

# **Pamplin College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Overview</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<i>Purpose of this Document</i> .....	4
<b>Minimum Credentials and Experience</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<i>Exceptions</i> .....	5
<b>General Expectations and Assessment Criteria</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<i>Teaching Expectations</i> .....	6
<i>Scholarship Expectations</i> .....	8
<i>Service Expectations</i> .....	9
<b>Required Application Materials</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Letters from External Reviewers</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<i>Selecting and Contacting External Reviewers</i> .....	10
<i>Deadline for External Review Letters</i> .....	11
<i>Confidentiality</i> .....	11
<b>Promotion and Tenure Portfolio</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<i>Submission Deadline</i> .....	12
<i>Format and Organization</i> .....	12
<i>Evidence of Teaching</i> .....	14
<i>Evidence of Scholarship</i> .....	15
<i>Evidence of Service</i> .....	16
<b>Process Overview</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Promotion and Tenure Committee Guidelines</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<i>College Committee Guidelines</i> .....	18
<i>Departmental Committee Guidelines</i> .....	19
<i>Exceptions to Review by Departmental Committee</i> .....	20
<b>Appeals of Promotion and Tenure Recommendations</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>Pre-Tenure Review</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Post-Tenure Review</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>Appendix 1: External Reviewer Disclosure and Approval Form</b> .....	<b>28</b>

<b>Appendix 2: Sample Letter to External Reviewers .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Review and Promotion of Lecturers .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Faculty Workload.....</b>	<b>37</b>

## OVERVIEW

These Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Pamplin College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences (“Pamplin guidelines” hereafter) are intended to foster excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service among the college’s faculty. These guidelines do not supersede, but supplement and further elaborate on Augusta University’s *University Guidelines for Faculty Promotion and Tenure* (“university guidelines” hereafter).

While it is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate excellence in all areas of his/her professional responsibilities, it is the responsibility of the college and the candidate’s department to maintain a robust course of faculty development and assessment which, starting from the date of hire, assists the candidate in understanding what is expected for promotion/tenure, assessing his/her progress in fulfilling those expectations, and if necessary, developing an appropriate plan of improvement prior to requesting promotion/tenure.

In fulfillment of that responsibility, Pamplin provides all tenure-track faculty with timely and frequent opportunities to assess their progress. These include the assignment of a faculty mentor, regular annual reviews, regular peer evaluations of teaching, a comprehensive mid-course review of the candidate’s progress toward tenure, and the establishment of clear expectations for the award of promotion/tenure as outlined in these and the departmental guidelines. Support continues after tenure through regular annual reviews and peer evaluations of teaching, as well as a comprehensive post-tenure review every five years. Full-time, non-tenure track faculty receive similar forms of support.

### **Purpose of this Document**

The purpose of this document is to explain how the university guidelines for promotion/tenure are applied within Pamplin, including any college-specific procedures or criteria for assessment. This document only addresses the most pertinent, college-specific criteria for promotion/tenure of full-time, tenure-track faculty. Guidelines for the review and promotion of Lecturers are in Appendix 3 of this document.

Additional topics and information may be found in the university guidelines, the BOR Policy Manual, and the USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook, all of which may be accessed from the Resources page of the Pamplin website at [augusta.edu/pamplin/resources.php](http://augusta.edu/pamplin/resources.php).

Departmental and discipline-specific criteria for promotion/tenure are described in the Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure (“departmental guidelines” hereafter), which may be accessed from the Resources page of the Pamplin website.

## MINIMUM CREDENTIALS AND EXPERIENCE

The minimum credentials and experience required to be eligible for each rank and tenure are listed in the following table:

Status	Rank	Minimum Criteria (as of the effective promotion/tenure date)
Full-time, tenure-track	Assistant Professor	Terminal degree (or nearing its completion), or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience.
	Associate Professor	Terminal degree or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience. Completion of at least <i>five</i> years as Assistant Professor.
	Tenure	Terminal degree or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience. Completion of at least <i>five</i> years, but normally <i>six</i> and not more than seven, as Assistant Professor or above.
	Professor	Terminal degree or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience. Completion of at least <i>five</i> years as Associate Professor.

Neither the possession of appropriate credentials nor longevity of service is a guarantee of promotion or tenure. Since expectations for tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor are the same, candidates normally apply for both at the same time.

Credit toward promotion/tenure shall be awarded only if it was specified in the candidate’s contract at the time of his/her initial appointment. Except when credit is awarded, faculty members are typically eligible to apply for tenure at the start of their sixth year of continuous, full-time service, and may not apply later than at the start of their seventh year of service.

Faculty who intend to apply for promotion/tenure should make that fact known to their Department Chair by the January prior to the fall term in which they intend to apply to ensure they are eligible.

### Exceptions

The following exceptions are permitted under the college and the university guidelines:

- A faculty member may apply for tenure at the start of his/her fifth year of service at the invitation of his/her Department Chair and Dean.
- A faculty member may apply for tenure later than his/her seventh year of service if he/she is granted a one- or two-year extension for an event that qualifies under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), but does not necessarily result in a formal leave of absence. Normally, such an extension *must be requested within three months of the extenuating event*. See “Extension of Probationary Tenure Periods” in the university guidelines for additional details.
- A faculty member may apply for promotion with fewer than the required minimum years of service in rank if the request has strong justification and approval by the president.

See BOR Policies 8.3.6-7, USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook 4.5, and the university guidelines for additional information or exceptions to these criteria. Definitions of terms pertaining to status and rank may be found in AU policy on Faculty Classification.

## GENERAL EXPECTATIONS AND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

In accord with the policies established by the Board of Regents (BOR) and Augusta University, Pamplin specifies three areas of assessment for the award of promotion/tenure:

1. Teaching
2. Scholarship
3. Service

A fourth area—“professional growth and development” as delineated in BOR Policy 8.3.6.1—is subsumed in these three. All faculty are expected to engage in professional development that enhances their teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities.

Since faculty expertise, responsibilities, and workload vary, the candidate’s contributions in each area shall be assessed in terms of the candidate’s rank, discipline, and reported effort. Departments will specify appropriate expectations for promotion/tenure in accordance with these variables.

At each level of review within the college, the candidate’s contributions in each area will be assessed based on the evidence presented in the candidate’s promotion/tenure portfolio and external letters. Positive recommendations for promotion/tenure shall require a finding of “outstanding” in the areas of Teaching and Scholarship, and “meets the standards” in the area of Service.

General expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service for Pamplin faculty are described below. Effort- and discipline-specific criteria may be found in the departmental guidelines.

### Teaching Expectations

*Teaching* refers to the best practices and responsibilities required to be an effective educator, advisor, and mentor. These include: (a) knowledge of the subject matter, (b) effective planning and communication of curriculum, (c) supervision of students, (d) creation of engaging learning environments, (e) fostering of student development and engagement, (f) availability and receptivity to students, (g) fair and timely evaluation of student performance, (h) student advisement, and (i) innovation in educational delivery.

Pamplin faculty are expected to employ teaching methods and techniques that recognize a variety of learning styles, cultural backgrounds, and instructional settings. Instructional and curricular innovation is encouraged, especially when it provides ways for students to become actively engaged in the lesson or the work of the discipline. Faculty members should also be skillful advisors and mentors, encouraging students to seek and engage in other educationally- and professionally-beneficial experiences outside of the classroom, when appropriate.

All Pamplin faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching, to maintain a regular program of assessment of their teaching, to stay abreast of new techniques in the literature, and to share those ideas with the campus community. As faculty become more senior, it is expected that the scope, depth, and/or impact of their teaching efforts should also increase, especially with regard to directed student learning activities outside of the classroom and curricular contributions beyond their immediate course responsibilities.

Responsibilities and expectations for teaching, regardless of rank, are listed in the following table:

<b>Responsibilities</b>	<b>Teaching Expectations</b>
Knowledge of the subject matter	Has command of the subject matter. Demonstrates breadth and depth of knowledge. Remains current on developments in the field.
Effective planning and communication of curriculum	Organizes study of the subject effectively, including student learning outcomes and instructional objectives. Is well prepared for each class. Constructs appropriate syllabi and materials. Covers material consistently and deliberately with good organizational planning. Structures classroom discussions in a manner that facilitates learning. Stays abreast of new technology, innovative teaching practices, and pedagogical tools. Meets teaching obligations diligently: begins/ends class on time, submits grades on time, cancels classes only for exigent circumstances, and compensates for missed time by scheduling make-up classes or other pedagogical means.
Supervision of students	Fosters student accomplishment of objectives (services, procedures, internships, apprenticeships, etc.), when applicable.
Creation of engaging learning environments	Creates an environment conducive to learning. Motivates students to learn. Makes effective use of different teaching methods and technologies as appropriate. Conveys concepts through content delivery, questioning, and moderation of student discussion, as appropriate.
Fostering of student development and engagement	Stimulates critical thinking, analysis, and other forms of active engagement by students.
Availability and receptivity to students	Is reasonably available to students. Is receptive to student questions. Maintains regular office hours. Offers advice to students on academic and professional matters.
Fair and timely evaluation of student performance	Assesses student work/performance in a fair and timely manner. Creates appropriate examinations. Develops guidelines for student papers or presentations. Grades student examinations, papers, or presentations impartially. Creates and uses appropriate tools for reviewing and evaluating areas of hands-on performance and ethical and professional responsibility.
Student advisement	Advises students on academic and professional matters during and outside of assigned advisement periods. Is knowledgeable of graduation requirements, general registration procedures, and any other requirements stipulated in the advisee's major.
Innovation in educational delivery	Utilizes innovative techniques in educational delivery which foster excellence in student learning and performance, as appropriate to the discipline.

See the departmental guidelines for discipline-specific criteria for outstanding teaching.

### Scholarship Expectations

*Scholarship* refers to scholarship, research, and creative endeavors appropriate to the candidate’s discipline. In evaluating scholarship for promotion/tenure, primary consideration is given to dissemination of the individual’s scholarly work; however, consideration will be given to other forms of scholarship, especially in fields where publication of scholarly work is not a mainstream method of dissemination. See the departmental guidelines for discipline-appropriate forms of scholarship.

Pamplin faculty are expected to establish a lead role in scholarship, research, and/or creative endeavors. Those efforts must be of high quality, appropriate to the candidate’s college and professional affiliation, and should be on a trajectory of national and international development. Candidates are also encouraged to collaborate; however, each individual should make original contributions to collaborative processes.

General expectations for scholarship are listed in the following table:

Objective	Scholarship Expectations
Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor	Trajectory of <i>regional</i> and <i>national</i> scholastic development. Growth as an accomplished scholar and/or artist within his/her discipline, with new dissemination of his/her work through publications or other peer reviewed outlets at an outstanding level.
Promotion to Professor	Sustained record of publication in high quality, refereed professional journals; publication of a monograph with a peer reviewed, national or international academic press; or artistic endeavors that have peer recognition and have reached a national or international audience since last promotion or hire. Leadership role for grant writing activities as appropriate to his/her discipline. Dissemination of his/her scholarship at <i>national</i> or <i>international</i> conferences on a consistent basis since promotion to Associate Professor. Promise of continued achievement in scholarship or creative endeavors.

Items accepted for publication *prior to the candidate’s hire or last promotion* shall not count toward the minimum departmental expectations for scholarly publication/production unless such credit was specified in the candidate’s contract at that time.

Items accepted for publication during the period under review will be counted towards scholarship, even if they are not yet in print, as long as evidence confirming acceptance (e.g. correspondence from the publisher or press) is included in the candidate’s promotion/tenure portfolio.

Items “in progress” or “under submission”—but not yet accepted—shall not be credited toward minimum departmental expectations for publication/production; however, reviewers may consider such items as evidence of the quality, trajectory, and/or sustained effort of the candidate’s scholarly agenda.

See the departmental guidelines for discipline-specific criteria for outstanding scholarship.

### Service Expectations

*Service* refers to activities that contribute directly or indirectly to the well-being of the university, college, department, profession, or broader community. These activities may be solicited or unsolicited, paid or unpaid. In evaluations of service for promotion/tenure, primary consideration is given to professional service in the area of the candidate’s expertise and that furthers the mission of AU, including:

- *Service to the profession*: participating or holding office in professional associations and societies, professional adjudications, organizing a conference, serving on an editorial board, serving as external reviewer for grants or a peer-reviewed journal, and other such contributions.
- *Administrative service*: duties normally expected of program directors, assistant chairs, and other university-sanctioned administrative appointments below the rank of Department Chair.
- *Academic service*: activities within AU, such as serving on committees, overseeing programs, consulting with committees or peers, lectures, conducting workshops, providing instruction beyond assigned teaching load, and providing other services or assistance.
- *Community service*: activities in which the candidate applies his/her professional expertise to the broader community, such as serving on committees, administering programs, consulting, lecturing, conducting workshops, providing instruction, media interviews, op-eds, and other such contributions.

Service activities outside AU which relate to fulfilling one’s civic duty, but not to the candidate’s professional expertise, should *not* be considered in evaluating service.

As faculty become more senior, it is expected that the scope and depth of their service efforts will also increase, especially with regard to their service to the profession.

General expectations for service are described below:

Objective	Service Expectations
Tenure/promotion to Associate Professor	Satisfactory (“meets the standards”) service to his/her department, college, university, and profession.
Promotion to Professor	Sustained record of satisfactory (“meets the standards”) service to his/her department, college, university, and profession.

See the departmental guidelines for discipline-specific criteria for satisfactory (“meets the standards”) service.

## REQUIRED APPLICATION MATERIALS

An application for promotion/tenure consists of two principal components:

### 1. Letters from external reviewers

Three letters from external reviewers are required to support requests for tenure or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or higher.

The process of selecting reviewers should begin at least four months prior to the start of the fall term in which the candidate intends to apply.

See *Letters from External Reviewers* below for more information.

### 2. The Promotion and Tenure Portfolio

The Promotion and Tenure Portfolio (“portfolio” hereafter) is compiled by the candidate to summarize and provide evidence of his/her achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service since the time of hire or last promotion.

The portfolio is due no later than one week after the first day of classes in the fall term in which the candidate is applying.

See *Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Requirements* below for more information.

## LETTERS FROM EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Requests for tenure or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or higher must be supported by three letters from external (non-AU) peers or academic leaders *of the same or higher rank and tenure as that to which the candidate is applying* or, when appropriate, qualified professional peers with comparable standing as approved by the departmental committee and Department Chair (Appendix 1).

### Selecting and Contacting External Reviewers

To ensure adequate time to obtain the letters, the process of selecting external reviewers should occur in the spring term, *at least four months prior to the start of the fall term in which the candidate intends to apply*, and requests for letters should be made at least three months prior to the start of the fall term.

The Department Chair, departmental promotion/tenure committee, and the candidate should work together to contribute to a mutually acceptable list of at least *eight (8)* qualified external reviewers, which is to be completed no later than April 20 of the year in which the candidate intends to apply. The form in Appendix 1 must be used to document this process and shall be kept on file in the candidate’s department, with a copy provided to the candidate. The candidate is prohibited from discussing the review process with any reviewer on the list until the promotion/tenure process is completed.

In generating the list, the candidate may recommend colleagues from other institutions who have significant scholarly reputation and sufficient knowledge of the candidate’s work, but with whom the

candidate does not have a close personal or professional relationship that may prevent the reviewer from making a fair and impartial assessment. The candidate shall disclose the nature of any relationship he/she may have with any reviewer listed. The departmental committee and/or Department Chair may challenge any reviewer whose relationship to the candidate is deemed close enough to pose a potential conflict of interest, or whose qualifications are deemed inadequate. The candidate may challenge for cause any reviewer listed. If the departmental committee and the candidate are unable to complete a mutually acceptable list by April 20, the Department Chair must then complete the list.

Once the list is finalized, the Department Chair will select three names, but *shall not inform the candidate which three have been selected*. The Department Chair will contact the selected reviewers and provide clear instructions about the purpose and scope of the review. If any reviewer declines to provide a letter, the Department Chair will choose an alternate from the approved list to ensure the requisite three letters are obtained.

At a minimum, each external reviewer is to be provided with a copy of these college guidelines, the departmental guidelines, the candidate's curriculum vitae, and at least one representative sample of the candidate's scholarship—the latter of which the reviewer should assess in terms of its quality and importance in the field.

At the department's discretion, external reviewers may be asked to assess additional materials evidencing the candidate's contributions to scholarship, teaching, and/or service, as appropriate. Departments should keep in mind that the more materials they include for external review, the likelier it may pose a hardship for the candidate, who will need to provide those materials by the time reviewers are contacted, well in advance of the deadline for submitting his/her completed promotion/tenure portfolio.

See Appendix 2 for a sample letter to external reviewers.

### **Deadline for External Review Letters**

Letters from external reviewers must be signed, dated, and on official stationery, and should be accompanied by a brief biosketch or condensed vita (2 pages or less). These materials should be received *at least one week prior to the first day of classes in the fall term in which the candidate is applying*. The Department Chair shall ensure that the letters are received by the deadline, including contacting the reviewers in early July to remind them of the deadline and inquire about the status of their letters.

### **Confidentiality**

The candidate shall not be informed of the identity of the three reviewers selected by the departmental committee. If the candidate subsequently wishes to review the letters written by the external reviewers, he/she must make a written request to the Dean of the Pamplin College who has the sole responsibility for redacting letters. Only redacted letters that protect as fully as possible the identity of the external reviewers will be made available to the candidate, and only in response to a written request.

## PROMOTION AND TENURE PORTFOLIO

The candidate for promotion/tenure must submit a portfolio that documents his/her contributions to teaching, scholarship, and service. Those contributions shall be assessed in the light of the candidate's rank, reported effort, and years of service in accordance with the promotion/tenure criteria specified in these and the departmental guidelines.

The candidate should present the information that best supports his/her candidacy based on the expectations of his/her discipline. This information should be presented in the most concise manner possible (using lists, tables, and diagrams) and must adhere to the format and organization specified below. All materials included in the portfolio should be compiled and submitted as a single PDF document. (Departments may require or request additional information to help them make their decisions, but those additional materials should remain at the department level; they should not accompany the portfolio as it moves up to the college promotion and tenure committee.)

### Submission Deadline

The candidate must submit his/her portfolio to the departmental promotion/tenure committee *no later than the start of the fall term*. (Consult the college calendar of promotion/tenure deadlines on the HR Promotion and Tenure Process website for the specific date). Once the initial application has been made, the committee may request supplementary materials or rebuttal documents if it is deemed necessary; otherwise, the candidate shall not be permitted to make changes or additions to the portfolio after the submission deadline.

### Format and Organization

The portfolio must be submitted as a single PDF document that contains all of the following materials, in order, using the specified headings to mark the start of each section:

Order	Heading	Description
1	Application Form(s)	Download the Application Forms for promotion and/or tenure from the AU promotion and tenure website. The candidate must complete <u>separate</u> forms for promotion and for tenure if applying for both. Signatures are required.
2	P&T Portfolio Attestation Form	Download the P&T Portfolio Attestation Form from the AU promotion and tenure website. The candidate should sign the attestation indicating that the portfolio is complete and adheres to the order, format, and content outlined in the college and university guidelines.
3	Summary of Annual Evaluations & Assigned Effort Form	Download the Annual Evaluations and Assigned Contract Effort Form from the AU promotion and tenure website. The candidate should fill in his/her annual evaluation results and his/her contractually-assigned effort distribution (teaching, scholarship, service, administration) for every year of the period under review.

Pamplin College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences – Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

4	Curriculum Vitae	A current vita that includes all relevant RSCA activities, grant activities, awards, and service commitments, organized in reverse chronological order with dates and funded amounts (if applicable). Use headings/labels to distinguish clearly between peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed work. Insert a line in each section to clarify which activities/achievements (i.e., those above the line) occurred since the time of appointment or last promotion/tenure (whichever is more recent).
5	Teaching Statement	Narrative (1 page or less, single-spaced, Calibri 12 font) highlighting the candidate's teaching philosophy, methods, and procedures, and how these contribute to student learning, as well as contributions in student advising and mentoring.
6	Scholarship Statement	Narrative (1 page or less, single-spaced, Calibri 12 font) highlighting and expounding on the significance of the candidate's scholarship in the discipline, including publications, presentations, and other examples of scholarship listed on the vita. The candidate should explain how his or her scholarship contributes to regional, national, or international prominence, appropriate to rank.
7	Service Statement	Narrative (1 page or less, single-spaced, Calibri 12 font) highlighting the candidate's service to his/her profession, department, college, university, and/or the USG.
8	Appendix A – Internal review letters	Letters from the departmental promotion/tenure committee(s), the Department Chair, the college promotion/tenure committee, and the Dean.
9	Appendix B – Annual Performance Evaluations	Copies of the Annual Performance Evaluation Forms (provided by Human Resources) for the last five years.
10	Appendix C - Evidence of Teaching	See <i>Evidence of Teaching</i> below. The total of all <i>optional</i> evidence included for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service combined should not exceed 100 pages (required evidence does not count toward this 100-page limit).
11	Appendix D - Evidence of Scholarship	See <i>Evidence of Scholarship</i> below. The total of all <i>optional</i> evidence included for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service combined should not exceed 100 pages (required evidence does not count toward this 100-page limit).
12	Appendix E - Evidence of Service	See <i>Evidence of Service</i> below. The total of all <i>optional</i> evidence included for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service combined should not exceed 100 pages (required evidence does not count toward this 100-page limit).
13	Appendix F - External Review Letters	Letters from external reviewers, including a brief biosketch or condensed vita (2 pages or less) for each reviewer.
14	Appendix G – Pre-tenure Review Letter or Report	If applying for tenure, include a copy of the pre-tenure review letter or report.

No other materials should be included in the portfolio except those that fall within the format and scope specified in the table above. Examples of appropriate forms of evidence are listed below. The combined total of *optional* evidence for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service may not exceed 100 pages.

### **Evidence of Teaching**

The portfolio should demonstrate the candidate's achievements in teaching, especially as they pertain to the nine categories of teaching effectiveness listed under "Teaching Expectations" above.

#### Required

The following materials must be included:

- A list of all courses taught, organized by semester and including enrollments, since the date of hire or last promotion.
- Summary Reports of student course evaluations for all courses taught for the past five years.
- Copies of all summative Peer Evaluations of Teaching for the past five years.

#### Optional

Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- Up to three formative Peer Evaluations of Teaching or letters from a peer who has watched the candidate teach.
- Letters from up to 5 graduate students/advises that address the quality of the supervision received (if advising graduate students).
- A list of examples of student achievements such as projects, awards, honors theses, publications, presentations, time to degree for graduate students.
- A list of course and program development activities.
- Evidence that the candidate assesses whether or not s/he has been successful in improving student learning outcomes.
- An annotated list of pedagogical literature and instructional development sessions that have influenced the candidate's teaching and how the candidate has addressed this information in planning his/her classes and instructional strategies.
- Data on student performance on standardized examinations pertinent to the discipline.
- Data on student performance in subsequent courses.
- Evidence of Scholarly Teaching. (See Section 4.7.2 in the *USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook* for definitions and criteria.)
- Other evidence that reflects excellence in teaching.

## Evidence of Scholarship

The portfolio should demonstrate the candidate's achievements in scholarship, research, or creative endeavors, including the dissemination of his/her work through publication and other peer-reviewed outlets. Since not every publication or creative endeavor is of equal intellectual merit, the candidate should define and make the case for what is significant.

### Required

The following materials must be included:

- A list of all publications that explicitly designates peer review from others.
- A list of refereed conference presentations.
- A list of relevant creative endeavors and activities, including art exhibitions; professional poetry recitals; theatrical, dance, or music performances; etc.

### Optional

Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- Abstracts, first pages, or full copies of significant publications by the candidate.
- A list of invited seminars and presentations.
- A list of funded research activities, with funding amounts.
- A list of grants, fellowships, and scholarships as appropriate to the discipline, with funding amounts and time periods during which funding was active.
- A list of involvement in the scholarly, research, and creative products of students and other trainees, including but not limited to, conference presentations, publications, and like creative activities.
- Evidence consistent with the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, the Scholarship of Engagement, and The Scholarship of Discovery. (See Section 4.7.2 in the *USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook* for definitions and criteria.)
- Other evidence that highlights peer recognition of the quality and sustainable contributions of the candidate's scholarship in the field.

### **Evidence of Service**

The portfolio should demonstrate the candidate's service as a member of communities within and beyond AU, and in activities that draw upon the candidate's professional expertise.

#### Required

The following materials must be included:

- A list of international, national, or regional professional committees, including any offices held.
- A list of USG, AU, college, and departmental committees, organized by level, indicating leadership roles.

#### Optional

Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- Evidence that the faculty member links his or her work in some way to public contemporary issues and/or to improving quality of life.
- Evidence that the faculty member, either through scholarly work and/or service, applies knowledge toward solutions to complex societal problems and human needs.
- Evidence that the faculty member contributes to the continuous improvement of higher education.
- Evidence that the faculty member contributes in some way to the public good.
- Evidence that the faculty member has served his or her profession through professional organizations and/or other professionally oriented entities.

## PROCESS OVERVIEW

An overview of the promotion and tenure processes is outlined in Figures 1 and 2, respectively, of the university guidelines.

The review process begins with the departmental committee. Positive decisions to support the candidate's request for promotion/tenure subsequently move up, in order, through the following levels of review: the Department Chair, the college promotion/tenure committee, the Dean, the university promotion/tenure committee, and the Provost.

As the candidate's materials move up the review process, each level will decide whether to support candidate's request for promotion/tenure. At each step of the process *that is marked with an asterisk (\*)* in Figures 1 and 2 of the university guidelines (the Chair, Dean, and Provost steps), candidates shall be notified via Augusta University email within five (5) business days of the recommendation and receive a copy of the written summary. **Any identifying references to external reviewers must be redacted in the copy sent to the candidate.** A copy of this notification should also be sent to the candidate's Department Chair.

If, at any level (including review levels not marked with an asterisk), the recommendation is made not to support the candidate's request, the candidate and the previous level of review shall be notified immediately in writing of that decision. In such cases, the process stops and the candidate's materials should not be forwarded to the next level unless the candidate appeals the decision. See *Appeals of Promotion and Tenure Decisions* below.

The candidate shall have the right to withdraw his/her name from consideration for promotion and/or tenure at any time in the review process.

## PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE GUIDELINES

The following guidelines apply to all members of any promotion/tenure committee:

- No individual shall serve on more than one promotion/tenure committee at different levels (department, college, university).
- No faculty member in a position at or above the level of Department Chair shall serve on any promotion/tenure committee.
- All promotion/tenure committee members shall adhere to AU's Individual Conflict of Interest policy.
- The chair of the promotion/tenure committee at each level (department, college) will provide a 1-3 page letter containing the committee's recommendation for promotion and/or tenure and a summary of the candidate's achievements in each area (teaching, scholarship, service). See *Process Overview* above and the additional guidelines for college and departmental promotion/tenure committees below for important details.

### College Committee Guidelines

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee will write a formal, detailed letter with an explicit recommendation concerning promotion/tenure for each candidate. If the candidate has requested *both* promotion *and* tenure, the letter must use separate sentences to convey the committee's recommendation with regard to each request. The letter, which should be considered a form of peer review, must articulate clear reasons for the committee's recommendation, summarizing or making specific references to the evidence presented in the candidate's portfolio. This letter should be prepared on official letterhead, signed by the committee chair, and added to Appendix A of the candidate's portfolio. A copy of this letter shall be forwarded to the Dean *but not to the candidate*. **Candidates are only notified of the recommendations at the review levels marked with an asterisk (\*) in Figures 1 and 2 of the university guidelines (the Chair, Dean, and Provost steps).**

The Pamplin College Promotion and Tenure Committee ("college committee" hereafter) shall adhere to the following guidelines:

1. The college committee will consist of six members, all full-time, tenured, and holding the rank of either Associate Professor or Professor. The six members will consist of one representative elected from each of the following departments:
  - Art & Design
  - Communication
  - English and World Languages
  - History, Anthropology, & Philosophy
  - Music
  - Social Sciences
2. Exceptions to this committee membership policy may be appealed by the Dean to the Provost. The Provost will review college committee membership annually.
3. Approximately one-third of the committee membership will be elected/appointed each year. Initial committee members will be elected/appointed to one-, two- or three-year terms. Members shall not serve consecutive terms. Initial terms will be determined by lot. In the event a member must be replaced before his/her term of service expires, that member's department shall recommend a replacement to the Dean.
4. All committee members are eligible to vote on tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion decisions.
5. A quorum will consist of 75% of those eligible to vote, who must be physically or real-time virtually present at the meeting. A 60% majority vote of those present physically and real-time virtually will be required to pass a motion to promote or to tenure. Since the vote required is 60% of the members *present*, an abstention will have the same effect as a *no vote*.
6. In the event that a sufficient number of qualifying faculty is not available in the college, faculty outside the college shall be appointed by the Dean to serve on the college committee. When outside members are appointed to the college committee, every effort shall be made to solicit members who have some understanding of the disciplines contained within the college and some familiarity with those discipline's norms for excellence. The procedures used to place outside

members on the committee must be harmonious with the elected/appointed proportions described in 1 above.

7. Appeals of the college committee decisions are to be made in accordance with the appeal procedures outlined in the university guidelines.

### **Departmental Committee Guidelines**

Each department will establish a standing Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (“departmental committee” hereafter) which will serve as the first level of review in the promotion/tenure process, except in cases specified in *Exceptions to Review by Departmental Committee* below.

The departmental committee will write a formal, detailed letter with an explicit recommendation concerning promotion/tenure for each candidate. If the candidate has requested *both* promotion *and* tenure, the letter must use separate sentences to convey the committee’s recommendation with regard to each request. The letter, which should be considered a form of peer review, must articulate clear reasons for the committee’s recommendation, summarizing or making specific references to the evidence presented in the candidate’s portfolio. Additionally, the letter should specifically address and qualitatively evaluate any material that may be difficult for non-specialists to evaluate. This letter should be prepared on departmental letterhead, signed by the committee chair, and added to Appendix A of the candidate’s portfolio. A copy of this letter shall be forwarded to the Department Chair *but not to the candidate*. **Candidates are only notified of the recommendations at the review levels marked with an asterisk (\*) in Figures 1 and 2 of the university guidelines (the Chair, Dean, and Provost steps).**

The departmental committee shall adhere to the following guidelines:

1. The policies and procedures (i.e., term limits, quorum rules, membership, voting procedures, etc.) of the departmental committee shall be established by the department. These policies and procedures must be approved by the College Dean and the University Provost, made readily available to faculty, and reviewed at least every three years.
2. The committee must be comprised of a minimum of three members of the department who hold full-time appointments at the rank of Associate Professor or higher.
3. Tenure recommendations shall be made by a minimum of three tenured members of the departmental committee.
4. In the event that a department does not have three eligible members as described in 2 or 3 above, qualifying faculty from other departments in the college must be appointed to the department committee by the Department Chair or his/her designee.
5. When outside members are elected/appointed to a departmental committee, every effort should be made to solicit members who have some understanding of the disciplines contained within the department and some familiarity with those disciplines’ norms for excellence.
6. Quorum rules and majority vote percentage standards will be established by the department.
7. Appeals of departmental committee decisions are to be made in accordance with the appeal procedures outlined in the university guidelines.

### **Exceptions to Review by Departmental Committee**

#### Administrators

In the case of administrators (Department Chairs and above) being considered for promotion and/or tenure, the Dean will appoint a three-person committee to review the portfolio and make a recommendation. This committee serves in place of the departmental committee. The three individuals will have the same or higher rank and tenure status for which the candidate is being considered. The candidate will be reviewed in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The recommendation is made to the college promotion/tenure committee.

#### Cross-Departmental and Cross-College Appointments

In the case of cross-departmental appointments within one college, the Dean shall designate the applicant's primary department for the purposes of this process and shall establish a procedure for appropriate consultation between the primary department and other department(s) in which the candidate holds appointment. Once established, the normal procedures for promotion/tenure review will be followed.

In the case of cross-college appointments, the Vice President for Faculty Affairs shall designate the applicant's primary department for the purposes of this process, establish a procedure for appropriate consultation between the primary department and other department(s) in which the candidate holds appointment, and notify the Deans of the appropriate colleges as to the manner in which they should share the responsibility of making a recommendation on the application.

## **APPEALS OF PROMOTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS**

A candidate may appeal a recommendation not to promote/tenure at each level of the promotion/tenure review process within 10 business days from the date of communication of the decision to the candidate.

In the event of such an appeal, Pamplin will follow the appeal procedures outlined in the university guidelines.

## Pre-Tenure Review

### PURPOSE

The purpose of the pre-tenure review shall be to provide the faculty member with a clear understanding of those areas that might need attention if the candidate is to continue his/her progress toward successfully achieving tenure.

### TIMING

Each faculty member's department shall provide a comprehensive pre-tenure review of his/her progress toward tenure during the candidate's third year of service. The review committee should instruct the candidate to submit his/her materials by **January 15** of that year, and must complete its review—including communicating its findings by written report to the candidate and the Department Chair—*no later than March 15 of that year*.

If the faculty member was hired with prior credit toward tenure, a mid-course review shall be conducted. Assuming that a tenure review normally occurs in the sixth year of service, this mid-course review will occur as follows:

- Faculty members with one year of prior credit will be reviewed in the spring semester of their second year of institutional service, otherwise following the deadlines specified above.
- Faculty members with two years of prior credit will be reviewed in the fall semester of their second year of institutional service, with the committee's review completed by October 31 so the Dean may notify the VPAFA and provide a copy of the review to the Provost by December 1.
- Faculty members with three years of prior credit will not undergo a pre-tenure review.

Faculty who believe they are due for pre-tenure review should make that known to their Department Chair and/or Dean in the year prior to their expected review, rather than waiting for official notification.

### BASIS OF REVIEW

The candidate will submit a pre-tenure portfolio for the review. The content and format of the portfolio should be similar to those specified above in the *Promotion and Tenure Portfolio* section of this document; however, the candidate will not be required to provide internal or external letters of support.

At a minimum, the candidate should be asked to submit a curriculum vitae; a one-page summary (each) of his/her efforts and achievements in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service; copies of all student course evaluations, peer evaluations of teaching, and annual performance evaluations conducted since his/her

hire; and at least one representative sample of his/her recent scholarship. The summary of Scholarship should describe the status of any projects in progress (submitted, advance contract, etc.).

The review committee may request additional materials as appropriate to the candidate's activities, discipline, or assigned effort, especially when those materials are deemed necessary to support a thorough and accurate assessment of the candidate's progress toward tenure.

## **PROCESS**

The pre-tenure review will be conducted by a review committee of at least three tenured faculty members from the candidate's department or academic unit. If an insufficient number of tenured faculty exist within the unit, tenured faculty from a related field may serve on the committee; however, the candidate must consent to the appropriateness of the appointments. At the department's discretion, the review may be conducted by the departmental promotion/tenure committee.

The committee should review the candidate's progress toward the completion of the requirements of tenure as outlined in the university guidelines, as well as these and the departmental guidelines. The committee should examine and note the candidate's accomplishments, as well as provide constructive assistance to the candidate by detailing areas of weakness that he/she should address and any changes in orientation or activity that might aid the candidate in meeting the requirements for tenure.

The committee will prepare a written report of its recommendations. That report should also remind the candidate that although the committee's comments are intended as an aid to achieve tenure, the successful satisfaction of the committee's recommendations will not alone guarantee a positive tenure review. A copy of the report shall be delivered to the candidate and to the candidate's Department Chair no later than March 15.

The candidate may choose to write a written response to the committee report within 10 business days of receiving that report. That response should be delivered to the Department Chair and appended to the committee report.

The candidate and his/her Department Chair will review the report together and develop a development plan based on the committee's recommendations. A copy of the committee recommendations (including the candidate's written response, if one was provided) and a signed copy of the development plan will be submitted to the Dean for consideration and approval no later than April 5.

By April 15, the Dean shall notify the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs when the review has been completed and provide a summary of the results. Also by April 15, the Dean will provide a copy of the review to the Provost, who will review, with the Dean, faculty members who are not achieving suitable progress toward tenure.

All steps in this process—including the review, the development plan, and all specified notification steps, and any necessary follow up—will be completed by April 30.

## Post-Tenure Review

### PURPOSE

All units are required to conduct a periodic, regularly scheduled review of tenured faculty to provide ongoing assessment of teaching, scholarly achievement, and service activities of the individuals after they have been granted tenure.

### TIMING

Annually, Human Resources will provide the Dean with a list of faculty who are due for post-tenure review. The review shall be conducted five years after the faculty member's most recent promotion or personnel action, and reviews shall continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion. The review committee should instruct the candidate to submit his/her materials by **January 15** of that year, and must complete its review—including communicating its findings by written report to the candidate and the Department Chair—*no later than March 15 of that year*.

If an individual is on leave at the time of review, he/she will be reviewed during the first academic year after his/her return. Achievements that occurred during the period of leave may be included in the review.

Faculty who believe they are due for post-tenure review should make that known to their Department Chair and/or Dean in the year prior to their expected review, rather than waiting for official notification.

Tenured faculty who have a primary administrative appointment (50% or greater reported effort) shall not be subject to post-tenure review. See *Exceptions to Post-Tenure Review* below.

### BASIS OF REVIEW

The faculty member shall submit a Post-Tenure Review Portfolio that describes his/her achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service since the time of last review. That portfolio must adhere to the format and organization described below.

The review will encompass teaching, scholarship, and service. It will focus on the materials presented in the portfolio, which will be assessed in the light of the faculty member's assigned/reported effort, rank, and years of service.

Significant activity is expected in all areas of assigned responsibility in proportion to the faculty member's chair-assigned effort for each area. Lack of activity in an area for three years shall be deemed unsatisfactory.

## PORTFOLIO FORMAT

The post tenure review portfolio must be submitted electronically to the current chair of the Pamplin Promotion and Tenure Committee, as identified in the “College Committee Membership and Terms” document on the Resources page (<http://www.augusta.edu/pamplin/resources.php>).

All portfolio materials should be assembled into a **single PDF document** using the format described under “Order of Documents” below. For information about converting Microsoft Word and image files (.jpeg or .gif) to an accessible Adobe PDF format, see “Creating PDFs” in Adobe’s online user guide (<https://helpx.adobe.com/acrobat/user-guide.html>).

### Order of Documents

Each section of your portfolio should begin on a new page using the headings and order specified below:

Order	Heading	Description
1	Coversheet	A coversheet with the date of the review; your name, rank, and department; and your chair-assigned effort percentages for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service for each year of the period under review.
2	Table of Contents	A table of contents indicating the page on which each of the following sections begins.
3	Curriculum Vitae	A current vita that includes all relevant RSCA activities, grant activities, awards, and service commitments, organized in reverse chronological order with dates and funded amounts (if applicable). Use headings/labels to distinguish clearly between peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed work. Insert a line in each section to clarify which activities/achievements (those above the line) occurred since the time of last review.
4	Teaching Statement	Narrative (1 page or less, single-spaced, Calibri 12 font) highlighting your teaching philosophy, methods, and procedures, and how these contribute to student learning, as well as contributions in student advising and mentoring.
5	Scholarship Statement	Narrative (1 page or less, single-spaced, Calibri 12 font) highlighting and expounding on the significance of your scholarship in the discipline, including publications, presentations, and other examples of scholarship listed on the vita. Explain how your scholarship contributes to regional, national, or international prominence, appropriate to rank.
6	Service Statement	Narrative (1 page or less, single-spaced, Calibri 12 font) highlighting your service to the department, college, university, USG, and/or the profession.
7	Annual Evaluations	Copies of your annual faculty evaluations since the time of last review.
8	Peer Evaluations of Teaching	Copies of all peer evaluations of teaching since the time of last review.

9	Student Course Evaluations	Summary Reports of student course evaluations for all courses taught since the time of last review.
10	Teaching	Evidence of your achievements in the area of Teaching.*
11	Scholarship	Evidence of your achievements in the area of Scholarship.*
12	Service	Evidence of your achievements in the area of Service.*
* <i>NOTE: Evidence included for sections 10, 11, and 12 may not exceed a <u>combined total of 30 pages</u> and should only include activities since the time of last review.</i>		

### Forms of Evidence

Evidence of achievement in each area—Teaching, Scholarship, and Service—should be limited to the period following your last review, and should be organized in reverse chronological order, from the most recent to the oldest achievements. That evidence should demonstrate substantial activity and achievement in all areas of assigned responsibility.

For college definitions of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, as well as forms of evidence you may wish to include (and that review committees are accustomed to seeing), refer to the following earlier sections:

- *General Expectations and Assessment Criteria*
- *Evidence of Teaching*
- *Evidence of Scholarship*
- *Evidence of Service*

These sections provide helpful clarity about definitions and preferred evidence for each area of effort. Keep in mind that any specific expectations and forms of evidence marked as “required” in those sections refer to regular applications for promotion/tenure; they do not necessarily refer to post-tenure review. All formal requirements for the post-tenure review portfolio are specified here, in the *Post-Tenure Portfolio Format* section above, and the post-tenure review committee has comparatively greater discretion to determine what constitutes a substantial or deficient level of achievement in each area.

## PROCESS

Review will be conducted by at least three tenured faculty members, all or a majority of whom should be in the Pamplin College (typically, a subcommittee of the Pamplin Promotion and Tenure committee). A representative of the individual’s department may be included as a non-voting member of the review committee.

The committee will prepare a written report summarizing its findings and any recommendations for improvement. At a minimum, that report should include a paragraph-length summary of the rationale for the committee’s evaluation of the faculty member’s performance in *each area* of assigned responsibility (Teaching, Scholarship, and Service). That summary should, whenever possible, include a representative sampling of comments from the individual’s annual evaluations, student course

evaluations, and other materials or evidence from the post-tenure review portfolio. A written copy of this report will be provided to both the faculty member under review and the Department Chair.

The Department Chair will review the report findings with the faculty member. The faculty member will be allowed at least five working days to review the report prior to that meeting. After the meeting, the faculty member and the Department Chair will sign the report document to confirm that it has been discussed. If the faculty member desires, he/she may prepare a written response. The Department Chair will then transmit the report and any response to the Dean.

### **Post-Tenure Development Plan**

When areas of deficiency are noted and further action is required, the Department Chair is responsible, in consultation with the faculty member and Dean, for establishing a Post-Tenure Development Plan (PTDP) directly related to the findings of the post-tenure review and identifying appropriate resources for completion of the PTDP. If a PTDP is required for a Department Chair, it will be developed by the Dean in consultation with the Chair. The PTDP shall be included with the report and forwarded to the the Provost.

The Post-Tenure Development Plan (PTDP) shall do all of the following:

1. specify goals or outcomes that are required for the faculty member to overcome identified deficiencies
2. outline specific activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals or outcomes
3. set appropriate times within which the goals or outcomes will be accomplished (which should not exceed three years)
4. indicate the criteria by which progress will be monitored

The Department Chair will monitor the faculty member's progress and reassess the plan annually as part of the faculty member's annual evaluation.

The Dean will be responsible for financial arrangements associated with the PTDP. If the nature or scope of the PTDP is such that the individual cannot carry out other duties, the Department Chair and the Dean shall make other arrangements for these duties to be completed.

At the end of the PTDP the individual shall be reviewed by a three-member review committee. If possible, the committee should have the same members who completed the original review. Results of the review will be communicated in writing to the Department Chair. The Department Chair and the committee will come to an agreement on the content of the review. If they cannot come to an agreement, the Dean will be consulted.

Upon satisfactory completion of the PTDP the individual shall continue with five-year reviews, such time commencing with the next academic year after completion of the program.

If completion of the PTDP is deemed unsatisfactory by the review committee, the Department Chair, and the Dean, this decision with a recommendation from the Department Chair and the Dean will be referred to the President for further action.

All records of reviews will be retained by the Dean's office. At the end of each academic year the college must forward to the office of the Provost the names of the faculty members reviewed that year, the results, and the names of each member of the review committees.

A faculty member who disagrees with the results of a post-tenure review, a PTDP, or any subsequent actions resulting from the review process has the right to appeal, as outlined below.

### **Appeals of Annual and Post-Tenure Evaluations**

Individual faculty members shall have an avenue for appeal of decisions made from annual review or post-tenure review, or for disagreement with a PTDP or any subsequent actions resulting from the evaluation process.

In the event of such an appeal, Pamplin will follow the appeal procedures outlined in the university guidelines.

## **EXCEPTIONS TO POST-TENURE REVIEW**

Tenured faculty who have a primary administrative appointment (50% or greater reported effort) will not be subject to post-tenure review. If an administrator should return to a primary academic position, s/he will be placed into the post-tenure review cycle and will be evaluated under these guidelines in the fifth year following the return to the faculty and at subsequent five-year intervals.

## **Appendix 1: External Reviewer Disclosure and Approval Form**

The “External Reviewer Disclosure and Approval Form” is to be used to identify appropriate external reviewers for the promotion/tenure process. Essential information about each reviewer is requested on the form, and all reviewers must meet the criteria established above in the *Letters from External Reviewers* section of this document. This list should be completed no later than April 20 of the year in which the candidate intends to apply for promotion/tenure.

With regard to using the form:

- “Source” is the person who identified the external reviewer (normally, the candidate, a member of the departmental promotion/tenure committee, or the Department Chair).
- If the candidate has any relationship to the reviewer, that relationship must be disclosed in “Relationship to the Candidate.” If the person is an acquaintance or someone known from academic conferences, that does not necessarily disqualify them, but should be disclosed.
- The departmental committee or the Department Chair may object to any reviewer whose relationship to the candidate is deemed close enough to pose a potential conflict of interest, or whose qualifications are deemed inadequate.
- The candidate may challenge for cause any reviewer listed.
- As the candidate and departmental committee reach agreement on the qualifications of each reviewer, that reviewer’s name should be added to the list with all requested information. Both the candidate and the chair of the departmental committee should sign to indicate their approval.
- If the departmental committee and the candidate are unable to generate a complete and mutually acceptable list by April 20, the Department Chair must then complete the list.

Once the list is finalized, the Department Chair will select three names to contact for letters *but will not disclose the identities of the selected reviewers to the candidate.*

The process of contacting reviewers to request letters should begin at least three months prior to the start of the fall term in which the candidate intends to submit his/her portfolio. See the “Sample Letter to External Reviewers” in Appendix 2 for additional details on making those requests.

Pamplin College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences  
**EXTERNAL REVIEWER DISCLOSURE AND APPROVAL FORM**

Candidate Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Request (*check all that apply*):  Tenure  Promotion to the rank of \_\_\_\_\_

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

Pamplin College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences – Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> [ ] Yes [ ] No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> [ ] Yes [ ] No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> [ ] Yes [ ] No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> [ ] Yes [ ] No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

<b>External Reviewer:</b>		<b>Source:</b>	
<b>E-mail:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>	<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Institution:</b>		<b>Rank:</b>	<b>Tenured?</b> [ ] Yes [ ] No
<b>Postal/overnight address:</b>		<b>Relationship to Candidate:</b>	
<b>Approval Signatures:</b>			
_____		_____	
<i>Candidate</i>		<i>Departmental P&amp;T Committee Chair</i>	

The absence of either the candidate’s or the departmental committee chair’s signature for any reviewer identified above shall indicate that one or both parties were unable to reach an agreement on that reviewer by the deadline, and that the Department Chair was compelled to complete the list.

Final approval of this list by the Department Chair is indicated by the signature below.

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Department Chair*

## Appendix 2: Sample Letter to External Reviewers

[date]

[reviewer name]

[address]

RE: Review of [candidate] for [promotion/tenure, etc.]

Dear [name]:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer for [candidate]. [Candidate] is applying for [objective – *e.g., tenure and promotion to Associate Professor*]. Your experience, expertise, and reputation make you an especially appropriate person to help us evaluate [his/her] achievements.

For your review, I am enclosing [identify the enclosed materials to be reviewed]. As you will note from the candidate's CV, [he/she] has [published/co-published/presented/exhibited/etc.] other works. I would be happy to send you copies of those as well if you would find them helpful. Certainly, to the extent that you are familiar with the candidate's other work and can evaluate the enclosed work in that context, we welcome your comments.

Copies of our college and departmental guidelines for tenure and promotion are also enclosed. Please note that our discipline-specific expectations for excellence vary according to the candidate's rank and reported effort. [Quote or summarize the relevant standards for the rank the candidate is seeking, including the rank and reported effort by which the candidate is to be judged.]

Your assessment of [candidate]'s scholarly/creative work will play a very important role in our review process. We ask that you please submit a written report that discusses the quality of that work, including:

- The technical and conceptual quality of the work.
- The extent to which it builds upon and advances scholarship in the field.
- The recognition the candidate has achieved in his/her field, including how his/her work is regarded by others, if known.
- The stature of the forums in which the candidate has published and presented his/her work.
- The trajectory of the candidate's scholarly/creative work and potential for future achievement.
- Whether the candidate's work meets the relevant standard for [identify rank/tenure candidate is requesting] as defined in the promotion and tenure documents we have provided.

If you have seen [candidate] present [his/her] work at professional meetings, we would also welcome any observations you might have about the quality of presentation. Likewise, if you have worked with [candidate] in other contexts germane to this evaluation, or have other information or commentary you deem relevant to [his/her] qualifications, we welcome that information as well.

The report should be in letter form, signed and on official stationery. Its length is subject to your discretion. We ask that you also include a brief biosketch or condensed vita (2 pages or less) describing your credentials and scholarly record. Our college promotion and tenure procedures allow us to share copies of the external review letters with the candidate upon request; however, in order to protect your confidentiality to the greatest extent possible, all identifying information—including your biosketch or condensed vita—is redacted before those letters are shown to the candidate.

We would appreciate your report by [date – *no later than two weeks prior to the start of fall classes*] in order to complete our evaluation in a timely manner. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at [phone number] or by e-mail at [email address].

Please accept our sincere thanks for your assistance in this important matter.

Sincerely,

[Name of the chair of the departmental tenure/promotion committee]

[Title]

Enclosures

[NOTE: *Enclose a copy of the candidate's CV, the materials selected for review, a copy of the college and the departmental promotion/tenure guidelines, and any other materials that may be required for the reviewer to make a fair and informed assessment.*]

## **Appendix 3: Review and Promotion of Lecturers**

To carry out special instructional functions such as basic skills instruction, instructional staff members may be appointed to the position of Lecturer. Upon the completion of at least six years of full-time service at the institution, Lecturers are eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Review for this promotion should occur during the sixth year of service and should follow the guidelines stated below.

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are not eligible for the award of tenure, and promotion to Senior Lecturer shall not be construed as a guarantee of continued employment.

### **Annual Review and Reappointment**

Full-time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are appointed on a year-to-year basis. Reappointment should be based on evidence of effective performance as determined by peer evaluations of teaching, student course evaluations, and annual review by the Department Chair. Appointments are approved through the usual academic administrative process for faculty appointments. Neither Lecturers nor Senior Lecturers are eligible for the award of tenure.

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers who have served full-time for the entire previous academic year have the presumption of reappointment for the subsequent academic year unless *notified in writing* to the contrary as follows:

- For Lecturers with less than three (3) years of full-time service, non-reappointment notice should be provided as early as possible, but no specific notice is required.
- For Lecturers with three (3) or more years but less than six (6) years of full-time service, non-reappointment notice must be provided at least 30 calendar days prior to the first day of classes in the semester.
- For Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with six (6) or more years of full-time service, non-reappointment notice must be provided at least 180 calendar days prior to the first day of classes in the semester.

Previous years of service in positions other than Lecturer and/or Senior Lecturer shall not be included in the calculations to determine the schedule for notice of non-reappointment outlined above.

Previous years of service in any capacity at institutions other than AU shall not be included in these calculations.

This schedule of notification does not apply to persons holding temporary, limited-term, or part-time positions, or persons with courtesy appointments such as adjunct appointments.

### **Sixth-Year Review**

Per BOR Policy 8.3.8.2, reappointment of a Lecturer who has completed six (6) consecutive years of service to an institution will be permitted *only if the Lecturer has demonstrated exceptional teaching*

*ability and extraordinary value to the institution and if the institution determines that there is a continued need for the Lecturer.*

In accordance with this policy, Lecturers in Pamplin shall undergo a mandatory sixth-year review. At the conclusion of that review, Lecturers who have demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and who are deemed to have extraordinary value and continuing need in their respective programs shall be promoted to Senior Lecturer and be eligible for further reappointment. Such promotion shall not be construed as a form of tenure or other guarantee of employment.

Senior Lecturers remain subject to the same terms of review and reappointment as Lecturers. See *Annual Review and Reappointment* above.

#### Sixth-Year Review Dossier

The responsibility for providing evidence of instructional excellence resides with the Lecturer. The responsibility for demonstrating exceptional value and continuing need to the program resides with both the Lecturer and the Department Chair, who should work with the Lecturer to compile and contribute to a dossier of appropriate supporting documentation. This dossier must be assembled by the beginning of the Lecturer's sixth year of service, *no later than September 15 of the Lecturer's sixth year*. It must include all of the following:

- A cover letter summarizing the Lecturer's contributions to teaching and why those contributions constitute exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution.
- A position description for the Lecturer's currently-held position. If the reappointment/promotion includes a change in professional responsibilities, the proposed position description should be included.
- A curriculum vitae that summarizes relevant biographical, personal, and professional data.
- A list of all courses taught, organized by semester and including enrollments, since the date of hire.
- Copies of all annual faculty evaluations since the date of hire.
- Copies of all summative Peer Evaluations of Teaching since the date of hire.
- Summary Reports of student course evaluations for all courses taught since the date of hire.

Appropriate documentation of the Lecturer's ability and value goes beyond superior end-of-the-term student evaluations and annual reviews. Additional evidence may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Materials from classes, such as syllabi, exams, and samples of student work.
- Comments from peers who have collaborated with the Lecturer.
- Comments from student interviews.
- Letters of commendation from students, faculty peers, or external colleagues.
- Evidence of involvement in appropriate forms of professional development.
- Data showing that the Lecturer's students are highly successful in subsequent courses that build upon knowledge and/or skills taught by the Lecturer.

If the Lecturer has had reported effort in the areas of scholarship or service, the dossier should include appropriate evidence of those contributions as well.

The total of all additional (i.e. non-required) documentation/evidence included in the portfolio should not exceed 100 pages.

#### Sixth-Year Review Process

The Department Chair will forward the dossier and a recommendation for promotion and reappointment to the Dean no later than September 15 of the Lecturer's sixth year. If the Dean concurs with the Department Chair's recommendation, the Dean will forward the dossier and a recommendation for promotion and reappointment to the VP of Faculty Affairs.

The University P&T Committee and other persons or committees typically engaged in the university's promotion and tenure process (other than those identified above) shall not review the dossier for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Per the AU Policy on "Hire, Review, and Promotion of Lecturers" this process is distinct from the one prescribed for other faculty ranks in the university guidelines.

If a decision not to recommend the dossier is made at any level, the responsible administrator at such level (e.g., the Dean or VPFA) shall, in writing, notify the Lecturer and the administrators who processed the dossier. The notification to the Lecturer shall include clear notice that the Lecturer shall not be eligible for further reappointment, and shall make the Lecturer aware of his/her right to a review of this decision as described below.

#### **Review of Non-Reappointment**

Per BOR Policy 8.3.4.3, Lecturers and Senior Lecturers who have served for six (6) or more years of full-time continuous service in those positions at AU and who have received timely notice of non-reappointment shall be entitled to a review of the non-reappointment decision by the Dean of the college in which the Lecturer or Senior Lecturer is appointed.

If such a review is desired, the individual is required to provide a letter to the Dean of the college in which the Lecturer is appointed requesting a review of the decision. The letter should include justification of exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution. The Dean shall normally have ten (10) business days to review the request. The Dean will reply in writing with a decision to the individual, Department Chair, and Faculty Support Services. The Dean will either uphold the decision of the Chair or extend the contract for no more than one year.

## Appendix 4: Faculty Workload

### Overview

This framework is established to provide clarity and guidance to faculty and administrators with regard to assigning and managing workload for all full-time faculty members in the Pamplin College as defined in the *Augusta University (AU) Institutional Framework for Faculty Workload*.

This policy utilizes a differential distributed effort model to allocate full-time faculty workload. Although faculty teaching, RSCA, and service loads may, and do, differ across the college and within its departments and disciplines, deans and chairs strive for consistency and predictability in the relationship between each faculty member's assigned effort and the corresponding workload.

Each department within the college may establish department-level workload policies that adhere to the principles and policies outlined here, but provide additional clarifications and program- or discipline-specific examples pertinent to workload. These policies must be reviewed by the Dean and, if approved, shall be published in the departmental promotion/tenure guidelines, in an appendix titled "Faculty Workload."

### Definitions

**Workload:** All activities and responsibilities that a faculty member is expected to perform.

- Apportioned among defined categories which makes up a faculty member's university appointment.
- Conceptualized at the individual, departmental, college, and institutional levels.
- Fluctuates throughout the year across and within workload categories.
- Generally subjective, with components that are difficult to measure.

**Assigned effort:** The institutional metric used to approximate the amount of time that a faculty member should direct towards his or her assigned responsibilities within each workload category.

- Expressed as a percentage.
- Assigned by the supervisor in consultation with the faculty member.
- Variable within days and weeks across the year, but assigned in an annualized or semester average.
- Reflective of reasonable expectations of productivity (in terms of quality and quantity) considered standard within the discipline or profession, which will position the faculty member for successful advancement within the stated institutional mission.
- Distinct, albeit difficult to distinguish, from a multitude of valid professional commitments and endeavors faculty may choose to pursue or participate in voluntarily, beyond the duties intended by their effort assignment. It is the faculty member's responsibility to verify with the Department Chair which commitments are intended by, and count toward the fulfillment of, their assigned effort.

**Standard:** A common or consistent application of a metric within a category that provides additional clarity to expectations for a given assigned effort. It is expected that metrics associated with a given assigned effort would be the same across faculty members within a discipline or profession.

**Benchmark:** A point of reference against which standards are established. Where benchmarks exist for a discipline or profession, these benchmarks should be identified in the written workload policies and guidelines.

### Workload Categories

Pamplin College utilizes four of the five categories defined for the assignment of faculty workload by the *AU Institutional Framework for Faculty Workload*. These definitions are used to guide management and allocation of workload. The purpose of this guidance is to promote transparency, consistency, and understanding of workload assignments across the college.

Given the sheer number and diversity of responsibilities faculty may undertake—and broader variables that affect the amount of work involved with these commitments (e.g., changes in mission, policy, programming, resources, or enrollment)—this guidance is not, and cannot be, exhaustive. Faculty, chairs, and deans are often called upon to be flexible and creative in adjusting expectations when urgent or obligatory duties do not align with planned effort assignments. Accordingly, it is important that faculty notify their chair promptly when they believe their workload is out of alignment with these norms. Likewise, it is incumbent upon deans and chairs to investigate such concerns and, if valid, take reasonable steps to resolve them in a prompt, fair manner that may take a variety of forms as appropriate to each case (e.g., immediate or future reassignment from other duties, changes to contractually assigned effort, reduced teaching preps, additional pay).

There are a host of personal and professional reasons a faculty member may choose to pursue additional Teaching, Scholarship, or Service commitments beyond their assigned effort in those areas. These additional efforts are certainly valued by the college and get recognized in important ways through the established evaluation, promotion, merit increase, and/or awards processes; however, when such choices are undertaken voluntarily beyond the effort assigned, they do not obligate the college to reconfigure the faculty member's effort distribution or workload.

#### Teaching Workload

**Teaching** is defined in these and the departmental guidelines. Expectations for teaching vary in proportion to the faculty member's assigned effort for that area. Consult the departmental guidelines for more detail about the correlation between expectations and assigned effort.

Generally, faculty are assigned 10% Teaching effort for each course they teach in an academic year. For example, teaching ten courses in an academic year—sometimes referred to as a “5/5 load”—equates to 100% effort (10 courses x 10% effort per course = 100%). Teaching eight per year (“4/4 load”) equates to 80%, six per year (“3/3 load”) equates to 60%, four per year (“2/2 load”) equates to 40%, and so on. Asymmetrical loads are less common, but also permitted in the college and follow the same formula. For example, teaching three courses in fall, and two courses in spring (“3/2 load”)—for a total of five courses per academic year—equates to 50% Teaching effort.

Although this formula for calculating Teaching effort is based on the number of “regular” 3 or 4 credit hour courses assigned to the faculty member, it includes time associated with the prep, consultation, and grading for each course, as well as a proportional commitment to the broader teaching-related responsibilities of the department (e.g., participation in student advising, SLO assessment, program and course revisions, and other intermittent, difficult to quantify responsibilities that fluctuate over time, but are vital to student learning and success). Note, however, that when a faculty member is assigned a substantially greater or more concentrated portion of such departmental responsibilities than is typical (e.g., a designated faculty member who advises all majors in the department), these efforts should be assigned as a separate portion of effort rather than subsumed in the effort assigned for the faculty member’s course load.

With the dean’s approval, a department or discipline may depart from this standard Teaching effort calculation (i.e., 10% effort per course) when:

- the design of regularly offered departmental or discipline-specific courses varies substantially from the typical 3 to 4 credit hour format of most courses in the college (e.g., private music lessons); or,
- there are verifiable and compelling discipline-specific or accreditation-related reasons for quantifying faculty effort differently (e.g., NASAD accreditation standards for art studio courses).

In such cases, the variance shall be explained in the departmental guidelines, in an appendix titled “Faculty Workload.”

Course seating capacities naturally vary by department, discipline, and the type, level, and focus of the course; however, the vast majority of 3 to 4 credit hour courses in the college have regular capacities between 25 and 45 seats. Temporary or permanent changes from these regular capacities occur only with strong justification by the chair and approval by the dean. Some courses have been approved for lower capacities (typically not less than 20 seats) due to significant logistical constraints (e.g., sheer time required for students to present orally in a public speaking class), accreditation-related space or safety requirements (e.g., art studio courses accredited by NASAD), level of study (e.g., graduate-level courses), and/or compelling, peer-reviewed evidence that the lower capacity is critical to student success (e.g., introductory composition, which has a well-documented correlation with retention, progression, and graduation overall). A course section that fits these criteria and enrolls sufficiently (i.e., is not canceled due to low enrollment) shall count as one “regular” course for workload purposes.

In some instances, chairs may allow or assign faculty to teach multiple “stacked” course sections, which are scheduled to meet at the same time and place. (Note that this is different than cross-listing a course under multiple subject codes, which typically does not increase the total seating capacity beyond the college’s typical range for a single section.) In such cases, the stacked sections shall count as the equivalent of teaching *multiple, standalone courses* if all of the following conditions are met:

- Each section in the stack offers the same number of seats as a regular, standalone course (excluding small-format sections such as independent or directed studies).
- Each section in the stack is fully enrolled, except for the last section in the stack, which must be enrolled to at least 66% (two-thirds) capacity. For example, if three sections with a regular capacity of 30 seats are stacked, they must have a combined enrollment of at least 80 (two 30-student sections at 100% capacity, plus one 30-student section at 66% capacity) in order to count

as the equivalent of teaching three standalone courses; otherwise, they count as teaching only two courses (if 50-79 are enrolled) or one course (if 49 or fewer are enrolled).

Small-format sections and other irregular, but formally scheduled instructional duties (e.g., independent or directed studies, internships, honors thesis panels, etc.) which do not exceed four students (in the aggregate of all such formally scheduled assignments for a faculty member in a given semester) are generally presumed to be part of a faculty member's teaching responsibilities, and do not get reflected as a percentage of their assigned Teaching effort. However, when a higher volume of such commitments arises or is assigned to a faculty member (e.g., field work supervisor, program or internship coordinator), a portion of their Teaching effort may be assigned or reassigned for those commitments—typically, in the range of 10% to 20%, as negotiated with the chair and approved by the dean. Otherwise, additional pay or reassigned time shall be offered to the faculty member to compensate the additional duties.

Faculty should confer with their chair to determine which activities fulfill their assigned effort for Teaching.

### Scholarship Workload

**Scholarship** is defined in these and the departmental guidelines, and is often referred to as “RSCA” (Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity) due to the diverse forms it takes across the many disciplines within the college. Expectations for RSCA vary in proportion to the faculty member's assigned effort for that area. Consult the departmental guidelines for more detail about the correlation between expectations and assigned effort.

Generally, tenured/tenure-track faculty are assigned 10%, 30%, or 50% Scholarship effort, which typically corresponds with an assignment of 80%, 60%, or 40% Teaching effort, respectively. The departmental guidelines outline departmental and discipline-specific expectations for scholarly activity and productivity at each of these levels, with the understanding that faculty whose assigned effort for Scholarship falls in between these typical levels are expected to maintain a minimum level of scholarly productivity that is approximately between the stated expectations.

Faculty should confer with their chair to determine which activities fulfill their assigned effort for Scholarship.

### Service Workload

**Service** is defined in these and the departmental guidelines. Expectations for service vary in proportion to the faculty member's assigned effort for that area. Consult the departmental guidelines for more detail about the correlation between expectations and assigned effort.

The need for service can arise unpredictably through a variety of mechanisms, including time-sensitive “task forces” to address urgent topics or emergencies (e.g., the COVID-19 pandemic), mandatory rotations and/or elections of representatives to college- and university-level committees, and faculty-initiated requests or agreements to serve in various capacities.

Generally, tenured/tenure-track faculty are assigned 10% Service effort (no similar norm exists for non-tenure track faculty, who may or may not have assigned effort in this area). Often, this includes service on approximately 1-4 committees; however, the actual number of committees (or other comparable work) may vary—and may fall outside of this range—depending on each committee's size, schedule, and

duties; the faculty member's role (e.g., chair, officer, voting member, ex-officio); and other factors that affect workload. It may also include service on substantial projects or initiatives that occur outside of a committee context (e.g., collecting stakeholder input about tuition and fees, assigned roles in formal conduct hearings/investigations, compiling employment data for living alumni; supervising a student publication or honor society). Most of these commitments occur at the departmental, college, and university levels, but they may include service at the USG-level (e.g., service on a Regents Advisory Committee), service to the discipline/profession (e.g., conference panel organizer/discussant, journal editor/reviewer, professional organization officer), or service to the community (e.g., developing and hosting community workshops).

Regardless of their assigned effort for Service, all full-time faculty are expected to attend departmental and college faculty meetings, and to participate in at least two recognition/celebration events during the year. One of these events must be the university ceremony for convocation, commencement, or faculty recognition; the other may be at any level (e.g., FutureFest, Life of the Mind, Day of Service, honor society induction, study abroad fair, orientation/recruitment event, etc.).

Faculty should confer with their chair to determine which activities fulfill their assigned effort for Service.

#### Administrative Workload

**Administrative** effort is not generally assigned to faculty members. Most informal leadership and administrative activities should be categorized under Service—or, if appropriate, under Teaching or Scholarship. Administrative effort is typically reserved for ongoing, formal leadership responsibilities that include strategic planning, operational management (e.g., budget, personnel), and/or compliance/quality assurance (e.g., training, credentialing, policy-making, accreditation).

Administrative activities include those associated with the titles Deans, Assistant/Associate Deans, Department Chairs, Assistant Chairs, Graduate Directors, and some directors of centers and programs (e.g., Writing Center Director). Generally, the principal duties and expectations for assigned administrative effort are established by the formal position description or appointment letter, with the understanding that additional duties may be assigned by the supervisor. Since the nature and scope of these administrative duties varies greatly at different levels of authority and across different areas of responsibility—and also may change with shifting priorities, resources, or programming—it is not possible to generalize further about workload in this area.

Faculty should confer with their supervisor to determine which activities are expected to fulfill their assigned effort for Administration.

### **Metrics, Standards, and Benchmarks**

General college standards for the assignment of effort are described above for each workload category. Departments may establish more specific standards, metrics, or benchmarks in a department-level workload policy, in which case they shall be published in the departmental promotion/tenure guidelines, in an appendix titled "Faculty Workload."

Few metrics or benchmarks exist that have broad applicability to all disciplines within the college; however, one is particularly useful as a means to promote coherence and consistency in the

management of workload. As explained above, with the rare exception of a few discipline-specific variations, one regular, semester-length 3 or 4 credit hour course is equivalent to 10% effort. This includes class prep, delivery, consultation, and grading time, *and* broader, intermittent responsibilities to the program (e.g., assessment data collection, portfolio review). Given the ebb and flow of academic rhythms, experienced instructors understand why it is perilous to quantify these duties as an average time investment per day, week, or month; however, taken as a whole, they provide a useful conceptualization of what 10% effort may entail in terms of total workload across a full semester.

Accordingly, any other assigned duty or grouping of duties may be usefully compared with this norm. If the workload (i.e., time and energy) involved is approximately on par with teaching one regular, semester-length course, it may be equated to 10% effort—or else assigned a proportional percentage that reflects how far it varies from that norm (e.g., duties that represent approximately half the time associated with teaching one regular course would represent 5% effort).

With the caveat that this approach necessarily entails more art than science due to the variables involved (and thus, perfect precision is unattainable), deans, chairs, and faculty are strongly encouraged to consider this as a helpful starting point for conceptualizing and quantifying the relationship between assigned effort and other duties.

### **Processes**

Annually, all faculty are evaluated by their chair to review their progress and achievements from the preceding year, and to set effort-related expectations and goals for the coming year. These meetings should include candid discussions about workload, and faculty are encouraged to ask questions to ensure they understand the specific duties they are expected to fulfill for their effort assignment, as well as to express concerns if their assigned effort distribution does not align with their understanding.

Faculty are strongly encouraged to check in with their chair periodically throughout the year, especially when significant changes in their workload occur, to ensure their activities are aligned with their assigned effort. In some instances, these changes may be of sufficient magnitude and duration to warrant a change in workload or assigned effort, which may take a variety of forms depending on the circumstances. Faculty should work with their chair to determine when, and to what extent, such changes may be appropriate.

If faculty are not satisfied that appropriate adjustments to workload or assigned effort have been made, they should relay these concerns to the chair with suggestions for a more equitable arrangement, and permit the chair to respond. If that response is unsatisfactory, the faculty member may petition the dean for relief, in which case the dean or a designee shall promptly meet with the faculty member to hear the concerns, examine the faculty member's workload, and recommend relief, as appropriate.

When workload adjustments are deemed to be warranted, the relief may be immediate or delayed, depending on the timing and circumstances of the matter, and may entail changes to (a) the faculty member's assigned duties, (b) the effort distribution associated with those duties, or (c) both.

If appropriate workload relief must be delayed for any reason, it shall take effect no later than the next academic year; however, deans and chairs are strongly encouraged to find creative solutions that offer temporary relief as far as is practical in the interim, such as by reshuffling or exempting the faculty member from other assigned duties, or exploring the possibility of a future release/reassignment or additional pay as compensation for the overloaded duties.

In all cases, these mid-year changes to workload should be documented and acknowledged, with a brief explanation, in the faculty member's next annual evaluation.