the Provost for her/his review.
11. The applicant may request a meeting with the Department Chair and/or Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager prior to them making their final recommendation. The faculty member shall initiate the request and any meeting is voluntary for all participants. All applicants will be provided with the same opportunity. The Chair/Manager shall maintain a consistent policy for all applicants in their unit.
12. All materials submitted to TeP by December 22 will be made available to the Provost for review. The Provost reviews the application, the Department Committee Promotion

Recommendation, the Department Chairperson Promotion Recommendation, and the recommendation of the Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager prior to submitting his/her recommendation to TeP by February 1. The Provost's recommendation should only address promotion. In the event that the Provost is named as the President's designee for purposes of making decisions about promotions, then the Provost shall not make a recommendation.

13. The Provost's detailed recommendation for promotion shall be simultaneously provided to the applicant, who may submit a written statement to TeP addressing the Provost's recommendation by February 7.
14. If the TeP committee is not satisfied with the justification in the Department Chairperson Promotion Recommendation, the Department Committee Promotion Recommendation, the recommendation of the Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager, or the Provost's recommendation, the TeP committee will request additional information or seek clarification from the Department Chairperson, department committee, Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager, or Provost with the nature of the requested clarification in writing. The clarification will be provided in writing. TeP may then evaluate the Department Chairperson Promotion Recommendation, Department Committee Promotion Recommendation, recommendation of the Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager, or Provost's recommendations and faculty member responses and make its own evaluation.
15. The TeP Committee reviews all application materials, the Department Committee Promotion Recommendation, the Department Chairperson Promotion Recommendation, the recommendation of the Dean/Library Director/appropriate manager, the Provost's recommendation, and any responses from the applicant addressing these recommendations, and judges each application on the basis of the degree to which each candidate has met the criteria appropriate to the rank to which promotion is sought. The TeP committee will fully consider the faculty member's Statement of Expectations and the DTSM. Prior to making their recommendation, TeP may request additional information/clarification from any party (e.g. department committee, Chair, Dean, Provost) which has made a recommendation. The TeP committee makes a recommendation to the President or his/her designee no later than April 15.
16. Applicants applying for promotion may sign up for an optional short interview with the TeP committee.
17. If the TeP committee recommends against promotion when 3 or more of the recommendations included with the application have been for promotion, the TeP chair will provide a written synopsis of the reasons for their recommendation to the applicant by May 1. The synopsis should provide a detailed explanation which reflects the basis of TeP's recommendation. The applicant may submit a response to the President by May 8.
18. The President or designee notifies the applicant in writing of her/his decision no later than July 15.

B. Promotion Application format

1. It is the responsibility of the applicant to submit the application for promotion in the standard application format. **Applications for promotion not following the standard format and/or missing required materials may be disqualified.** Files will not be disqualified and candidates will not be penalized if his/her peers did not conduct the required classroom observations or student evaluations if those missing items were beyond his/her control. In the event that any party in the evaluation processes believes that the applicant has not followed the standard format or is missing required information, they will inform the applicant, the President or his/her designee and the local APSCUF President. The President or his/her designee will consult with the applicant and the APSCUF President to consider the appropriate course of action. When feasible, the applicant will be provided with the opportunity to correct the application. If the application is incomplete and it is not correctable, the President or his/her designee in consultation with the APSCUF President will determine whether the application will continue to be reviewed or whether it will be

disqualified. This process should be completed within 14 days of notification of the President or his/her designee.

2. The application will consist of four copies of the application dossier (labeled A, B, C, and D) and one copy of the supplemental binder containing supporting materials. Only material relevant to the promotion process as defined in Section III. B. 6. may be included in the application dossier. Additional materials that the candidate deems relevant may only be included in the supplemental binder. Every effort should be made to reduce to the volume of material submitted (e.g. photocopy journal articles and include in the supporting materials binder rather than submitting the entire journal).
3. In preparing the application, the candidate will develop a clear narrative summary of accomplishments in each of the three categories of evaluation. Concise narratives are especially valuable. Accomplishments achieved during the probationary period or since the last promotion will be weighted more heavily. When referencing scholarly activities, distinction should be made between original work, citations of applicant's work, editorials, and reviews. When referring to committee service, a list of committee assignments, period of service, and a clear description of the specific contributions to the committee should be provided.
4. Supporting material should be referenced in the appropriate section of the application dossier.
5. The application dossier will be submitted in a binder with index tabs separating the sections.
6. **Table of Contents for standard application format:**
   The application dossier for promotion contains the items below in the order listed. The candidate should submit all versions or examples of the items from the period covered (i.e. probationary period for tenure applications and since the last promotion for promotion applications)

I. Introduction
   1) Promotion Application Form
   2) Curriculum vita; not to exceed ten pages in 10 point type.
   3) Relevant Statement(s) of Expectations
   4) Department Teacher-Scholar Model
   5) Job description for alternative workload assignment (if any)
   6) Annual Performance Review(s) and Evaluation(s):
      a) If the application is for joint tenure and promotion then include: All probationary evaluations including department committee's, chair's and dean's evaluations, years 1—5.
      b) If the application is for promotion only then include: Year 1 evaluations including those of the department committee, chair, and manager.

II. Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities
   1) Candidate's narrative summary of accomplishments, not to exceed six pages
   2) Official Student Evaluation Reports from all of the above Annual Performance Review(s) (III.B.6 part I.6) and all those from III.A.3 above (if applicable). There must be a minimum of 5 Reports—see Appendix 4: FAQ for details.
   3) All Peer Observations and/or Director's Evaluations from Annual Performance Review(s) and Evaluation(s) required above (III.B.6 part I.6)
   4) Evidence of performance not to exceed ten pages total including such things as:
      a) Syllabi
      b) Teaching materials
      c) Evidence of advising effectiveness
      d) Executive summaries of Annual reports or excerpts of reports generated through AWA
      e) Executive summaries of assessment reports

f) Statement(s) from immediate supervisor(s) not involved in the evaluation or recommendation of the applicant.

III. Continuing Scholarly Growth
- Candidate's narrative summary of accomplishments, not to exceed five pages

IV. Service
- Candidate's narrative summary of accomplishments, not to exceed five pages

V. Index of Supplemental Binder
1) A detailed listing of the supporting materials in the supplemental binder divided into the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.
2) A copy of this listing must be included at the front of the supplemental binder to serve as a table of contents for the supporting materials. In addition, the supporting materials must be referenced in the Application Dossier.

7. Unofficial student rating data evaluations of teaching should not be included in the application.
8. Changes in the Application after the Evaluation has begun.
   a. Applications for tenure and promotion may not be changed after the application is submitted on November 1 except as indicated by this policy (sections III.A.14, III.B.1, III.B.9, etc.).
   b. The following items—Department Committee Promotion Recommendation, Department Chair Promotion Recommendation, Dean/Library Director/Manager Promotion Recommendation and Provost's Promotion Recommendation will be added to the application by the TeP chair as they are received. Similarly, any statements by the applicant in response to one of these recommendations as allowed by this policy or the CBA will be added to the application dossier by the TeP chair as they are received.
   c. In the event of any change in the application other than noted above in 8.b, notice shall be given to the applicant with an opportunity to respond.

C. Rules and Regulations Applying to Applications for Promotion

1. Completion requirements
   All requirements for promotion, with the exception of the completion of time in rank, must be fulfilled by the deadline date of submission of materials to the department chairperson.
2. Deadline dates
   All dates for the submission and final processing of promotion materials will conform to the dates stipulated in the CBA. Exceptions to those dates for individual cases will be resolved at Meet and Discuss. The university management will notify all faculty of said resolutions in the most expeditious manner available.
3. Conflict of Interest
   No person shall participate in the evaluation or recommendation of an applicant that is a member of his/her immediate family as defined by the CBA, or a person residing in his/her household.
4. One Role per Evaluator
   A faculty member may serve in only one role as part of another faculty member's evaluation process. If a faculty member has been elected to TeP and is also on the department recommendation committee or is a department chair he/she must not participate in the TeP discussions and recommendations for that particular faculty member.
5. Sources of evaluation
   Each department/unit may consider differences between primary and secondary sources of evaluation in each of the three areas of evaluation. Primary sources are those that are the most reliable or have the most direct evidence/ knowledge. Secondary sources are

those that can be expected to have evidence/knowledge, but the information is less reliable or direct.

6. Evidence
   a. Validity and Authenticity
      i. The applicant will certify that all evidence submitted is authentic and valid, by verification as stated on the application form. Submission of invalid and/or not authentic evidence may be grounds to disqualify an applicant for promotion.
      ii. The department committee chair should address any questions regarding the authenticity and validity of any evidence to the applicant giving her/him the opportunity to respond and/or provide additional evidence subject to the faculty member's right to grieve pursuant to Article 5 of the CBA. Unresolved questions will be noted in the Department Committee Promotion Recommendation.
   b. Evidence Required
      i. Applicants will submit any documentary evidence necessary to establish credentials, such as transcripts, to Human Resources.
      ii. The University administration will be the final certification point for degrees and other academic credentials put forward in support of a promotion application and any challenges to the authenticity of documents.
      iii. Applicants will document any accomplishments listed on the vita such as awards, grants, accepted publications, participation in juried shows, or service contributions which they present in support of a promotion application.
   c. Allowable Evidence

      Information, testimony, or other evidence, apart from that supplied by the applicant, the department/unit chair, the department committee, and the dean may be considered by the TeP Committee only if submitted at the request of the committee. This material shall be made part of the application and be made available to the applicant who shall be given the opportunity to respond before the TeP Committee makes its recommendation.
   d. Challenges to Evidence
      i. The burden of proof to disqualify an applicant on the grounds of false evidence lies with any challenge to the validity or authenticity of evidence submitted. The applicant must be informed of any challenges to his/her materials and be given an opportunity to refute the challenge.
      ii. Any investigation, authentication, or verification of material will be made by management and the final decision on the challenge will be made by the President or his/her designee. The faculty member shall maintain the right to grieve pursuant to Article 5 of the CBA.
      iii. In the event of a disclosure of misinformation at any stage of the evaluation process, the TeP Committee chair will insert the new information at the appropriate location in the application dossier, identify the insertion as new material, and notify all previous reviewers of the change. All reviewers who have completed their review of an applicant candidate shall have the opportunity to reconsider their recommendation.
   e. Record Keeping

      At his/her discretion, the President or his/her designee may retain one official copy of the application dossier, including the detailed listing of the supporting material, for at least one year following which time the application will be returned to the applicant. The materials will be kept in the Philips Memorial Building vault. The remaining application dossiers plus supporting material binder may be obtained by the applicant at the conclusion of the promotion procedure.
7. Rights of Applicants for Promotion
   a. An applicant for promotion is entitled to be aware of all criteria applied in the evaluation of his/her performance and any material (including information, testimony, evidence) added to or considered in relation to his/her application. Critiques of her or his performance should be written in clear, unequivocal language and she/he should be

protected against vague charges. Sudden changes in evaluative judgment should be explained by the evaluator(s).

b. Each applicant for promotion will have the right to appear before the department chair, department committee, dean, and TeP Committee to speak on his/her own behalf prior to the submission of the promotion recommendation by that party as described in Section III.A.

c. An applicant will have the right to meet with the committee chair and at least one other member of the TeP Committee after promotion decisions have been made.

d. Nothing in this policy can abrogate the contractual rights of the applicant to due process. An individual will have the right to file a grievance with respect to a promotion decision in accordance with the CBA.

8. Presidential Action
   a. Should the President or his/her designee have questions about the correctness of any recommendation submitted to him/her by the TeP Committee, she/he will provide the committee with an opportunity to meet with the President to discuss the matter. In no event is the President or his/her designee to act contrary to the recommendations submitted to him/her without first consulting with the committee.
   b. The President or his/her designee will not employ different criteria in his/her decisions from those specified by this policy.
9. Social Equity
   a. Each department/unit covered by this policy will base all personnel processes and recommendations upon professional standards. A person's race, gender, age, disability, national origin, sexual orientation, political views or affiliations, or religious views or affiliations will not be a consideration in the execution of this policy.
   b. The TeP Committee will share with the University Social Equity Officer procedures and data used and recommendations made at each level of the process.
   c. The Social Equity Officer may be present if invited by the TeP Committee when it establishes operational procedures. The Social Equity Officer may be present if invited by applicant(s) during meetings with applicants to ensure compliance with affirmative action principles.
10. Three Percent Clause
    a. The 3% Clause has its roots in Act 182 which states that "Of the thirty per centum, three per centum of the faculty may be granted full professorships on the basis of other qualifications than the doctorate...". The clause was designed to recognize, through promotion to the rank of Full Professor, faculty members who have made an extraordinary contribution to the discipline, community, and the university without acquiring the terminal degree. In order to be eligible for this promotion, the applicant must clearly document unique and remarkable contributions which have made a significant regional, national or international impact.
    b. Procedures for the submission of the application dossier will be the same as for all other applicants for promotion (see Section III), with the only difference being that, in addition to meeting all of the conditions and criteria for full professor, exceptionality of achievement and recognition will be substituted for the terminal degree. The applicant must meet all other criteria for promotion to Full Professor in addition to the notable contributions that have resulted in national or international acclaim.
    c. The following are some examples of exceptional accomplishment:
       i. Invited/elected executive position of a professional organization with national/international impact.
       ii. Clinician, visiting scholar, or director of a seminar with national /international impact.
       iii. Producer, director, or performer in a creative and/or repertory work having national/international impact.
       iv. Primary editor or author of journals and books in their discipline.
       v. Regional, national, or international honors or awards presented for unique contributions to a discipline.

vi. Innovator of instructional or teaching aids and development of new academic programs making a significant impact and recognized at the national/international level.

vii. Achievement and distinction of students/groups/teams under direct supervision (e.g. forensic team, newspaper, theater group, musical chorus, athletic team, orchestra, director/composer/choreographer of show).

d. These examples are for illustrative purposes and are not intended to be inclusive. Any single accomplishment does not stand alone and should not be considered to substitute for the terminal degree. It is the accumulated accomplishments over time that serves to satisfy the requirement of exceptional contribution under this clause.

e. The 3% clause is meant to recognize those who have met all the requirements for full professor with the exception of the terminal degree. Since the earned doctorate is a sine qua non for the rank of full professor, the President will be reluctant to consider applications under the 3% proviso unless the petitioner can demonstrate extraordinary ability and achievement.

11. Degree Equivalency

Holders of professional doctorates, including but not limited to the J.D. degree, shall be deemed eligible for consideration for appointment or promotion, provided that they meet other criteria or expectations for appointment or promotion and that their candidacy is in compliance with the Act 182 stipulation that "Graduate degrees and preparation shall be earned in fields related to the service rendered to the college." Similarly, holders of the M.F.A. degree, when related graduate preparation totals at least 60 semester credit hours, shall be deemed eligible for consideration for promotion, provided that they meet other criteria or expectations for promotion and their preparation and primary assignment are in the studio or performing arts.

12. Applicability of the Policy

It is agreed that these changes will be in effect for fall 2010 through spring 2015. The parties agree that the operation of the TeP committee (Sections I.B.4a—d) will be revisited in 2010—2011. It does not supercede any newly negotiated CBA language for which there should be agreement. Additional review may be necessitated by changes in the CBA or mutual agreement of the parties.

Appendix 1: Promotion and Tenure Workshop (PTW) Committee

A. Overview

The PTW Committee is concerned with the issues of evaluation, tenure, and promotion and is charged with providing advice, training, and assistance to individual faculty members, departments, and the TeP Committee. In addition, PTW will make suggestions/recommendations to Management and APSCUF through Meet and Discuss. The PTW Committee is constituted as an advisory body, not a policy-making body.

B. Election

1. The PTW Committee will range from 5 to 7 members who serve staggered 2-year terms. Faculty members serving a regular term shall have already earned tenure. The Committee shall be formulated from the following constituencies:
    a. A faculty member who has recently completed service on the TeP committee (appointed jointly at Meet and Discuss), an APSCUF representative (appointed), a member of Academic Affair's Council who evaluates faculty (appointed).
    b. Once appointments have been made between 2 and 4 faculty members shall be elected to ensure representation from the following groups:
        - non-classroom faculty
        - the College of Arts and Sciences faculty
        - either the College of Education or the College of Visual and Performing Arts faculty
        - either the College of Health Sciences or the College of Business & Public Affairs faculty
2. If the PTW Committee should find that they require additional areas of expertise, ad hoc members may be invited to contribute to the Committee for short durations. Such ad hoc members are non-voting members of the Committee, and may be drawn from any faculty constituency.
3. Elections shall occur in April of each year and newly elected/appointed members shall be invited to the final meeting of the academic year, at which time the chair of the committee for the next year shall be elected by those individuals continuing in their term for the next year.
4. The Committee chair (or co-chairs) shall be elected by the members of the Committee at the final meeting of the academic year. Normally, at least one of the chairs shall have served either on TeP or on the PTW Committee for at least a year.
5. Duties of the chair shall include:
    a. Convening the Committee
    b. Conducting meetings
    c. Organizing Committee procedures, preparing the Committee calendar, scheduling all discussion meetings.
    d. Scheduling all training and information sessions for university faculty
    e. Meeting candidates desiring further information.
    f. The Committee will be provided with adequate secretarial support by the University.

C. Purpose

The PTW Committee shall serve in the following capacities:

1. Offering voluntary training workshops for faculty seeking tenure and promotion (on-going) as well as training for chairs and department committees (as needed)
2. Clarifying the promotion and tenure processes for faculty
3. Observing, reporting, and making recommendations to APSCUF and Management about the tenure and promotion processes; including making suggestions about standard formats for application materials.

4. Regularly check on the availability of relevant promotion and tenure policies and materials for all members of the bargaining unit, including Department Teacher Scholar Models (DTSMs).
5. Develop a broadly defined DTSM framework, subject to review, modification, and approval at local Meet and Discuss, which will encompass all DTSMs and serve to assist PTW in the review of DTSMs.
6. Provide all departments with the DTSM framework.
7. Provide voluntary training sessions and assistance as needed to departments in the preparation and revision of DTSMs.
8. Review DTSMs in accordance with Appendix2 of this policy.
9. Develop a schedule for systematic review of DTSMs.

D. Operation of the Committee

1. The Committee develops and offers voluntary workshops in faculty development and evaluation for faculty, chairpersons, department committee members, and appropriate administrators, and the processes and procedures of faculty review at West Chester University. Workshops will be held in Fall and Spring semesters.
2. The Committee reviews DTSMs and provides assistance to chairpersons, deans, and interested faculty in the revision of DTSMs.
3. At the last local Meet and Discuss meeting of the academic year, the PTW chair will give a report with a summary of the committee's activities carried out during that year, observations on the operation of the evaluation system, and recommendations for substantive changes in the evaluation, tenure, and promotion process.

Appendix 2: Review of DTSMs

1. Upon receipt of a DTSM at local Meet and Discuss, the DTSM shall be referred to PTW for review.
2. The PTW committee will do a general review of the DTSM and provide specific feedback to the department on issues such as clarity, depth, and efficacy.
3. If as part of that review, the PTW committee finds that the DTSM contains language that violates the CBA or section II.E of the Promotion Policy, the DTSM shall be returned to the department with an indication of the problem. Notification shall also be sent to local Meet and Discuss for informational purposes.
4. The PTW committee will identify exemplary DTSMs and, with the departmental permission, share those models with other units.
5. The PTW committee will provide assistance to departments if requested.
6. Following PTW review, the DTSM will become public (e.g. posted on the web, available in the library, etc)
7. This review is non-precedent setting, cannot be used as justification for limiting the contractual rights of a faculty member or APSCUF to grieve pursuant to Article 5 any and all parts of a DTSM or decision based in whole or in part on a DTSM, and cannot be construed to interfere with the right of management to direct the faculty in accordance with law and, in particular, to assign courses and duties consistent with the faculty member's area of expertise as allowed by the CBA.

Appendix 3: Meet and Discuss Process for SOE Resolution

1) If the dean/appropriate manager sent the issue to M&D:
   a) At the next regularly scheduled Meet and Discuss meeting, management will present the rationale for the modifications they are proposing.
   b) At the following M&D meeting, APSCUF, on behalf of the faculty member, will accept the modification, provide an alternative modification, or give a rationale for rejection of the

modification. Failure of APSCUF or the faculty member to respond will be considered agreement to the modification.

c) If the faculty member agrees to the modification proposed by management or management agrees to the alternative modification proposed by the faculty member, the SOE will be considered official. The department chair may choose to sign the modified SOE or choose to sign a statement that the modified SOE is being made official with his/her objection.

d) Otherwise, the SOE will remain unmodified. A copy of the latest version of the unapproved SOE will be attached to the minutes of the M&D meeting.

2) If the faculty member sent the issue to M&D:

a) At the next regularly scheduled Meet and Discuss meeting, the faculty member will present the rationale for the modifications they are proposing.

b) At the following M&D meeting, management will accept the modification, provide an alternative modification, or give a rationale for rejection of the modification. Failure of management to respond will be considered agreement to the modification.

c) If management agrees to the modification proposed by the faculty member or the faculty member agrees to the alternative modification proposed by management, the SOE will be considered official. The department chair may choose to sign the modified SOE or choose to sign a statement that the modified SOE is being made official with his/her objection.

d) Otherwise, the SOE will remain unmodified. A copy of the latest version of the unapproved SOE will be attached to the minutes of the M&D meeting.

3) No part of this process can be used to diminish the grievance rights of a faculty member pursuant to Article 5 of the CBA with regard to the SOE or use of the SOE in evaluation, tenure, or promotion.

Appendix 4: FAQ

This FAQ is provided for the benefit of all parties in the promotion process. The answers provided herein are not considered part of the policy, but clarification of the intent of the policy. For this reason, Appendix 4 (and only Appendix 4) can be modified by mutual agreement of APSCUF and management at local Meet and Discuss without constituting a modification of the promotion policy.

Q1: What does XXXX mean?

Answer:

SOE	*Statement of Expectations, see section II.B*
CBA	Collective Bargaining Agreement also known as the faculty contract
DTSM	Department Teacher-Scholar Model, see section II.E
APSCUF	Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties also known as the faculty union
M&D	Meet and Discuss, the contract mandated meeting between local management and local union leadership
TeP	Tenure and Promotion Committee, the university wide tenure and promotion recommendation committee, see section I.B
PTW	Promotion and Tenure Workshop Committee, see section I.A and Appendix 1

Q2: I had student evaluations done in all the sections I taught in year 1 of the process, but I don't have 5 or more reports. What do I do?

Answer: If there are fewer than 5 Reports available in accordance with III.A.3, all Official Student Evaluation Reports from the most recent Annual Performance Review prior to the Year One Review must be included. This process is repeated until a minimum of 5 reports are included.

Q3: What if I believe my Department Teacher Scholar Model does not represent me?

Answer: First, you should express that concern to your chairperson. If you do not get a response or you feel uncomfortable pursuing the issue with your chairperson, you should send your concerns to the PTW committee. Try to be as specific as possible. Finally, you may address these concerns in the narrative part of your application. Again, you should be as specific as possible and provide rationale for your view. While the DTSM is an important part of the promotion process, it does not override the CBA, the Promotion Policy, or your Statement of Expectations.

Q4: If I submit a joint tenure and promotion application, which rank description applies?

Answer: For tenure, the description for the rank that you currently hold; for promotion, the description for the rank to which you are applying.