

University of St. Thomas Policies

PROMOTION AND TENURE

Policy Number: F.03.01

Scope: All Term and Tenure-track Faculty

Purpose: To define and specify policies for promotion and tenure for University of St. Thomas term and tenure-track faculty

POLICY FOUNDATION

Promotion refers to the action of raising someone to a higher academic rank within the University of St. Thomas (See Policy F.01.02 Academic Ranks and Titles). Academic Tenure refers to a status granted by the Board of Directors of the University of St. Thomas during which the faculty member may expect to receive annual contracts of employment subject to University policy. Academic Tenure promotes academic freedom of inquiry, expression, and teaching in the faculty member's discipline or related field. A period of probation precedes Academic Tenure in most cases and sets the expectations for Academic Tenure and Promotion. Promotion may be granted by the Board without Academic Tenure; however, Academic Tenure can only be awarded if Promotion to associate professor or professor is concurrent. Both Academic Tenure and Promotion require formal action by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President. Upon the approval of the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will then present the approved candidate/s to the members of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Directors for their consideration. The Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, upon the Committee's approval, will then seek the approval of the Board of Directors as the final decision-making body.

While the University of St. Thomas is an institution that honors and supports the tenure system of faculty, it also has the option of a term faculty status with the opportunity for promotion in rank. Term faculty appointments do not include the opportunity for tenure, but provide the University, offering the option of promotion, with a way to make a commitment to the professional development of faculty who do not seek tenure.

Academic tenure is one way the University seeks to retain outstanding faculty and promote academic freedom to enhance the best teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship/creative works, and service. Tenure entails a mutually acknowledged expectation of continuing employment that is terminable by the University only for cause, a change in enrollment at the University, financial considerations, consolidation of departments or other reorganization, termination or substantial change of one or more courses or programs, or financial exigency. Tenure is awarded only following explicit review and never by length of service. Initial appointment, promotion, and the award of tenure are separate actions. Appointment or promotion to any rank does not confer tenure.

A tenured faculty member must hold the rank of associate professor or professor. The basis for the awarding of tenure extends beyond a distinguished academic record achieved during the probationary period or prior to appointment. The award and its continuation is also contingent upon a strongly favorable judgment of the faculty member's prospects for continued accomplishment in teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship/ creative works, and service

University of St. Thomas Policies

throughout her or his University career. Tenure is warranted only if there is a clear expectation that the candidate's professional record already does or eventually will justify promotion to professor at the University of St. Thomas. Tenure thus represents a commitment on the part of both the faculty member and the University. Tenure expires at the date of retirement or earlier if the faculty member's employment at the University has been terminated.

For promotion and tenure procedures to be optimized, they must be open, within considerations of individual privacy, and equitable, reflecting the ethical values of the University of St. Thomas and the Basilian order. The general policies and procedures to be used should be made widely known within departments, colleges and the University libraries. Regular evaluative review of faculty members will help to ensure openness of the tenure and promotion process and will provide feedback crucial to faculty development and growth.

FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES IN TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

Faculty members have a primary responsibility in providing the evaluations of merit which normally determine the academic personnel decision-making process, including appointment, promotion, and tenure. This responsibility involves the application of academic and professional judgment, in a framework of shared authority, among various levels of review and between faculty and administrative bodies. It further involves personal integrity and ethical discernment and judgment on the part of all parties involved in these processes as an expression of the values and mission of the University of St. Thomas.

While promotion and tenure performance reviews are guided by policies appropriate to the traditions and practices of academe, all reviews require that candidates document a demonstrated commitment to the University's mission and secondarily to the particular role and mission of their school and discipline. Faculty are reviewed at the department level, where departments exist, or at the school level, and at the campus level through the formal actions of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Members of this committee serve as representatives of the faculty campus community at large with deliberations that transcend their individual departments and schools. They serve as representatives of the faculty at large, evaluating candidates for University norms relevant to the traditions, practices, and future of academe.

The University of St. Thomas academic community is rich in discipline diversity. Faculty achievements reflect this diversity. Discipline-specific criteria ensure that the variance emergent from this diversity are an essential point of origin for the review process. Faculty members are accountable for a clear and current delineation of their discipline's performance expectations and their interpretation to the larger academic community.

This interpretation guides the deliberations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and serves as their initial appraisal of individual achievements. Members of the committee are concurrently accountable for evaluating the individual's achievements in a broader University understanding of the performance expectations of all members of the academic community within the traditions of the University and the national academic community.

University of St. Thomas Policies

Outcomes of this committee's actions are forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for administrative and Board of Directors action. To ensure trustworthiness in the review process for promotion and tenure, any evaluator at a given level (department, school, administrative) must, having voted at the initial decision-point level, recuse themselves for subsequent levels of evaluation and voting. This recusal is essential to increase fairness and demonstrate ethical clarity of policy. All participants in the review process are responsible for ensuring appropriate recusal decisions and their implementation.

Although the tenure and promotion process is geared, narrowly and properly, to evaluating individual performance, the changing needs and priorities of the institution may also affect the decision to grant tenure or award promotion. Both equity and the long-range interests of the institution, however, require directing primary attention to University needs and priorities at the time of appointment and careful intermediate and longer range academic personnel planning.

1. Promotion Policy

- a. Advancement in rank is based upon the recognition by a faculty member's peers of his/her academic achievement and upon their judgment that the level of achievement will continue.
- b. Eligibility for promotion depends upon both time in service at the University and meeting the criteria for the higher rank.
- c. For promotion to associate professor, a faculty member must have completed at least three years of full-time employment as a faculty member at the University of St Thomas, or completed a total of at least five years of full-time employment as a faculty member, combining employment at the University with employment elsewhere.
- d. For promotion to professor, a faculty member must have completed at least six years of full-time employment as a faculty member at the University, or completed a total of at least ten years of full-time employment as a faculty member, combining employment at the University with employment elsewhere.

2. Tenure Policy

Academic Tenure is intended to promote academic freedom of inquiry, expression, and teaching in the faculty member's discipline or related field. Academic Tenure affords a faculty member the expectation to receive annual contracts of employment subject to University policy and thereby encourage, promote, and expand academic freedom. (See Policy F.06.01 Academic Freedom). In the academic tradition, Academic Tenure offers faculty members additional confidence from untoward pressures both inside or outside the academic community.

- a. Tenure will normally be granted no sooner than a faculty member has completed at least seven years of full-time employment as a faculty member at the University, although years of university employment as a faculty member elsewhere may be included in determining the period of time that a new faculty member must be employed as a faculty member at the University before qualifying for tenure.

University of St. Thomas Policies

- b. The probationary period for one who has had three or more full-time years of employment as a faculty member at another college or university will not exceed four years at the University of St. Thomas.
- c. If the faculty member's employment as a faculty member at another institution exceeds three years, his/her total period of probation, including the years spent elsewhere, may exceed seven years.
- d. Full-time employment as a faculty member at the University in the positions of professor, associate professor, assistant professor and/or instructor shall be computed as probationary service for tenure for faculty with probationary tenure-track contracts.
- e. A faculty member with a probationary tenure-track contract must be considered for tenure during the sixth year of full-time employment as a faculty member at the University or during the third year at the University after at least three or more years of full-time employment as a faculty member in another college or university.
- f. Faculty members who take a leave of absence during their probationary period (e.g. to provide public or professional services elsewhere) may choose to apply for tenure one year later than the normal timeframe. However, an extension is not mandatory. A faculty member who has taken leave may apply for tenure during the timeframe specified in this policy.
- g. If the faculty member is awarded tenure, it will be effective one year after notice is given that tenure has been awarded, that is, no sooner than the completion of the faculty member's seventh year of full-time employment as a faculty member as computed in 2(a)-(f) above. The exception to this is the person who is awarded tenure at the time of employment.
- h. The locus of tenure is in a specific department, program or academic unit in the School of Arts and Sciences and the School of Business or in the School of Education and Human Services, the School of Theology, the School of Nursing or the Doherty or Beran Library.
- i. If a faculty member is denied tenure, he/she will receive a terminal tenure-track contract for the following year. No further tenure-track contracts will be issued after this terminal tenure-track contract. The faculty member denied tenure may be considered for appointment to a term contract if approved by the dean or department chair, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President. As with other term contracts, this term contract can be renewed in subsequent years if recommended by the dean or department chair, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President.
- j. No faculty member shall be considered for promotion and/or tenure while on a leave of absence.
- k. A probationary tenure-track position may be terminated at the discretion of the

University of St. Thomas Policies

University if the following circumstances exist, including but not limited to, a change in enrollment at the University, financial considerations, consolidation of departments or other reorganization, termination or substantial change of one or more courses or academic programs, or financial exigency.

3. Performance Review Policy

- a. All term, probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty are evaluated annually. This annual performance review policy is detailed in Policy F.07.07 Faculty Development and Evaluation.
- b. All term, probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty participate in a more comprehensive and detailed performance review every three years that ensures the vigorous and rigorous pursuit of excellence required of all term, probationary tenure-track and tenured faculty.
- c. This more substantive performance review is detailed in Policy F.07.07 Faculty Development and Evaluation, and provides the University with a process for ensuring ongoing faculty teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship/creative works, and service. This substantive performance review is detailed in the faculty procedures describing this process.
- d. The department chairs and/or deans are responsible for explaining requirements for tenure and promotion to all new probationary tenure-track and term faculty members upon their initial employment. This responsibility is then incorporated into the mandated annual and subsequent more substantive performance reviews of all faculty members.
- e. For probationary tenure-track faculty members, their first three-year substantive performance review is an integral part of their process toward pursuit of tenure and promotion and includes a formal performance review by the campus Promotion and Tenure Committee. A detailed description of this review is available in the faculty procedures.
- f. Probationary tenure-track faculty members are notified of the year of their mandatory tenure performance review at the time of their initial contract with the University and on each subsequent contract. A detailed description of this mandatory tenure performance review process is available in the faculty procedures.
- g. As noted in the policy foundation above: “To ensure trustworthiness in the review process for promotion and tenure, any evaluator at a given level (department, school, administrative) must, having voted at the initial decision-point level, recuse themselves for subsequent levels of evaluation and voting. This recusal is essential to increase fairness and demonstrate ethical clarity of policy. All participants in the review process are responsible for ensuring appropriate recusal decisions and their implementation.”
- h. Unwritten or undocumented criteria cannot be introduced or applied in review processes.

University of St. Thomas Policies

- i. Failure to follow the guidelines provided in the policies and procedures for review can lead to an unsatisfactory outcome for the faculty member under review or an appeal initiated by the reviewed faculty member based on actions of the department, school, dean or Promotion and Tenure Committee.

4. Evaluation for Promotion and Tenure: Policy Overview

- a. The University of St. Thomas places the highest value on excellence in teaching effectiveness. This standard of excellence is clear in the criteria for faculty evaluation and in University policies and publications. It therefore has primacy in the performance review for granting both promotion and tenure.
- b. The University also values research/scholarship/creative works, and service. Achievements in all these domains are necessary if a faculty member is to demonstrate a positive performance at the University of St. Thomas. Each person will have domains of greater or lesser strength and thus may receive different evaluative outcomes in each. Some components within each domain may include more substantive achievements than others, and this variance is noted in the review. In every case, each domain is reviewed (teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship/creative works, and service). This includes both discipline-level and campus-level reviews.
- c. Each faculty member is expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching and to maintain that level of performance. As one progresses during their employment at the University of St. Thomas, the expectation of achievement in all domains increases. Thus, faculty are expected to continue to demonstrate additional contributions to teaching effectiveness and be increasingly engaged in research/scholarship/creative works, and professional service to the University and community.
- d. For probationary tenure-track faculty, award of tenure requires concurrent promotion to the rank of associate professor.
- e. In addition to the campus-level expectations of the University of St. Thomas in regard to domains of performance (teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship/creative works, and service), discipline-specific criteria of schools and/or departments are identified in these domains of performance for the evaluation of the candidate.
 - i. These discipline-specific criteria are developed and implemented by each individual department and/or school.
 - ii. Individual departments and/or schools define, adopt and revise these standards every three years with the input of external reviewers and in consultation with the dean of the discipline's school and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
 - iii. These discipline-specific criteria are submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for their information and review. It is the responsibility of the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee to communicate to the dean of each school any questions or concerns they encounter in the review of these discipline-specific criteria. These concerns must be resolved prior to the review of

University of St. Thomas Policies

- any candidate for promotion and/or tenure.
- iv. These criteria, along with the campus-wide criteria, are used in assessing a candidate for promotion and/or tenure at the departmental or school level. They, along with the campus-wide criteria, must be provided to the faculty member upon appointment to a probationary tenure-track position eligible for promotion and tenure or a term position eligible for promotion.
 - v. In addition to explaining campus-wide requirements for promotion and tenure (See 3(d) above), the department chairs and/or deans are responsible for explaining discipline-specific requirements for tenure and promotion to all new probationary tenure-track and term faculty members upon their initial employment. This responsibility is then incorporated into the mandated annual and subsequent more substantive performance reviews of all faculty members.
 - vi. The discipline-specific criteria must also be included in the formal portfolio submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee at the time of the faculty member's promotion and/or tenure review. These discipline-specific criteria must also be included in the formal portfolio submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee at the time of the probationary tenure-track faculty member's three-year review.
 - vii. These discipline-specific criteria are public documents available to all interested faculty in the University of St. Thomas.
 - viii. In the case of a perceived conflict between discipline-specific criteria and campus-level criteria, such conflicts must be mediated by the Promotion and Tenure Committee separate from the review process for a specific faculty member and resolved prior to a specific review. The outcome of such a mediation is a written public report to the University community.
- f. The University-wide criteria have general applicability to all disciplines. The University also recognizes the necessary and stimulating diversity of its disciplines and schools as well as the varied contributions of the individual faculty members within them. Promotion and tenure review requires that all evaluators balance this University-wide applicability with the recognition of this valued diversity. Evaluators provide written summaries of their review outcomes to document this balance, i.e., provide summaries that include both sets of criteria.
- g. To further support the balance between campus-wide criteria and discipline-specific criteria, all candidates for promotion and tenure select an advocate who presents the candidate's portfolio to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, highlighting and clarifying the unique achievements of the candidate and answering questions, if needed that are raised by committee members. The advocate is excused prior to the deliberation and voting of the committee. The process for selecting this advocate and the procedures involved in this role are detailed in the faculty procedures.
- h. The University recognizes that faculty members in different departments and/or schools have different workloads based on their number and types of preparations, number of majors, distinct requirements of their discipline, professional school external agency requirements, number of graduates, and percentage of students engaged in

University of St. Thomas Policies

undergraduate or graduate research activity. Careful consideration of these department-specific workloads is designed to ensure fair comparisons among faculty members' contributions. The individual faculty member's portfolio documents and explicates his/her individual workload report,

5. Rubrics for Evaluating Candidates for Promotion and Tenure

- a. Evaluation rubrics refer to the sets of criteria that guide the evaluation process. The purpose of the rubrics for evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure is to assist with objective evaluation of candidates' qualifications and to provide more standardized proportionality of various elements of the evaluation.
- b. For each domain (teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship/creative works, and service), rubrics identify both the criteria that characterize the domain and descriptors that characterize achievement at three levels: "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," and "Does Not Meet Expectations." The concept of "expectations" refers to the discernment of those who assess the candidate's performance informed by the discipline-specific criteria and campus-wide criteria.
- c. The achievement level descriptors represent prototypical characteristics of a faculty member at a particular level of achievement, according to University and/or discipline-specific distinctions and the norms of the academic community.
- d. No faculty member is expected to be identical to the prototype. Evaluators determine which level best characterizes a candidate's achievement of a criterion. General instructions for using the rubric are provided with each rubric. The ethical interpretation of these instructions is the responsibility of the evaluator.
- e. Candidates are evaluated initially on the discipline-specific criteria, which must demonstrate a congruence with the campus-wide criteria. In addition, the rubrics include a discipline-specific single "criterion" for each domain to facilitate inclusion of performance assessments of domain achievements unique to a given discipline.
- f. The criteria within each domain are not equally weighted, with some providing more compelling evidence than others. In addition, discipline diversity introduces additional variance in performance appraisal. It is the responsibility of the evaluator to weigh the various criteria and discern the level that best characterizes a specific candidate's performance.
- g. The discipline-specific criteria are provided with the candidate's portfolio and should be accompanied by discipline-specific rubrics that will aid with evaluation of the discipline-specific criteria. The discipline-specific rubrics are developed at the school or department level and are public University documents. The candidate's advocate can further clarify the discipline-specific criteria at the time of presentation of the candidate to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

University of St. Thomas Policies

- h. In each domain, it is expected that candidates will have strengths as well as areas for growth. Similarly, candidates have different roles and responsibilities; thus, they may have different degrees of exposure and experience with various criteria. These variances are addressed by the faculty member in the portfolio and can be further explicated by the candidate’s advocate at the time of review. Evaluation of the individual candidate thus requires conducting the review within the context of the candidate’s overall portfolio.
- i. The rubrics below (sections 6 – 9 of this policy) represent standards for assessment of faculty as campus-wide policy and thus to be applied at the time of review for promotion and/or tenure. Templates are provided for each rubric to facilitate documentation of the assessment and are designed to ensure documentation of the evaluator’s judgment for both discipline-specific and campus-level criteria.

6. Faculty Member Roles and Responsibilities: Rubric A

As noted in 4(h) above, the University of St. Thomas “recognizes that faculty members in different departments and/or schools have different workloads based on their number and types of preparations, number of majors, distinct requirements of their discipline, professional school external agency requirements, number of graduates, and percentage of students engaged in undergraduate research activity.”

This rubric provides a more standardized template for evaluating the faculty member’s work roles and responsibilities. Each candidate completes the form below to better document the unique aspects of individual roles and responsibilities. This information is an official part of the faculty member’s portfolio. Portions of the rubric that do not apply to a specific candidate are simply indicated as “Not Applicable” in the rubric. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the information in this rubric prior to reviewing the subsequent rubrics. The candidate’s advocate can provide additional explanatory information if requested at the time of review.

	Undergraduate	Graduate
Hours per week spent in classroom (including labs)		
Hours per week spent in external agency negotiation/ collaboration		
Typical number of classes per semester		
Typical number of class preparations per semester		
Typical class enrollment (range)		
Typical number of advisees per semester		
Typical number of students engaged in research under faculty member’s mentorship per semester		

University of St. Thomas Policies

Typical number of students in final graduate research projects or dissertations under faculty member's supervision		
Unique responsibilities/roles (explanation provided in portfolio)		

7. Teaching Effectiveness: Rubric B

The University of St. Thomas gives primacy to teaching effectiveness, making evaluation of the faculty member's teaching of significance for tenure and promotion. The evaluation of teaching performance must be both appropriate and varied, informed by the campus-wide criteria listed in the matrix below, the discipline-specific criteria as they relate to the campus-wide criteria, and by the documentation provided by the candidate and the presentation of the candidate's advocate.

The matrix provides a protocol for evaluators reviewing a candidate. Recording judgments made about a candidate provides an overview of the candidate's achievements in the teaching effectiveness domain, enabling discernment about individual achievement in this domain. Evaluators thus are able to balance the unique individual demonstration of achievements with the university expectations of campus-wide norms of performance as shaped by the traditions of the academic community and the institutions comparable to the University of St. Thomas.

To facilitate this evaluation, the candidate is required to submit relevant documentation. The following list identifies appropriate inclusions in the candidate's portfolio to provide this documentation. It is not an exhaustive list and individual candidates may identify additional documentation to demonstrate achievement. The more inclusion provided, the more information is available to the evaluator for their review. Potential inclusions for documentation are:

- a. a brief statement of personal teaching philosophy;
- b. course materials (syllabi, assignments, examinations, handouts);
- c. student course evaluations;
- d. semester grade reports;
- e. on-line student assignments and/or course materials;
- f. special teaching assignments (for example, Honors Program, MLMLA, capstone course, service-learning courses, clinical-site expansion initiative, graduate program final research project/dissertation);
- g. contributions to curriculum development;
- h. innovations in approaches to teaching;
- i. information related to teaching performance or upgrading of teaching expertise;
- j. external expert review of actual teaching performance;
- k. peer review of actual teaching performance.

The teaching portion of the portfolio is reviewed at each step of the review process using the criteria below and the achievement levels identified. After a comprehensive review of the documentation that the candidate provides, each reviewer provides a judgment based on this

University of St. Thomas Policies

rubric, using the matrix to record judgments. Based on the data generated in the matrix, a final decision about the candidate's overall achievement in teaching effectiveness is rendered.

Criterion	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Current knowledge of the discipline	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Serious preparation for courses	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Skill in challenging students	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Ability to devise appropriate learning objectives and the means by which students can achieve them	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Ability to utilize appropriate available technology to assist student learning	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Achievement of discipline-specific expectations	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:

This matrix is the template for all faculty teaching effectiveness evaluations. In the promotion and/or tenure review process, an overall teaching judgment is rendered by each evaluator. For promotion and/or tenure review, ratings are determined for both campus-wide and discipline-specific identified criteria. Variance in teaching effectiveness may result in some criteria in the matrix having one or more inclusions and others having none. Where none exist, the category is marked as "Not Applicable."

Upon completion of the evaluation, reviewers will provide a brief written summary of the evidence and context for their final judgment. Reviewers will also provide a written summary rationale for the evaluator's final decision about promotion and/or tenure.

8. Research/Scholarship/Creative Works: Rubric C

The University of St. Thomas values the research, scholarship and creative work of all faculty. It recognizes that there is substantive variance in the research, scholarship and creative works of

University of St. Thomas Policies

faculty, in part a function of the distinctive nature of discrete disciplines. The University also affirms campus-wide criteria that demonstrate achievement in the domain of research, scholarship and creative work. The evaluation of research, scholarship and creative work performance must be both appropriate and varied, informed by the campus-wide criteria listed in the matrix below, the discipline-specific criteria as they relate to the campus-wide criteria, and by the documentation provided by the candidate and the presentation of the candidate's advocate.

The matrix below provides a protocol for evaluators reviewing a candidate. Recording judgments made about a candidate provides an overview of the candidate's achievements in the research, scholarship and creative work domain, enabling discernment about individual achievement in this domain. Evaluators thus are able to balance the unique individual demonstration of achievements with the University expectations of campus-wide norms of performance as shaped by the traditions of the academic community and the institutions comparable to the University of St. Thomas.

It is important that there be substantive evidence of the quality and importance to the discipline and/or the University of the work presented. Candidates will include in their portfolio evidence that meets criteria listed in the matrix below. Actual copies of scholarship, research and creative works are included in the portfolio to provide this evidence.

To facilitate this evaluation, the candidate is required to submit relevant documentation. The following list identifies appropriate inclusions in the candidate portfolio to provide this documentation. It is not an exhaustive list and individual candidates may identify additional documentation to demonstrate achievement. The more inclusion provided, the more information is available to the evaluator for their review. Potential inclusions for documentation are:

- a. Copies of peer-reviewed publications;
- b. Research proposals submitted for external funding;
- c. Research proposals submitted for internal funding;
- d. Power-points of public presentations;
- e. Programs of public presentations;
- f. Descriptions of creative videography;
- g. Student research reports;
- h. In process publication reports with journal editor letter of commitment;
- i. Descriptions of work in progress with examples of partially completed materials;
- j. Creative classroom/on-line teaching innovations samples;
- k. Documentation of peer use or reference to creative work or publications;
- l. Letters of peer review/evaluation of scholarship.

Work in progress, so long as it meets the tests of quality and importance, will be credited as supporting a case for tenure or promotion. Such ongoing research will not be rated on a par with or as a substitute for work completed. For promotion to the rank of professor, especially, books that are cited must be in print rather than in various stages in the process before appearing in print. Variance in research, scholarship and creative works may result in some criteria in the matrix having one or more inclusions and others having none. Multiple inclusions may provide the basis for demonstrating "exceeds expectations," e.g., peer-reviewed publications.

University of St. Thomas Policies

This completed research, scholarship or creative works portion of the portfolio is reviewed at each step of the review process using the criterion below and the achievement levels identified. After a comprehensive review of the documentation that the candidate provides, each reviewer provides a judgment based on this rubric, using the matrix to record judgments. Based on the data generated in the matrix, a final decision about the candidate's overall achievement in research, scholarship or creative works is rendered.

Criterion	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Peer-reviewed publications (e.g., book, monograph, refereed journal article, creative works in reviewed publications)	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Authorship of grant request requiring in-depth research	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Creative/artistic products or projects in public sphere	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Presentation of a workshop or scholarly paper to a professional organization	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Mentorship of student research	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Products related to scholarship of teaching	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Additional discipline-specific products	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:

This matrix is the template for all faculty research, scholarship and creative works evaluations. In the promotion and tenure review process, an overall research, scholarship and creative works judgment is generated by each evaluator. For promotion and/or tenure review, ratings are determined for both campus-wide and discipline-specific identified criteria. Variance in research,

University of St. Thomas Policies

scholarship and creative works may result in some criteria in the matrix having one or more inclusions and others having none. Where none exist, the category is marked as “Not Applicable.”

Upon completion of the evaluation, reviewers will provide a brief written summary of the evidence and context for their final judgment. Reviewers will also provide a written summary rationale for the evaluator’s final decision about promotion and/or tenure.

9. University and Community Service: Rubric D

University and community service involves those memberships and activities through which faculty members contribute to the well-being of their departments, schools or the University, the civic community, and/or their discipline or profession. These services further the University’s mission outside the classroom and the faculty member’s research, scholarship and creative works. These various academic, extracurricular, professional, civic and pastoral functions reflect the diversity of the faculty, the various disciplines, and the opportunities of individual faculty members. The University also affirms campus-wide criteria that demonstrate achievement in the domain of service. The evaluation of University and community service performance must be both appropriate and varied, informed by the campus-wide criteria listed in the matrix below, the discipline-specific criteria as they relate to the campus-wide criteria, and by the documentation provided by the candidate and the presentation of the candidate’s advocate.

The matrix below provides a protocol for evaluators reviewing a candidate. Recording judgments made about a candidate provides an overview of the candidate’s achievements in University and community service, enabling discernment about individual achievement in this domain. Evaluators thus are able to balance the unique individual demonstration of achievements with the University expectations of campus-wide norms of performance as shaped by the traditions of the academic community and the institutions comparable to the University of St. Thomas.

Evaluations of the University and community service domain include self-evaluation in the candidate’s portfolio and solicited and unsolicited external evaluations in the form of letters or other written communications, among others. Faculty are expected to make contributions that enhance the University, the missions of their unit, and their profession. It is important that there be substantive evidence of the quality and importance to the discipline and/or the University of the service presented. Candidates will include in their portfolio evidence that meets criteria listed in the matrix below.

To facilitate this evaluation, the candidate is required to submit relevant documentation. The following list identifies appropriate inclusions in the candidate portfolio to provide this documentation. It is not an exhaustive list and individual candidates may identify additional documentation to demonstrate achievement. The more inclusion provided, the more information is available to the evaluator for their review. Potential university and community service activities for inclusion in the portfolio with appropriate documentation are:

- a. Advising and counseling students;
- b. Activities promoting student organizations;
- c. Initiatives requiring innovative leadership;

University of St. Thomas Policies

- d. Participation on committees;
- e. Leadership on committees;
- f. Representing the University at various programs;
- g. Participation in student recruitment activities;
- h. Participation in the service learning program;
- i. Coordination and sponsoring of student organizations;
- j. Participation in community projects related to the faculty member's discipline;
- k. Leadership in professional organizations of the faculty member's discipline;
- l. Participation in special projects of the faculty member's discipline;
- m. Activities which foster the religious orientation of the University.

This completed service portion of the portfolio is reviewed at each step of the review process using the criterion below and the achievement levels identified. After a comprehensive review of the documentation that the candidate provides, each reviewer provides a judgment based on this rubric, using the matrix to record judgments. Based on the data generated in the matrix, a final decision about the candidate's overall achievement in service is rendered.

Criterion	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
Service to the University (including Department and School)	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Service to Students	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Service to the Profession and/or Community	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:
Additional discipline-specific products	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:	Discipline: University:

This matrix is the template for all University and community service evaluations. In the promotion and tenure review process, an overall University and community service judgment is generated by each evaluator. For promotion and/or tenure review, ratings are determined for both campus-wide and discipline-specific identified criteria. Variance in University and community service may result in some criteria in the matrix having one or more inclusions and others having none. Where none exist, the category is marked as "Not Applicable."

Upon completion of the evaluation, reviewers will provide a brief written summary of the evidence and context for their final judgment. Reviewers will also provide a written summary rationale for the evaluator's final decision about promotion and/or tenure.

10. Specification and Application of Rubrics for Promotion and/or Tenure

- a. Evaluation of achievement should be conducted within the context of the candidate's

University of St. Thomas Policies

overall portfolio, and the rationale for why a candidate does or does not meet (or exceed) expectations should be provided in writing in the summaries prepared by those who evaluate candidates.

- b. In assessing the eligibility of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, the evaluator must first establish that the candidate, at a minimum, meets expectations in all three domains of performance review.
- c. In evaluating each of the three major domains, those responsible will rate the candidate, interpreting the following categories in light of how they apply to discipline-specific criteria, the campus-wide criteria, the expectations of the University of St. Thomas faculty and the expectations of faculty from comparable institutions:
 - i. exceeds expectations
 - ii. meets expectations
 - iii. does not meet expectations
- d. Rubrics for performance review of faculty in the three performance domains (Rubrics B, C, and D above) will be utilized by all evaluators of candidates for promotion and/or tenure: department chairs or supervisors, deans, Promotion and Tenure Committee members, and campus administrative officers. These rubrics will also be utilized by all evaluators for faculty members' annual evaluation and subsequent more substantive reviews. This ensures consistency of performance criteria for faculty and fairness in the evaluation processes.
- e. In reviews for promotion and/or tenure, rubrics will be filled out by every associate professor and professor of a candidate's department or school if no department exists, to be included in the candidate's portfolio. This same requirement applies to the mandated three-year review for probationary tenure-track faculty.
- f. Rubrics are used to communicate with the candidate under promotion and/or tenure review by all parties engaged in communication with the candidate.
- g. Promotion to the rank of associate professor is necessary to be awarded tenure. Such promotion is, however, a separate action from the award of tenure. Each requires a separate review and vote by evaluators at each step of the process. The candidate for tenure must thus concurrently be promoted to the rank of associate professor or professor.
- h. Departments and/or schools will only initiate a review for promotion and/or tenure when they make a judgment that a candidate has, at a minimum, demonstrated, an achievement level of "Meets Expectations" in all three domains of evaluation.
- i. While the University does not have minimum or numerical requirements for inclusions in the rubrics for the three domains of appraisal, evaluators are expected to make ethical and discerning judgments about the composite of achievements of candidates reflected in the domain matrices. As noted above, "Evaluators thus are able to balance the unique individual demonstration of achievements with the university expectations of campus-wide norms of performance as shaped by the traditions of the academic community and the institutions comparable to the University of St. Thomas."
- j. The policy, as described above in 10(i) applies to both promotion and tenure reviews and

University of St. Thomas Policies

decisions.

- k. Before making a long-term commitment to a faculty member, the University must be convinced that the candidate for tenure will continue to make valuable contributions in the areas of teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship/creative works, and service.
- l. The evidence a candidate presents to document review for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor and from associate to full professor must extend beyond that which was presented for the previous promotion.
- m. The rank of professor is reserved for those faculty members whose careers reflect outstanding cumulative achievement and a consistent and sustained evaluation that exceeds expectations.

APPROVED: Board of Directors

Date of Original Formation: 09/01/2010

Revision Number: 3

Revision Date: 06/06/2019

Effective Date: 06/06/2019