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I. Charge (commissioned by the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts Fall 2004)
A single committee comprised of eight faculty representatives shall constitute the Standards for Professional Advancement Committee. Six representatives shall be elected by the tenured and tenure-track members of each of six academically affiliated divisions of the College: English; Fine Arts and Philosophy; Political Science and History; STS/Public Policy and Sociology/Anthropology; Psychology, School Psychology, Criminal Justice, and Social Work; Economics and Communication. Two tenure-track faculty shall be elected at large by the tenure-track faculty of the College. The Committee will present a report to the faculty of the College by the end of the current academic year (May 2005). The report should include a review of the current criteria and standards for merit, tenure and promotion and present recommendations for a set of standards, procedures and criteria which reflect the following values and goals:
a. Fairness
b. Equity
c. Consistency
d. Transparency
e. Accurate Reflection of Actual Faculty Performance (e.g., validity and reliability)
f. Allowance of variation across departmental and disciplinary bounds based on articulated differences in norms and standards across these departments and disciplines
g. Reflective and in accord with Institute and College workload standards
In the framing of College-wide recommendations, the Committee must consult fully and explicitly with all Departments in the College.

II. Recommendations

We invite the College of Liberal Arts to consider these recommendations and, if deemed appropriate, propose pertinent changes to the Policies and Procedures Manual.

A. Merit, tenure, and promotion decisions should be based primarily upon criteria developed collaboratively within each department. Each department is the best judge of the criteria by which to evaluate a faculty member’s performance. Faculty performance expectations should be flexible, collaborative, anchored by appropriate norms, comprehensive, reflective of work complexity and informed by faculty values. In case department criteria for merit, tenure, and promotion decisions have not yet been developed, departments should do so. In order to ensure transparency, all department criteria should be made available in writing to the College.

B. Departments should consider this report when designing or revising merit, tenure, and promotion guidelines and criteria. Departments may especially benefit from reviewing the comprehensive list of dimensions of faculty performance and other departmental criteria.

C. Faculty, departments, college tenure committees, college promotion committees, deans, provosts, and presidents should consider this report when making merit, tenure, and promotion decisions. In particular, this report offers a more comprehensive list of faculty performance dimensions than is currently available in College or Institute policy.

D. Faculty, departments, college tenure committees, college promotion committees, deans, provosts, and presidents should consider departmental criteria when making merit, tenure, and promotion decisions.

E. Merit, tenure, and promotion decision-makers should consider factors that may moderate faculty performance. A list of such factors is set forth in this document.

F. The tenure decision and the promotion from assistant to associate professor should be one and the same decision, as is standard practice in other academic institutions. Separate processes should be combined into one.

G. Faculty assessment should not be merely evaluative, but should also aim at professional development.

H. The process of assessing faculty performance and providing feedback should involve faculty peers, rely on credible and multiple sources, and be collaborative in nature. In particular, faculty should receive informal feedback more than once per year.

I. The evaluation of teaching should be expanded beyond student evaluations to include other means of assessment such as peer review. In addition, given the weight often placed on teaching evaluation scores, the current CLA teaching evaluation form should be
reviewed to assess its effectiveness in evaluating teaching performance. Further, in order to interpret teaching evaluations, means and standard deviations of CLA teaching evaluation scores should be calculated each quarter and published by the College.

J. The evaluation of scholarship should include self and peer evaluations, and include dimensions other than publications.

III. Dimensions of Faculty Performance
A. Introduction
We collected information from each department in CLA about the dimensions of performance that should be considered in merit decisions (see Appendix 1.1). Using this data, we constructed a comprehensive list of performance dimensions for scholarship, teaching, and service, as well as a list of moderating factors (factors that should be considered when evaluating performance) that were explicitly or implicitly included in the data, or were identified in our discussions. Although these dimensions arose first out of a consideration of merit criteria, they are applicable to tenure and promotion decisions as well. The dimensions of performance presented here are more detailed and comprehensive than the current list of dimensions presented in the Institute and College Policy and Procedures Manuals.

We offer these dimensions of performance to faculty, departments, and college committees for their consideration as they design or modify criteria for merit, tenure, and promotion decisions. We also offer these dimensions of performance to deans, provosts, presidents, tenure committees, and promotion committees for their consideration as they evaluate faculty for merit, tenure and promotion.

No college-wide weighting of the dimensions, nor of the broad areas of performance (i.e., scholarship, teaching, service), is offered. After repeated attempts to arrive at a single system of weights that would be sensibly applied across all departments, we concluded that such a goal was impossible given the variety of disciplines represented in our college. It is very difficult to find a common metric by which to compare, for example, a publication in a journal of Sociology with the composition of a musical score. We decided therefore to recommend that departmental criteria and weightings in merit, tenure, and promotion be given paramount weight in these decisions (see Recommendations above). While these dimensions provide general concepts for evaluation, we realize that each discipline has its own ways and venues of measuring academic achievements. We also encourage departments to take into consideration moderating factors, as they affect one’s working condition and accomplishments. Some examples of these are listed under Moderating Factors (III.E below). As faculty responsibilities vary depending on the size and type of each departmental unit, it is critical that the weight and interpretation of items in the guidelines be determined by each department. The appropriate evaluating body should have the flexibility to contextualize each faculty member’s achievements.

The following three sections are meant to be descriptive only; the order of presentation is not intended to convey priority.

B. Scholarship Dimensions
1. Publications. Publications are generally identified as published scholarly documents that
advance knowledge in a field. Publications may include:
a. Books, including scholarly texts, popular texts, textbooks, edited volumes, monographs
b. Refereed journal articles
c. Reviews of a book, article, presentation, exhibit, artwork, or performance
d. Creative writing (e.g., poetry, prose, play scripts, creative non-fiction) or musical composition
e. Chapters in an edited book
f. Translations
g. Teaching/training materials
h. Non-refereed publications
i. Conference proceedings
j. Reprinting of previously published works
k. Reference works, such as dictionary and encyclopedia entries.

2. **Presentations.** Presentations are generally identified as personally delivered scholarly output, such as through signed, spoken, or musical performance, and may include:
a. Presenting a conference paper or poster
b. Presentations to other colleges or universities
c. Presentations to community groups
d. Panel presentations, such as being chair or discussant
e. Presentation at an RIT faculty seminar or colloquium
f. Presenting an invited/keynote lecture
g. Conducting a workshop or training session
h. Presenting a juried exhibition of artwork.

3. **Grants.** Since grants are associated with project funding, they are included here as scholarly activity and output. Relevant activities and outcomes may include:
a. Receipt of external funding for a project
b. Receipt of internal funding for a project (e.g., FEAD, Faculty Research Fund, Miller, Sabbatical, Provost Learning Initiative)
c. Submission of external/internal grant proposals.

4. **Professional contributions and recognition.** Professional contributions are identified as contributions to scholarly associations; recognition is identified as awards received for such contributions. Professional contributions and recognition may include:
a. Membership in scholarly associations
b. Editorial board service
c. Serving as peer reviewer for refereed publications and presentations
d. Service as officer in a scholarly association
e. Service as a journal editor
f. Service as a book review editor
g. Organization of scholarly activities (e.g., workshops, symposia, exhibitions, organizational catalogues, conferences, training sessions)
h. Curatorial work
i. Receipt of awards for professional service
j. Service as a proposal reviewer for government, academic, or industrial programs or proposals
k. Award for scholarly contribution (e.g., writing contest, book recognition).
5. **Professional development.** Professional development consists of maintaining and developing scholarly competence. Professional development may include:
   a. Remaining current in one’s discipline
   b. Attending scholarly presentations/conferences
   c. Attending workshops to improve scholarly competence (e.g., National Science Foundation “short courses,” National Endowment for the Humanities “seminars”)
   d. Conducting an organized program of self-study in a new area of scholarship
   e. Completing a professional or scholarly degree/program (e.g., obtaining advanced/terminal degree/certification in a field)
   f. Engaging in ongoing unpublished (work-in-progress) research or creative work
   g. Obtaining or maintaining professional licensing.

6. **Consulting.** Consulting is identified as transferring or applying scholarly knowledge to individuals or groups in a range of contexts. Consulting may include providing expert advice/commentary/reports/workshops/training to individuals, private organizations, attorneys, news agencies, or public agencies.

7. **Creative work.** Creative work is identified as scholarly output that is artistic in nature. Creative work may include:
   a. Work-in-progress written work (e.g., poetry, prose, play scripts, creative non-fiction) or musical composition
   b. Direction of or acting in plays or musicals
   c. Art-work (painting, sculpture, drawing, print-making, photography, video, computer art, installation art)
   d. Musical performance.

**C. Teaching Performance Dimensions**

1. **Instructional Delivery.** Instructional delivery generally refers to those activities performed in the service of teaching, such as lecturing, testing, grading, and classroom (real/virtual) discussions, and in-class activities. These may include:
   a. Clear and effective communication of course content, with appropriate use of teaching resources, ability to provide clear and understandable explanations
   b. Interest and enthusiasm in subject and ability to generate interest in the student
   c. Active and personal interest in the progress of the class, and positive attitude toward students
   d. Evaluating and grading students and using fair and professional standards, along with the timely return of tests and papers
   e. Use of high quality teaching materials, such as clear, up-to-date syllabi
   f. Attendance at teaching workshops or conferences and participation in regional and national pedagogical organizations.

2. **Interactions with Students.** Interactions with students generally refers to the relationship with students out of the classroom to enhance the learning experience at RIT. Typical elements of this teaching dimension may include the following:
   a. Mentoring students
   b. Maintaining office hours according to college-wide requirements
c. Guiding independent study
d. Active and personal interest in students as evidenced by availability for student advising, positive attitude toward students, assistance with student professional development, or jobs/graduate school placement
e. Extracurricular activities such as field trips, conversation tables, theatre productions, and musical performances.

3. Course Development and Content Mastery. Course development generally refers to the development of substantive course content and its organization, as well as the descriptive characteristics of the course. Mastery generally refers to the acquisition of deeper subject matter knowledge in one’s discipline. Typical elements of each may include the following:
a. Development/improvement of course content, including the broadening of knowledge associated with the course and consistent reevaluation of course content
b. Development of new/innovative courses
c. Experimentation with class sizes, graders, and other methods of pedagogy
d. Development/improvement of course materials including syllabi, handouts, and readings.

D. Service Dimensions
1. Service to Students. Service to students generally refers to individual and collective support provided by the faculty member to students not necessarily enrolled in his or her own classes. The purpose of this support is to counsel students regarding involvement in programs and activities. This support may include:
a. Recruiting into and retaining students in one’s program
b. Advising students in the department (majors / minors / concentrators)
c. Advising students in the RIT Exploration, CRO, CRP, or other programs
d. Advising a student function or organization
e. Writing recommendation letters.

2. Service to Department. Service to department generally refers to day-to-day activities that are essential to the ongoing and successful operation of the department. Typical activities performed by the faculty member that show his/her availability to his/her departmental colleagues and willingness to cooperate with them may include:
a. Serving as department or program chair
b. Serving as appointed or elected member of departmental post or serving in a supervisory capacity within a department
c. Chairing a departmental committee
d. Participating in departmental committees, meetings, functions and special projects
e. Initiating or leading important department activities or events
f. Coordinating department activities and conferences
g. Creating a new facility or program (laboratory, center, partnership)
h. Performing in professional capacity (e.g. choral director, musician) outside of required curricular performances
i. Chairing clubs and organizations
j. Receiving awards for service.

3. Service to CLA and the Institute. Service to the College of Liberal Arts and to the Institute
generally refers to participation in regular activities that are essential to the ongoing and successful operation of the College. Activities performed by the faculty member that show his/her availability to colleagues outside the department, and willingness to cooperate with them may include:

a. Serving as appointed or elected member of College or Institute post
b. Chairing a College- or Institute-wide committee
c. Participating in College- or Institute-wide committees, meetings, functions and special projects
d. Serving on major (time intensive) standing committees (e.g. College Curriculum Committee, Institute Curriculum Committee, Academic Senate, or a committee pursuing external grants) or on Institute Council
e. Holding multiple committee memberships
f. Initiating or leading important College- and Institute-wide activities or events
g. Initiating and carrying out a program which leads to a significant increase in RIT’s resources, or in RIT’s ability to perform its mission
h. Creating a new interdisciplinary facility or program (laboratory, center, partnership) outside of one’s own department
i. Performing in a professional capacity (e.g. choral director, musician) outside of required curricular performances
j. Performing intra-University consultations
k. Chairing clubs and organizations
l. Receiving awards for service.

4. Service to the Community. Service to the community generally refers to participation in activities of varying frequency that are conducive to the ongoing and successful engagement of the faculty member with his/her local community outside RIT. Activities performed by the faculty member that show his/her availability to organizations or individuals in the Rochester area, and willingness to cooperate with them may include:

a. Performing public speaking
b. Maintaining membership in or chairing committees, boards, clubs or organizations
c. Participating in new community initiatives and showing leadership in them
d. Receiving awards for service.

E. Moderating Factors
In order to ensure that evaluations occur in a holistic and context-sensitive manner, the following are examples of some moderating factors that may be taken into account when conducting merit, tenure, and promotion evaluations.

Moderating factors may include (but are not limited to) the following:
1. Number of course preparations
2. Number of courses taught
3. Number of new courses introduced
4. Number of courses team-taught
5. Number of courses taught using innovative/experimental forms of pedagogy
6. Number of independent studies supervised
7. Demands imposed by service commitments to the department, college, or Institute
8. Demands imposed by service commitments to one’s discipline (e.g. being an Editor or Book Review Editor for a journal, etc.)
9. Personal issues (e.g., death of family member or close friend, health related matters, etc.)
10. Amount of time spent on meaningful, but unsuccessful projects (e.g., writing grants, writing an article that was rejected, etc.)
11. Progress made toward completing a book; articles submitted for publication (neither rejected nor accepted at the time of review)
12. Date when last book or major research article was completed
13. Number of students taught.

IV. Summary of Current Departmental Merit Criteria
The above Dimensions of Faculty Performance are the main factors of performance currently considered by departments in merit evaluations. In addition, teaching is generally weighted more heavily than scholarship, and service is given least importance.

V. Summary of Current Departmental Tenure Criteria
We requested departmental tenure criteria and received documents from Communication, Economics, English, Political Science, Psychology, School Psychology, STS/Public Policy, Foreign Languages, and Sociology and Anthropology (see Appendix 1.2). We reviewed these documents and summarize them here.

A. Weighting. Most departments refuse to apply strict quantitative measurements to the three areas of performance, while stating that effective teaching is the single most important criterion for earning tenure, closely followed by scholarship. Extensive service outside the department is not expected of tenure-track faculty, but active involvement within one’s own department is. Except for one department, which has clearly defined publication requirements, all CLA departments agree on the impossibility of quantifying academic performance.

B. Achievement. Professional achievement in the three dimensions of work—teaching, scholarship and service—that warrants the granting of tenure should generally be preceded by positive yearly merit and tenure evaluations. Departments rate teaching performance based on student evaluations (while acknowledging the limitations of this instrument), on peer evaluations, and on the willingness of the junior faculty member to teach a variety of courses, update existing ones and design new ones. Departments rate scholarship according to the number and type of publications, conference presentations and related work, while recommending that flexibility be used in the evaluation of junior faculty. In the service category, only participation in department activities is seen as vital for earning tenure.

C. Caveats. Most departments in CLA agree that several mitigating factors will affect the quality of work of junior faculty. These factors should be taken into consideration in any tenure decision. They include: the teaching load; the number of preparations per quarter; the number of new courses per year; the skewed distributions in teaching evaluations; the nature of the teaching involved (writing-intensive, or not).

VI. Summary of Current Departmental Promotion Criteria
We requested departmental promotion criteria and received documents from Communication,
Economics, English, Political Science, Psychology, School Psychology, STS/Public Policy, and Sociology and Anthropology (see Appendix 1.3). We reviewed these documents and summarize them here.

**A. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor**
Department criteria for this promotion are the same as tenure criteria. Some departments explicitly stated that promotion to Associate Professor and the decision to grant tenure should be coupled, i.e., granting of tenure should automatically mean a promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.

**B. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**
Department criteria for a promotion from Associate Professor to Professor stated that candidates should demonstrate excellence in all three areas of teaching, research and scholarship, where excellence would be judged using similar criteria as used for tenure. Some departments explicitly mention the use of review letters by outsiders as an input in the promotion decision. In departments where numerical goals for tenure have been specified, similar goals would have to be accomplished by the candidate after tenure.

**VII. Literature Review**
We conducted an abbreviated review of the academic literature associated with merit, tenure and promotion. The review did not attempt to be exhaustive or deep, but to capture the main ideas embedded in the research and theorizing on this topic. We reviewed six scholarly books and one review article (see Appendix 2). Reviews of each text are appended. Summaries of the main findings of these reviews follow; they have been grouped under several main themes.

**A. Higher education trends reflect a greater focus on research and sensitivity to fiscal and legal pressures.**
1. Since WWII, priorities in American higher education have shifted away from teaching and toward research.
2. Faculty evaluation became a more earnest concern during the 1970s and 1980s due to fiscal crises faced by academic institutions during this period.
3. Legal challenges to hiring and promotions have greatly increased since the 1970s.

**B. Faculty assessment should not be merely evaluative, but should also aim at professional development.**
1. Effective faculty evaluation has two goals—institutional accountability and career development of faculty.
2. Faculty evaluation is necessary to document evidence for promotion, tenure, and salary increases.
3. Effective faculty assessment promotes faculty members’ career development by stressing mentoring, feedback and continuous assessment.
4. Faculty assessment should be used in such a way that it is useful to faculty members and enables them to grow and improve.
5. Clear institutional goals are very important in enhancing organizational morale and a positive work climate. For example, faculty and administration should hold the same expectations regarding teaching versus research.
C. The process of defining faculty performance expectations should be reflective of work complexity, flexible, collaborative, anchored by appropriate norms, comprehensive, and informed by faculty values.
1. Effective faculty evaluation reflects the complexity of the academic job.
2. Faculty assessment first involves defining faculty work roles and responsibilities; these can be defined in both work done by faculty and by outcomes.
3. Criteria should take career and institutional differences into account.
4. Faculty and chairs should collaborate on what types of evidence are admissible in assessing faculty performance.
5. The increasing practice of more structured faculty assessment methods has a downside: it leads to the undervaluing of activities that are not easily quantified.
6. Effective faculty evaluation systems are informed by faculty values.

D. The process of assessing faculty performance and providing feedback should involve faculty peers, rely on credible and multiple sources, and be collaborative in nature. In particular, faculty should receive feedback more than once per year.
1. Faculty peers should be employed in assessing work.
2. Faculty should meet at least twice per year with chairs related to the performance appraisal process.
3. Feedback to faculty about their performance should be conducted in non-threatening environments.
4. Evidence for faculty assessment should be credible and from multiple sources.

E. The evaluation of teaching should be expanded beyond student evaluations to include dimensions such as peer review.
1. Teaching ratings of faculty by students are moderately correlated with effective teaching.
2. Teaching performance would benefit from greater use of peer review.

F. The evaluation of scholarship should include self and peer evaluations, and include dimensions other than publication (e.g., teaching-oriented scholarship and interdisciplinary synthesis of knowledge).
1. Scholarship should include interdisciplinary and intradisciplinary efforts that synthesize and reframe knowledge and afford a better understanding of our contemporary world.
2. Teaching should be considered as a core dimension of scholarship.
3. Self and peer critique of works of scholarship should be included as a dimension of scholarship.
4. Scholarship should include other activities besides publishing. The research university model is inappropriate for many academic institutions.

VIII. External Review
We conducted an external review of merit, tenure, and promotion criteria at similar academic institutions. We began with a list of 32 schools listed in Appendix 2. This list is the same list that was used by the Ad Hoc CLA Research Committee (John Capps, Suzanne Graney, Tom Castellano, Uli Linke) in their work earlier in the 2005 academic year. This list was obtained by merging two overlapping catalogs: schools used by Human Resources for compensation.
benchmarking at RIT and schools that are part of the Association of Private Technological Universities.

We searched the websites of these schools for merit, tenure, and promotion guidelines. None of the schools we searched had published appropriate college-wide merit criteria. Tenure criteria were found at University of Rochester, Virginia Tech, Syracuse University, Georgia Tech, Illinois Institute of Technology, SUNY Binghamton, SUNY Albany and Stevens Institute of Technology. Promotion criteria were found at University of Rochester, Virginia Tech, Syracuse University, Georgia Tech, Illinois Institute of Technology, SUNY Binghamton, SUNY Albany, and Stevens Institute of Technology.

We perused these guidelines, discussed them, and made several general observations pertinent to our charge:

A. In general, tenure and promotion guidelines in comparable institutions that we were able to access contain elaborate procedures in place for departmental evaluation; these procedures are aimed at fostering greater departmental participation in the evaluation of a candidate. Candidates for tenure, for example, are often annually evaluated with structured input from all department members. Department members must read the candidates’s publications or observe their teaching and sometimes give written comments in the official annual tenure review.

B. Similarly, tenure and promotion criteria are often designed by departments.

C. In addition, the considered departmental recommendation—arrived at using departmental guidelines and departmental procedures—is heavily weighted in the tenure and promotion decision. This decision is often made by a college committee, but the departmental recommendation is given paramount weight.

D. We observed procedures in case of disagreement. For example, if the department recommends an individual for tenure or promotion, but the college tenure committee or the dean of the college disagrees, the written conclusions of each party are sent to the next level of authority (e.g., the provost). A second procedural example: Tenure candidates must obtain recommendations from all parties in the institutional hierarchy: the department, the college committee, the dean, the provost, the president, and the board of trustees. Any one of these parties holds “veto power.”

E. We observed that the tenure decision and the promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor is one and the same decision. We observed no separate tenure and promotion process; awarding tenure also means achieving promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor.

F. We observed evidence of flexibility in all procedures—we saw no criteria that specified numeric thresholds of performance. All procedures were careful to allow subjective judgment to affect decisions. Tenure (and promotion to Associate professor) criteria, for example, sometimes used the phrase “potential for performance” and “capacity to demonstrate excellence.” Promotion to Professor used the phrase “externally recognized level of performance” and in some cases “nationally recognized.” In line with this observation, we saw
evidence that quality of performance was more important than quantity. For example, if a publication had a great impact upon a field of knowledge, it would count heavily in a promotion decision even though it was only one publication.

G. We observed that in some cases, the term “creativity” or “creative contributions” is used in place of “scholarship.”

IX. Committee Activities

A. We discussed and clarified our charge.

B. We collected departmental criteria for merit, discussed these extensively, and created a comprehensive list of faculty performance dimensions.

C. We attempted to arrive at a single college-wide set of criteria and abandoned this approach as inappropriate for a diverse college such as ours.

D. We reviewed and discussed Institute and CLA policies and procedures on merit, tenure, and promotion.

E. We requested departmental criteria for tenure and received such criteria from: Communications, Economics, English, Political Science, Psychology, School Psychology, STS/Public Policy, Foreign Languages, and Sociology and Anthropology.

F. We requested departmental criteria for promotion and received such criteria from: Communications, Economics, English, Political Science, Psychology, School Psychology, STS/Public Policy, and Sociology and Anthropology.

G. We conducted an external review of comparable institutions’ merit, tenure, and promotion criteria and guidelines.

H. We conducted a brief review of the academic literature on the topic of faculty evaluation.

I. We drafted a preliminary report of our findings including recommendations, and solicited departmental feedback and visited all but three departments, reviewing the report, and recording suggestions and comments.

J. We used this feedback to revise the final report.
Appendix 1.1

COLA Department Merit Criteria and Guidelines 2005-3

DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
ROCHESTER INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR MERIT DETERMINATIONS
October 2004; First Draft
January 2005; Second Draft
February 18, 2005, Final Draft; Approved by the Criminal Justice Faculty

The purpose of this document is to provide the faculty of the Criminal Justice Department at RIT clear guidelines and specifications of the requirements for the receipt of annual merit raises. It is also designed to communicate departmental standards about the interrelationships between merit, tenure, and promotion. This policy statement supports the Department's continuing commitment to the three-fold mission of teaching, scholarly achievement and research, and service. In this respect it is consistent with those of the Institute and the College of Liberal Arts. While quantitative measures of productivity are important, the central philosophy is that the awarding of merit will rest primarily on the assessed quality of performance in each of the elements of the Department's mission.

Shared Responsibilities

Faculty members bear primary responsibility for the timely planning and implementation of 1) a professional development plan and 2) documentation of performance and productivity. The effective planning, implementation, and documentation of these professional development plans are central to success in the annual receipt of merit raises, as well as success in eventual requests for tenure and/or promotion. The Chair is responsible for effectively communicating Departmental standards, facilitating positive faculty performance and desired outcomes, and assuring the timely completion of those steps of the process which require other faculty and Chair action. In addition, the Chair and other Administrative officials -- including the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts -- share responsibility for assuring fair processes of faculty assessment that are consistent with Departmental, College and Institute policies; and providing to the best of their abilities accurate assessments of faculty performance. Ultimately, however, the faculty member bears the primary responsibility in shaping the outcomes of merit decisions.

Overlaps in Criteria for Merit, Tenure and Promotion

Standards and criteria for merit, tenure, and promotion exhibit pronounced overlaps. Nonetheless, there are significant differences in the criteria and consequences between the award of merit, tenure and promotion. Thus, the clear articulation of the important distinctions between each decision set is warranted.

Merit decisions reflect the recognition and monetary reward provided the Institute to individual faculty members for their contributions to the successful accomplishment of Institute goals during a one-year period of time. Gradations in the level of recognition and monetary reward fall into the established categories of (1) outstanding; (2) very good; (3) satisfactory; and (4) needs improvement or unsatisfactory. This is quite unlike the tenure or promotion decisions which result in binary outcomes (yes/no) only. Additional differences include the time span of evaluation (one year for merit versus multiple years for tenure and promotion) and the
consequences of the decision outcomes (e.g. short term psychological and monetary rewards for merit versus employment termination or prolonged employment guarantees for tenure decisions versus potential long-term prestige and monetary gains for promotions in faculty rank).

The weight accorded the basic dimensions of academic professional activity (teaching, scholarly activity/research, service) may also vary between the three decision sets. The Criminal Justice Department strongly endorses such a view. The primary values of the department revolve around the establishment and delivery of quality learning environments and outcomes for our students. Consequently, prime faculty tasks include effective teaching and departmental/institute service, including advising and student support functions, in the pursuit of quality learning. Scholarly activity/research and disciplinary/community service buttress the achievement of quality learning environments and outcomes, but are not nearly as central to this primary mission as are teaching and departmental/institute service functions. Thus, the Department feels that effectiveness in the teaching and service domains will typically be necessary for both the reward of the strongest potential merit outcomes and the receipt of tenure.

The receipt of tenure necessitates measures of effective teaching and service. More is required, however. For a positive tenure decision, the candidate must present evidence that s/he is actively engaged in the discipline of criminal justice and has the ability and commitment to make sustained and lifelong contributions to education and knowledge bases in criminal justice. Positive measures of scholarly/research performance are thus highly desired and accorded significant weight in this decision process.

Promotion in rank should not be based primarily on teaching and service performance, but on an assessment process featuring a much greater emphasis on scholarly/research outcomes. A separate document on Promotion standards containing basic departmental expectations regarding promotion will be provided. Clearly, scholarship will be emphasized within these standards.

Merit Standards and Considerations

The basic implication of the above is that the most desirable outcomes for merit decisions (e.g., outstanding ratings) include clear measures of effectiveness in the teaching and service functions combined with some minimal level of research/scholarly activity and productivity. Appendix A presents a detailed listing of activities and/or outcomes which delineate those types of activities and outcomes that will be recognized during the merit decision process. While the list is long, the items do not include the total population of activities and outcomes that can result in faculty recognition or reward. The listing does include, however, those things that are considered the staples of academic life -- things typically associated with “value” in the academic enterprise of criminal justice education. Point totals are associated with each item to suggest the relative weight that will be accorded each item. These are to identify the relative importance of the item in generating subjectively-determined merit decisions. They will not be utilized to generate a quantitative summative measure of faculty performance.

The threshold level for an “outstanding” rating is clear evidence of quality teaching and service coupled with demonstrable high-quality scholarly and/or research contributions. The latter extends beyond the presentation of papers at conferences, or the submission of manuscripts for tentative publication. Included should be articles in print or accepted for publication in top-tier peer-reviewed journals, original chapters in books making strong contributions to the extant knowledge base, the submission and acceptance of a book-length manuscript for publication, and/or the submission of a grant application resulting in funding.
Publication quality will be considered in combination with numbers of publications when establishing the threshold for an outstanding rating. In general, at least one high quality publication will be sufficient to warrant a rating of outstanding. Assessments of quality will be made jointly by the Chair and the faculty member. If disputes over quality assessments emerge, a faculty committee will be convened to address and resolve the dispute. Typically, however, a high quality publication is assumed unless there is evidence presented by one of the parties to the contrary.

The threshold level for a “very good” rating is clear evidence of quality teaching and service (including vital contributions to quality student advising within the department) coupled with activity that is likely to result in significant scholarly and/or research contributions in the immediate future and/or sustained lower-level contributions to the body of knowledge. The scholarly and research components include the preparation of papers for presentation at conferences, submission of manuscripts for publication review, work on research projects (funded or unfunded) with the potential to extend the body of knowledge in a particular topical area, and publications in non-peered review outlets or in lower-tier journals. Thus, a very good merit rating is anchored on either 1) research or scholarly activity likely to result in significant contributions to the body of knowledge or 2) research and scholarly outcomes that are valued but which do not rise to the standards associated with an outstanding rating.

A rating of “satisfactory” rating is evidence of acceptable levels of teaching with responsive service contributions to the department, College, Institute and discipline. Faculty receiving this rating will be those who are minimally meeting professional expectations regarding teaching and service, and who are not manifestly engaged in meaningful scholarly and/or research activity. Consistent or even intermittent ratings of satisfactory in the pre-tenure period indicate that the faculty member will not likely achieve a positive tenure decision. Such ratings in the post-tenure period indicate that progress towards promotion is not being realized.

A rating of “needs improvement or unsatisfactory” is reserved for faculty who are experiencing difficulty in establishing minimally acceptable classroom learning environments and/or those who are not satisfactorily discharging their minimal service obligations (e.g., not contributing to departmental and/or college governance functions). Such a rating should initiate departmental or college-level interventions to remediate the difficulties that have led to such a rating.

If a dispute between the faculty member and Chair arises in the overall rating of the faculty member, a departmental faculty committee will be convened to hear the dispute and attempt a resolution. Additionally, all university grievance procedures are applicable if disputes arise and cannot be resolved at the departmental level.

**Evaluation of Teaching**

Since the major purpose of RIT is teaching, measures of teaching effectiveness should be routinely collected, collated and presented in the merit process. Relevant information must, at a minimum, include:

1. Copies of syllabi and other materials which make it possible to evaluate the objectives, methods, organization and materials of courses that have been designed and/or taught by the candidate.

2. Student evaluations of the in-class performance of the candidate for all courses taught.
In addition to this required evidence, the faculty member may provide evidence of other measures of teaching effectiveness such as:

A. Design of courses in relation to best and/or innovative practices.
B. Additional instructional materials.
C. Student counseling and conferences.
D. Peer Evaluations of teaching effectiveness by faculty who have taught with or observed the applicant teaching in the classroom.
E. Student testimonials of effective teaching.

Teaching evaluations should also take into consideration the number of courses taught within the evaluation period, the average number of students per class, whether courses were taught for the first time or greatly modified from previous assignments, etc.

The quality of student advising services will also be considered a central component of teaching effectiveness. Availability to students in terms of maintaining office hours, responding to student requests for information in a timely manner, and providing students with active academic and career guidance are considered elements of quality advising.

In general, faculty with a relatively low teaching load are expected to engage in more research and scholarly activity than are those faculty with more significant teachings assignments and/or student contact demands.

Evaluation of Research

It is expected that the candidate will have demonstrated intellectual productivity through such activities as research, publication, participation in professional organization and/or meetings. Involvement in meaningful inquiry is at the heart of the qualification for membership in the University community. The quality of intellectual productivity is crucial to the ultimate decision on promotion and/or tenure. Evidence concerning the quality of research should indicate:

1. Whether or not the research has been presented at professional meetings or published.
2. If published, a statement describing the journal in terms of earned reputation and review process.
3. If a publication is co-authored, the extent, nature and quality of the candidate's contribution.

In view of the fact that the Department houses a multidisciplinary program, it must be taken into account that a faculty member may be in a specialty area where measures of productivity may vary somewhat from those commonly associated with those whose specialties lie in the social sciences. The burden lies with the faculty member to justify and document such a
difference, it if exists, and to document the measures of intellectual productivity traditional to that discipline. If such a difference is documented and supported the faculty member's intellectual productivity and the quality thereof shall be judged on the basis of criteria traditional to the specialty.

The temporal nature of scholarly and research activity is such that determinations of productivity constrained by an assessment period of one year or less will tend to artificially inflate or deflate the record of performance during a particular one year period. Oftentimes, the time it takes from the beginning of a research effort to the completion of that effort in a publication outcome will span multiple years. Accordingly, for the assessment of merit in the area of research/scholarship, the Criminal Justice Department will utilize a three-year moving average.

**Evaluation of Professional, Institute, College and Departmental Service**

Faculty members should provide evidence if their demonstrated contribution, not only to his/her own professional interests and development, but also to those of the Department, the College of Liberal Arts and the Institute as a whole. This includes professionally related activities such as chairing or participating on committees of professional organizations or boards, or holding elected or appointed offices in relevant professional associations, community service, etc.

Institute, College, and Departmental service includes such activities as chairing or participating on committees, participation in faculty meetings and other activities essential to the ongoing and successful operation of the Department, the College and the Institute. To be considered part of the evaluation for tenure or promotion, such activities must be at the direction of or have the approval of the Chair. Written evidence of such activity must be part of the candidate's dossier.
APPENDIX A: SUGGESTED MERIT CRITERIA

Provided in the following pages are a detailed listing of activities and/or outcomes which delineate those types of activities and outcomes that will be recognized during the merit decision process. While the list is long, the items do not include the total population of activities and outcomes that can result in faculty recognition or reward. The listing does include, however, those things that are considered the staples of academic life -- things typically associated with “value” in the academic enterprise of criminal justice education. Point totals are associated with each item to SUGGEST the relative weight that will be accorded each item. These are to identify the relative importance of the item in generating subjectively-determined merit decisions. They will not be utilized to generate a quantitative summative measure of faculty performance.
## INSTITUTE/DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Point Range</th>
<th>Standard Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Extensive intra-University consultation</td>
<td>5-30</td>
<td>(Max. 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Major administrative duties on ad hoc committees, or special assignments</td>
<td>5-40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Training workshops within the University, talks to University groups and classes not regularly assigned.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*D. Serving as appointed to elected member of division, College, University post or committee</td>
<td>5-20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Responsive and productive behavior on department and University Committees</td>
<td>5-30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Supportive activities necessary to satisfy Departmental goals and objectives</td>
<td>5-30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Being elected chair or member with extensive duties, of any committee, may be negotiated for bonus points with appropriate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Current Points</th>
<th>Faculty Self Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Consultation to community and professional groups</td>
<td>4 (Max. 20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Serving of professional boards/committees</td>
<td>8 (Max. 24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Public speaking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. President of a national professional organization (½ value for state or regional) (Based on breadth, prestige, and number of members in the organization.)</td>
<td>10-50 (Max. 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Officer of a national professional organization (½ value for state or regional) (Based on breadth, prestige, and number of members in the organization.)</td>
<td>5-25 (Max. 25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Organize a conference/symposium</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
<td>Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Editor or associate editor of a national professional journal (Any activity must be documented)</td>
<td>5-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Member of a professional organization committee</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Attend professional conference (only if not on program)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Chair a panel at a conference</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Serve on governmental task forces</td>
<td>10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Max. 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Provide expert testimony before state or federal legislative bodies</td>
<td>5-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M. Presentation or workshop at a professional conference other than an original scholarly paper 10

______________________________________________________

______________________________________________________

N. Served as outside evaluator for department in another college 5

______________________________________________________

______________________________________________________

______________________________________________________

O. Organize or be a discussant on a conference panel 5

______________________________________________________

______________________________________________________

P. Professional development for scholarly or teaching purposes 5-15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Manuscript</th>
<th><strong>Minimum Award for Initial Submission</strong></th>
<th>Additional Award for Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. An original book*</td>
<td>10-25</td>
<td>50-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. An original training manual</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Peer reviewed journal article</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Each original chapter in an edited book</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Editorial work only for an edited book</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>10-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Non-peer reviewed journal article</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Internal grant proposal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Each revised manuscript of a previously published work in any edited volume</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>New external grant *** proposal (point range reflects innovations, prestige of funding agency and dollar amount of grant)</td>
<td>10-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Book review (single book) (Max. 15)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Book review (multiple books and/or bibliographic essay/review article)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Reviewer for a journal (Review must be presented)</td>
<td>5 X # of articles reviewed (Max. 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Conference paper</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>Substantial revision of a published book</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the event of co-authorship, the number of points awarded will be divided by the number of co-authors, unless a larger percentage is both justified and documented.

* Points may be requested for partially completed works. Awards will be based in part on percentage of work completed and approved by the publisher. The total number of points may not exceed the number that would have been awarded for the manuscript, if it was completed in just one reporting time.

** If points not previously requested for submission, they may be claimed with accepted for publication.

*** Resubmitted material will not earn additional points, unless substantive and qualitative revisions have been made and documented.

**** Any published creative or scholarly work evaluated as an exceptional or seminal contribution may be awarded, upon application by a faculty member, up to a 50% increase in points in the appropriate category.

### TEACHING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Standard Award</th>
<th>Award for Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Student Evaluations and/or other objective measures of teaching effectiveness which indicate that teaching is at least acceptable</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-30 points per course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Developing a new course</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Standard + 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong></td>
<td>Substantial revision of a course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.</strong></td>
<td>Serving on Student M.S. Commitees</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.</strong></td>
<td>Nominations for /Receipt of Eisenhart Award</td>
<td>3 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F.</strong></td>
<td>Exemplary Student Advising Activities</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The faculty of the Department of Communication offer recommendations in two areas related to merit: first, for the process by which merit increments are distributed, and second, for the method by which merit levels are determined.

We recommend that merit increments be distributed in a two-tier system. First, all faculty members receive the same cost-of-living increment. Merit increases would be over and above the cost-of-living amount, and determined by the academic department chair in specific dollar amounts for each merit level.

As to how merit is decided, we affirm the primacy of teaching effectiveness among the three assessment categories: Teaching Effectiveness; Academic and Professional Activities; and Contributions to the Department, College and Institute. Further, to determine merit levels for each of these divisions, we enumerate those activities in each category relevant to making that determination. We present these activities as a listing and not to be interpreted as an ordinal- or interval-form scale. We avow that any activities undertaken by a faculty member must be evaluated by the department chair in the context of all the work reported by that individual during the review period, including ongoing projects and projects not yet completed. For example, someone who makes good progress on a book while at the same time performing outstanding teaching and service contributions should be evaluated outstanding overall. We are convinced that anatomizing and scaling the value of individual accomplishments in each category serves only to make the process rigid, with the result unreflective of the real work completed. A flexible system such as we recommend allows for a balanced and encompassing evaluation, carried out by the person in the best position to make such an evaluation: the department chair.
The Department of Communication faculty offer a listing of constituent elements for consideration when assessing an individual faculty member’s annual performance. The items identified below are representative, not exhaustive nor necessarily mutually exclusive. The items and their presentation as well as their presentation ordering are not to be interpreted as ordinal-or interval-form scales.

**Teaching Effectiveness**
- student evaluations
- course materials
- teaching awards, e.g., Eisenhart
- presentation/publications of material about teaching
- peer visitations and evaluations
- designing new courses
- applications of pedagogical theory to class designs and experiences
- copies of student work(s) with instructor’s comments
- receipt of student Kearse (and similar) Award
- modifications to existing course(s)
- number of course preparations per year
- independent studies sponsored/directed
- participation in team teaching
- specialized forms of teaching: e.g., distance or blended learning
- participating or directing teaching workshops
- presentation of short courses at professional conferences

**Academic and Professional Activities**
- reviewing manuscripts for professional journals/publishers
- editor/editing professional journals and other publications
- published scholarship
- scholarship in progress
- public presentation of scholarship
- creative works
- obtaining a grant/funding for research
- preparing a grant/funding proposal
- currency with one’s discipline; reading professional literature
- co-author or co-presenter of scholarship research
- consulting activities with corporation or not-for-profit organization
Service: Institute, College, Department and Community
   academic advising: undergraduate students
   academic advising: graduate students
   advising/directing undergraduate theses
   advising/directing graduate theses
   membership in clubs, organizations and committees
   chairing clubs, organizations and committees
   awards for service
   participation in Departmental initiatives
   leadership of Departmental initiatives
   advising and recruiting efforts
   retention activities and efforts
Economics Department (from faculty minutes)

VII. Discussion of Merit/Tenure/Promotion: Mike Vernarelli

Mike reminded the faculty that Dean Moore has asked each department to specify as concretely as possible the departmental criteria for merit, tenure and promotion. We began discussing these criteria at our last department faculty meeting and Mike asked that we pick up the conversation where it stood as of that meeting. In addition, Mike suggested that we discuss these matters in anticipation of college level discussions that began at the previous College of Liberal Arts faculty meeting. The Economics Department faculty continued this discussion, starting with Dean Moore's desire to form a committee with broad representation to explore this topic. Bharat indicated that when such a committee materializes, he would be willing to serve on the committee. The faculty thanked Bharat for his willingness to serve. The department faculty then continued the discussion of what service on that committee might entail, and what would seem to be of most importance is for our representative to articulate the Economics Department's criteria for merit, tenure and promotion to other departments and join in discussions as to how our criteria compare and contrast with criteria in other departments. Thus, the department faculty returned to the conversation from the September 3 department faculty meeting regarding departmental criteria.

The senior faculty reiterated its view that publishing five quality peer-reviewed journal articles (an average of one per year during the five probationary years prior to application for tenure) would fulfill the research expectations for tenure. The senior faculty, however, wished to offer a clarification to the September 3 discussion. While publishing five quality peer-reviewed journal articles should be considered a firm baseline, a candidate who does not achieve this baseline should not automatically be disqualified from tenure consideration. There is some substitutability between publishing refereed journal articles and other scholarship activities, so that each candidate will be evaluated according to the merit of his or her entire research portfolio. However, the marginal rate of substitution between the one or more articles that may be lacking and other accomplishments in one's portfolio is very hard to quantify. Amit proposed examples of how the tradeoff could be affected by matters such as the quality of the journals in which the candidates' papers appeared; the number of citations of the papers from sources such as SSCI (Social Science Citation Index); and the contents of the outside tenure letters of recommendation. Since these measures are important but are also, by their nature, relatively harder to synthesize into a "Yes/No" recommendation for tenure, the senior faculty strongly prefers that junior faculty focus on producing five quality refereed journal articles before the tenure evaluation and not plan on needing these additional measures to be evaluated.

The faculty discussed these points further and the concern was raised that adopting a five-article goal may not necessarily be consistent with building a solid research portfolio. Some junior faculty suggested that if one becomes preoccupied with getting the five articles done, there may be an undesirable lowering of quality. The faculty discussed the point that there is some risk to pursuing research that may have a higher payoff, and that each faculty member needed to find his or her personal comfort level with that tradeoff. The point was also made that the five-article baseline was emphasized to each candidate during the hiring process that Dean Moore was in support of this.
standard, and that the search committee in each case strongly considered the likelihood that the candidate could in fact attain the five-article goal.

There was further discussion of alternative approaches to the five article standard. Jeff voiced his vision of what he would advocate if he were conducting annual summative reviews of tenure track faculty. This vision was listened to but not necessarily subscribed to by the tenured faculty, who have conducted the annual summative review using the five article standard.

Mike indicated that the discussion had already spilled over the time allocated for the meeting and tabled the discussion to our subsequent meeting in October. Mike indicated that we do have a little bit more time to complete our deliberations before Dean Moore will ask him for his final report.

Mike asked if there were any issues of New Business to present to the faculty. Hearing none, the meeting adjourned at 4:15PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Wagner
V. New Business

Mike reported that since the agenda for today's faculty meeting was issued, Dean Moore asked each department chair to discuss the criteria for merit evaluations with their department faculty members as soon as possible. Mike began by noting that there are four possible summary ratings: Outstanding, very good, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. Mike described his view that an "Outstanding" rating corresponds with very effective teaching, significant scholarly work, and some service. Mike invited discussion of this topic. The faculty concurred with this criteria. In addition, the faculty discussed the relationship between merit criteria and tenure criteria. The Economics tenured faculty reiterated its view that tenure-track Economics faculty members should produce an average of one peer-reviewed journal article per year in order to make good progress toward tenure, and that producing such an article each year would fulfill the scholarship criteria for an "Outstanding" merit rating. Mike indicated that Dean Moore wants each department faculty to discuss tenure and promotion criteria this year as well, so that these discussions will continue at department meetings this year as the College of Liberal Arts works toward establishing uniform criteria for merit, tenure and promotion.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Wagner
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I. Introduction

   a) Background

   This document presents criteria established by the RIT STS/Public Policy Department to help guide decisions related to annual merit review, tenure, and promotion. The document is intended to supplement policies and procedures currently identified in Institute and College policy manuals.

   The STS/Public Policy Department is distinctive in that it houses an interdisciplinary faculty, each with multiple professional constituencies. Faculty in the department may have expertise in a variety of areas, including science, engineering, STS, history, anthropology, political science, environmental science, law, and public policy. For example, faculty may demonstrate expertise in technical areas, may do theoretical or applied work, or may concentrate their research in specific contexts (e.g., environmental policy, information policy, historical perspectives of S&T, etc.). For this reason, these criteria guidelines identify a broad range of activities supported within the departmental mission.

   b) Faculty Responsibilities

   Faculty members in the Department will be dedicated, accomplished, and viable professionals and educators. Faculty members will meet the general responsibilities of a full-time RIT faculty member as defined in the RIT Policies and Procedures Manual. Along with these professional responsibilities, faculty will enjoy the privileges and responsibilities of academic freedom and shared governance.

   c) Criteria

   The Department will use the Institute criteria categories for annual merit evaluations, tenure evaluations, and promotion recommendations. For merit evaluations, which are conducted by the Department Chair per College policy, these criteria should be used by the Chair in conducting the evaluation. Faculty are therefore encouraged to use and refer to the criteria in their annual self-evaluation reports.

   Criteria are grouped into the following three categories: (a) teaching, (b) scholarly achievement and professional development, and (c) contributions to the Department, College, and Institute.

   d) Flexibility of Guidelines

   When developing annual merit evaluations, the Department Chair will use these evaluation guidelines to the maximum extent possible but also recognize that these standards will not capture every activity in which faculty are engaged. The Chair will be open to consideration of faculty activities that are not accounted for in these criteria in the merit review process.
e) **Standards for Annual Evaluations**

For annual merit evaluations, the Department Chair will evaluate each faculty member and rate that faculty member within each assessment category as: (1) Outstanding; (2) Very Good; (3) Satisfactory; (4) Needs Improvement; or, (5) Unsatisfactory. Ratings are determined by a combination of agreed upon expectations and performance with respect to these expectations. Typically, faculty who exceed expectations in a particular category will receive a VERY GOOD or OUTSTANDING rating. Faculty who meet expectations will receive a SATISFACTORY rating. And faculty who do not meet expectations will receive a NEEDS IMPROVEMENT or UNSATISFACTORY rating. Details on ratings within each category are provided in separate sections of this document.

Once a faculty member has been rated in each category the comprehensive evaluation rating will be determined as follows:

- Points are awarded based on the faculty member’s rating in each category:
  - For each OUTSTANDING rating, the faculty member receives “4” points.
  - For each VERY GOOD rating, the faculty member receives “3” points.
  - For each SATISFACTORY rating, the faculty member receives “2” points.
  - For each NEEDS IMPROVEMENT rating, the faculty member receives “1” point.
  - For each UNSATISFACTORY rating, the faculty member receives no points.

- Total points are added for the three categories and a final ranking is determined as follows:
  - OUTSTANDING: 11 or more points
  - VERY GOOD: 8-10 points
  - SATISFACTORY: 5-7 points
  - NEEDS IMPROVEMENT: 2-4 points
  - UNSATISFACTORY: 0-1 point

*Exception:* No faculty can receive a SATISFACTORY evaluation if at least one of their categorical rankings is UNSATISFACTORY.

We emphasize that the criteria in this document represent guidelines. We recognize that exceptions can be made, including the consideration of activities not identified in this document that may nevertheless warrant an outstanding evaluation. In exceptional cases, evaluators may override the point system as long as sufficient rationale is made.

f) **Standards for Promotion and Tenure**

The Department Chair and faculty will also use these guidelines for tenure and promotion considerations. For the 2004-05 academic year, the guidelines will only be used for annual merit review. However, in the future we expect to include in this document guidance on how evaluators will use these criteria to make tenure and promotion recommendations.

g) **Amendment Process**

Recommendations regarding changes to these Guidelines may be submitted to the Department Chair. The Chair will raise the recommendations as motions at departmental meetings. Such motions will pass with a two-thirds vote of the Department faculty.
II. Teaching Standards

Specific criteria for Teaching are included in College and Institute policy manuals and are adopted here, with some additions, reflecting criteria particularly important in the STS and Public Policy fields. The following details provide information regarding ratings within the Teaching category:

1. To receive a Satisfactory rating for Teaching, a faculty member must demonstrate \textit{many} of the activities listed below:
   
a) Commitment to assigned classes, e.g. thoroughness of class preparation, suitable grading practices, availability during office hours, and timely return of tests, assignments, and papers.

b) Course organization, e.g. coverage of the approved course objectives; course content, syllabi, handouts, readings and/or textbook consistent with the approved course description; and course level and rigor consistent with student abilities and Department practice.

c) Clear and effective communication, with appropriate use of teaching resources.

d) Keeping course content and methods suitably updated.

e) Student evaluations of classes over the period of review in the general range of low to mid “3s”; or an increase of at least a half a point in student evaluations from the last time the course was delivered.

f) Positive efforts on the behalf of your students, as shown by availability outside of class, assistance with student professional development, or jobs/graduate school placement.

2. To receive a Very Good rating for Teaching, a faculty member must meet Satisfactory criteria and also demonstrate \textit{some} of the activities listed below:

a) Strongly positive student response to teaching, e.g. student-sponsored teaching awards, student evaluations in the range of high “3s” to low “4s”; or an increase of at least a full point in student evaluations from the last time the course was delivered; or unusually positive alumni comments.

b) Peer recognition of teaching ability and commitment to teaching, e.g. highly positive reports of peer observation of teaching.

c) Evidence of instructional vitality, e.g. development of a new course, innovations in course content or methodology, and use of a variety of teaching methods.

d) Effective teaching in a variety of learning contexts, e.g., lectures, seminars, student research projects, independent studies, discussion groups, field teaching, etc.

e) Engaging in additional teaching activities outside one’s normal teaching load, e.g., guest lectures, independent studies, etc.

f) Breadth in teaching expertise, e.g. the ability to teach a variety of subject areas, at the upper and lower levels, courses for different student populations, or between theoretical and applied courses.
g) Professional development through such efforts as participation in workshops, conferences or similar activities devoted primarily to improving teaching methods and course content.

h) Receiving a FEAD grant from the College for course development.

i) Developing and delivering a new course without FEAD grant assistance.

j) Participating in regional and national pedagogical organizations.

3. To receive an *Outstanding* rating, the individual must meet *Very Good* rating criteria and also demonstrate some of the achievements listed below:

   a) Publication of book chapters, textbooks, or teaching materials for classroom use.
   
   b) Receiving recognition for work in pedagogy, e.g., through RIT or externally sponsored teaching awards.
   
   c) Student evaluations in the range of mid “4s” to 5.0.
   
   d) Presentations and publications on innovations in course content and teaching methodology.
   
   e) Significant leadership demonstrated in the area of teaching, i.e., the ability to initiate and execute constructive curricular change in STS, Public Policy, the College, or RIT.
   
   f) Working with thesis and senior project advising significantly above normal course-loads.

4. A faculty member who does not meet *Satisfactory* requirements will be rated as *Needs Improvement*. A faculty member who receives two *Needs Improvement* ratings in two successive years will receive an *Unsatisfactory*.

III. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Development

   Specific criteria for Scholarly Achievement and Professional Development are included in College and Institute policy manuals and are adopted here, with some additions, reflecting criteria particularly important in the STS and Public Policy fields. The following details provide information regarding ratings within this category:

1. A *Satisfactory* rating requires evidence that the faculty member is continuing to learn and stay abreast of developments within his/her field. The activities listed below are examples of evidence that may be used to support a rating of *Satisfactory*. An individual is expected to show *many* of these activities:

   a) Membership and participation in national professional meetings, field conferences, and other scholarly gatherings.
   
   b) Research involving students in independent studies, senior projects, MS theses, or the Honors Program.
   
   c) Presenting papers at regional meetings and publishing in non-refereed journals.
d) Demonstration of professional development through such activities as NSF short courses, attending national meetings, etc., or an organized program of self-study in a new area of research.

e) Engaging in unpublished ongoing research.

f) Presentation of faculty seminars and colloquia at RIT.

g) Receiving a Faculty Research Grant from the College.

h) Maintaining professional licensing.

2. To receive a *Very Good* rating for this category, a faculty member must meet *Satisfactory* criteria and also demonstrate *some* of the activities listed below:

a) Invited lectures and/or publication in the proceedings of national or international conference.

b) Publication of book reviews, discussions, and technical reports in one’s professional area(s).

c) Serving as an editorial member of a professional journal.

d) A major effort conducting workshops, symposia, and training sessions in one’s professional area(s).

e) Advising student research projects that lead to presentation or publication in a professional forum.

f) Presentation of papers at national or international professional meetings.

g) Submitting grant proposals for external funding.

h) Receiving a FEAD grant from the College for research-related activities.

i) Engaging in public media activities (e.g., op-eds, interviews, etc.) that demonstrate expertise in one’s field(s).

j) Collaborating in interdisciplinary projects with others outside one’s primary professional area.

k) Conducting professional consulting activities.

l) Participating on an editorial board for a journal or other publication.

m) Providing advice to policy makers and others, through invited papers, testimony, or policy formulation.

n) Reviewing proposals for sponsored government, academic, or industry programs.

o) Serving as an officer of a national or international professional organization.

3. To receive an *Outstanding* rating, the individual must contribute to the advancement of knowledge in the field. An *Outstanding* rating requires evidence from professionals external to RIT that the individual is recognized for scholarly contributions or professional expertise. The individual must demonstrate *some* of the achievements listed below:
a) Service as editor of a national or international journal.
b) Receiving a Miller Fellowship from the College for research-related activities.
c) Recipient of an externally sponsored grant, award, or contract, with the understanding that the size and/or quality of the grant, award, or contract justifies outstanding performance.
d) Major publication of research or other scholarly activity in refereed national or international professional journals in one’s professional field(s).
e) Publication of a book in one’s professional field(s).
f) Conducting consulting activities that demonstrate expertise and the advancement of knowledge in one’s professional field(s).
g) Serving as editor of a scholarly volume in one’s professional field(s).
h) Authoring a textbook.
i) Publishing teaching materials that are widely disseminated and used in curricula in one’s professional field(s).

4. A faculty member who does not meet Satisfactory requirements will be rated as Needs Improvement. A faculty member who receives two Needs Improvement ratings in two successive years will receive an Unsatisfactory.

IV. Contributions to the Department, College, and Institute (Service)

Specific criteria for Contributions to the Institute and College are included in College and Institute policy manuals. Here we add contributions to the Department as well. We call this category “Service”.

1. To receive a Satisfactory rating for Service, a faculty member must share in the duties needed for the effective operation of the Department and make contributions to the College and the Institute. To receive a Satisfactory rating, the individual must participate in some of the activities listed below:

   a) Actively participating in day-to-day Department and Program activities, with a spirit of professionalism and collegiality.

   b) Serving and participating on Departmental or Program committees.

   c) Serving as an official faculty advisor to students.

   d) Writing letters of recommendation for students upon request and as appropriate.

   e) Advising students who are normally not currently in your class on curricular, career, or other matters.

2. To receive a Very Good rating for Service, a faculty member must meet Satisfactory criteria and also demonstrate some of the activities listed below.

   a) Serving and participating on College committees.

   b) Serving and participating on Institute committees.
c) Participating in student recruitment activities.

d) Initiating or leading important Departmental activities or events.

e) Participating in grant proposals for external funding.

f) Serving as a member of academic senate.

g) Serving on Institute Council.

3. To receive an *Outstanding* rating, the individual must demonstrate leadership in Service to the Department, College, other RIT programs, or the Institute. The individual must demonstrate *some* of the activities listed below.

a) Initiating and carrying out a program which leads to a significant increase in the Department’s or RIT’s resources, or in the Department’s or RIT’s ability to perform its mission.

b) Engaging in Service *leadership* within the community.

c) Making a contribution which applies the resources of the Institute to solving a problem of national or international concern (e.g., running a symposium, workshop, or conference).

d) Providing extraordinary service to the Department, College, or Institute, where a clear degree of leadership is sustained throughout the period of review.

e) Serving as faculty advisor to student organizations or serving as a participant or advisor for special student functions.

f) Providing a major service or serving an important office at the College, Institute, or state level.

g) Participating on *special* projects for the Department, College, or Institute.

h) Providing other services that the Department deems demonstrable of significant leadership contribution.

4. A faculty member who does not meet *Satisfactory* guidelines will be rated as *Needs Improvement*. A faculty member who receives two *Needs Improvement* ratings in a row, will receive an *Unsatisfactory*. 
Department of Fine Arts
Merit Evaluation Criteria

I. Criteria for Teaching Effectiveness

The Fine Arts Department supports the College's statement that teaching effectiveness is "most difficult" to define; that it is virtually impossible to isolate any one set of factors from among all the variables which are interacting in the individual teacher's contribution to changes in the learner; that many of these changes are complex and subtle and often are not observable until much later in the student's life.

Our department also has the added complexity that there are performance expectations as part of some regular assigned teaching loads (e.g., theatre, choral groups, and instrumental groups). The department affirms the importance of student performance as an educational activity in a university setting. The study of music and theater is rendered less immediate and complete without appropriate performance activities. Therefore, performance activities in the musical and dramatic arts are considered, at least in part, teaching activities, and constitute part of the regular faculty teaching load. Faculty in the performing arts treat the various ensembles and dramatic productions with the same care, dedication, time and effort as more conventional classroom assignments. Indeed, the preparation and administration of these activities requires at least as much attention as the more conventional course. Therefore, the criteria used for the evaluation of teaching are also appropriate for performance activities. This being the case, it should be recognized that each performance is, in effect, a new course, as the materials used for performance change every performance cycle (quarter to quarter for music ensembles, year to year for theater), and should receive appropriate consideration as such in the evaluation process.

The following suggestions are offered and they should be taken into consideration with particular application to the individual plans of work.

Our thinking is that quality teaching is expected—indeed it is the reason we chose to enter this career field—and that grading it by levels is only a partial and imperfect way to assess outcomes. RIT has always held to the idea that teaching effectiveness will be given primary consideration in the determination of merit.

a. Initiation and development of educationally meaningful courses and performances
b. Creative innovations in teaching and performances
c. Willingness and ability to guide independent study
d. Broadening knowledge through the development of new courses in areas beyond a teacher's given area of expertise (including team teaching)
e. Receiving a major teaching award
f. Broadening knowledge through research in connection with existing courses (including guest lecturing)
g. Willingness to assume different teaching assignments (large classes, etc.)
h. Quality of teaching materials: exceptional clarity to syllabi (and course outlines) indicating an up-to-date and flexible approach for students
i. Integrating ideas and methods into courses from attending workshops and conferences
j. Length of successful teaching experience at RIT and elsewhere
k. Knowledge of subject matter
l. General knowledge and range of interests
m. Interest and enthusiasm in subject
n. Ability to generate interest in the student
o. Ability to provide clear and understandable explanations
p. Active and personal interest in the progress of the class
q. Active and personal interest in the student as evidenced by availability for student counseling
r. Quality of instruction, i.e., what is demanded of the student and what did they learn; types of tests, quality of papers and projects

II. Research and creative endeavor and scholarly and professional activity

Research and/or creative endeavor and scholarly and professional activity within the department may assume diversified directions or combinations in the area of music, theater, art and art history, and film. Any one of the criteria may be considered sufficient evidence of effectiveness in research and/or creative endeavor and scholarly and professional activity. Any reasonable combination of partially fulfilled criteria is likewise considered sufficient.

Creative Activity
Creative activity in drama and theatre, including
- Writing an original play
- Developing an original performance work
- Creating an innovative original design for a theatre production
- Creating, co-creating, or directing a multi-media or interdisciplinary performance or other form of theatre production that demonstrably surpasses conventional standards for such activity.

Creative activity in music, for example to include
- Composing an original music composition
- Creating or co-creating a multi-media or interdisciplinary performance (as of music theatre, dance theatre, and the like)
- Releasing a CD or other recording as a soloist, conductor, or composer

Creative activity in studio art
- Creative art-making in one or more media, including but not restricted to the following: painting, sculpture, drawing, print-making, photography, video, computer art, installation art, performance art, mixed media (to be credited when exhibited in juried or non-juried exhibitions, mixed or solo exhibitions, or installed or performed in museums or art galleries or otherwise made available to public view and/or on the occasion of sale to public or private collections).
- Acceptance in national or international and regional juried exhibitions
• Acceptance in regional or area juried exhibitions
• One-person shows in a reputable gallery, public place, university, or museum
• Group shows in which the body of work exhibited by the candidate is sizable
• Significant commissions

Scholarship
• Publishing a book in one’s field.
• Authoring textbooks or teaching materials.
• Editing a book in one’s field.

• Publishing papers in national or international refereed journals, and in other types of recognized publications in the field.
• Publication of book reviews, performance reviews, exhibit reviews, reviews of art works, entries in exhibition catalogues, dictionary entries, program notes, or comments and reports in professional newsletters.
• Curatorial work, including the organization of exhibitions and the production of related catalogues and other associated publications.
• Presentation of papers or participation on panels at national or international conferences.
• Presenting papers at local and regional conferences and assemblies.
• Invited lectures and/or publication in the proceedings of national or international conferences.
• Speaking engagements at other universities, research institutions, or professional organizations.
• Presenting at faculty seminars and colloquia.

Professional Development and Activities
• Serving as an editor of a national or international journal.
• Serving as an editorial member of a professional journal.
• Serving as a referee for a professional journal.
• Serving as an officer in a local, regional, national, or international professional association.
• Membership and participation in professional associations.
• Participating as a judge or adjudicator for performances, texts, exhibits, and the like for professional associations.
• Engaging in public media activities (e.g., testimonials, op-eds, interviews, etc.) that demonstrate one’s expertise in the field.
• Conducting professional consulting activities.
• Providing advice to professional arts organizations through invited papers or presentations.
• Initiating grant proposals for external funding.
• Receiving college, institute, government, or foundation grants or awards.
• Winning a competition directly related to one’s field of expertise.
• Receipt of professional achievement awards or other evidence demonstrating external recognition of individual professional achievement.
• Attending or conducting workshops, symposia, seminars, master classes, institutes, organized programs of self- or private study, and the like in one’s professional area.
• Contributing to a theatrical performance by a campus, local, or regional arts organization. Such contribution could include creative writing, criticism, directing, musical direction, acting, dancing, choreography, fight choreography, composing, design, film-making, performance coaching, artistic exhibition, curating, photography, producing, artistic management, and production management.
• Contributing as performer, conductor, or composer to musical performances by campus, local, or regional music groups, both amateur and professional, or giving solo performances in campus, local, or regional venues.

Other Research Activities
• Demonstrated contribution to knowledge through a focused, goal-directed program of research or other scholarly activity.
• Engaging in unpublished ongoing research.
• Research directed toward on-campus performances, exhibits, or installations.
• Research involving students in independent studies, senior projects, theses, or the Honors Program.
• Active research involving students and/or colleagues, demonstrable through presentation, publication, performance, or exhibition in a local or regional forum.
• Collaborating in interdisciplinary research, exhibition, or performance projects with others outside one’s discipline.
• Other significant scholarly or artistic achievement, recognition, or professional development.

III. Contributions to the Institute, College, and Department (Service)

Minimum: required of everyone
• Attending and participating in departmental meetings
• Serving on departmental committees
• Undertaking departmental assignments
• Serving on college/institute committees

In addition: x number of items listed below required for Very Good, x+x number of items below required for Outstanding
• Initiating and carrying out a program that leads to an increase in the department or institute’s resources
• Participating in grant proposals for funding
• Serving on “major” standing college, institute committees (time intensive), e.g, college curriculum committee, ICC, academic senate, others
• Chairing a department, college, or institute committee
• Chairing the department
• Chairing a program
• Participating in special projects and ad hoc committees for the college, institute
• Participating in or advising a special student function
• Advising students enrolled in the department’s minors
• Serving on graduate student MFA thesis boards
• Serving as faculty advisor to student organizations
• Performing in professional capacity (e.g., choral director, musician) outside of required curricular performances
• Providing a major service or serving an important office at the college, institute level
The criteria below have been established by the Department of History as a means to evaluate the merit allocation among its members. These measures of each department member’s year should be considered suggestive; they include but are not limited to the activities and accomplishments enumerated in each category.

11 November 2004

Teaching: Satisfactory
Generally average student and peer evaluations
Commitment to assigned classes
Maintenance of regular office hours
Timely return of tests and papers
Course organization: clearly designed objectives, syllabi, handouts, and readings consistent with course description
Clear and effective communication about the appropriate use of teaching resources
Positive attitude toward students
Mastery of subject matter

Teaching: Very Good
Generally strong student evaluations
The following criteria (in addition to those listed as Satisfactory) could contribute to a Very Good rating:
  Participation in instructional improvements activities
  Peer recognition of teaching ability and commitment to teaching
    (including guest lectures)
  Ability to teach a wide variety of courses at introductory and upper division levels
  Willingness to expand expertise to meet department or college needs
  Participation in interdisciplinary and/or team-taught courses

Teaching: Outstanding
Generally superlative ratings in student evaluations
The following criteria (in addition to those listed as Satisfactory and Very Good) could contribute to an Outstanding rating:
  Innovation in course content
  Innovation in teaching methodology
  Development of new courses that meet the needs of majors, minors, and concentrators
  Development of new programs
  Supervision of a senior thesis or senior project
  Teaching independent study courses
  Taking instruction that facilitates communication with diverse student constituencies
  Receipt of teaching awards
**Scholarship: Satisfactory**
Membership in professional organizations
Attendance at professional meetings, conferences, or other scholarly gatherings
Ongoing research agenda

**Scholarship: Very Good**
The following criteria (in addition to those listed as Satisfactory) could contribute to a Very Good rating:
- Participation (as presenter, discussant, chair, or organizer) in professional meetings, conferences, and other scholarly gatherings
- Presentation for a community group
- Submission of a proposal for an external grant
- Presentation at another college or university
- Non-refereed publication, whether print or on-line
- Invited lectures and/or publication in the proceedings of a national or international conference
- Publication of a book review or review of a course text
- Conducting a workshop, symposium, or training session
- Organization of a department conference
- Responding to media invitations to provide expert commentary (interviews, op-ed pieces)

**Scholarship: Outstanding**
The following criteria (in addition to those listed as Satisfactory and Very Good) could contribute to an Outstanding rating:
- Award of an internal or external grant
- Publication of a book
- Publication of an article in a peer-reviewed journal
- Publication of a chapter in a peer-reviewed volume
- Serving as officer of a national or international professional organization
- Membership on the editorial board of a professional journal
- Serving as peer reviewer for a professional journal, publisher, or a granting agency
- Receipt of professional achievement awards

**Service: Satisfactory**
Attendance and participation in departmental and College meetings
Serving on a College or Institute committee
Advising students in the department (majors, minors, and concentrators)

**Service: Very Good**
The following criteria (in addition to those listed as Satisfactory) could contribute to a Very Good rating:
- Advisor to a student organization
- Advising students in the RIT Exploration, CRO, or other programs
- Assuming a leadership role at the departmental level.
Service: Outstanding
The following criteria (in additional to those listed as Satisfactory and Very Good) could contribute to an Outstanding rating:
- Chair of a College or Institute committee
- Serving on a major College or Institute committee (such as Institute Curriculum committee, Faculty Senate, or a committee pursuing external grants)
- Creating a new facility or program (laboratory, center, partnership)
- Serving as department or program chair
Department of English

Recommendations for Criteria in the Evaluation of Faculty for Annual Merit Review

Preamble:

In evaluating faculty for the purposes of annual merit review, and, by extension, in considering faculty progress toward tenure, the College of Liberal Arts must acknowledge the particular academic context within which such evaluation takes place.

This context requires an unusually heavy teaching load compared to research-proper and even many peer institutions. Furthermore, our Institute and this College in particular also require a greater commitment to service than similar institutions because both the Institute and the College are in a time of transition, requiring an especially high level of faculty guidance and governance—much of this responsibility falling upon the shoulders of junior faculty, particularly in departments such as English in which there are few or no faculty in mid-career.

We must all understand this context clearly before adopting or even recommending any criteria for evaluation. The items below attempt to outline this context from the point of view of the Department of English, and to suggest a framework for establishing reasonable, fair, equitable, and flexible Merit Review criteria.

Given
• that faculty in the College of Liberal Arts at RIT teach three courses per quarter;
• that for the English Department, these courses are student-centered, requiring qualitative evaluation of student writing including individual conferences and extensive written feedback from professors to students;
• that, in the area of scholarship, the humanities are currently experiencing a crisis in academic publishing (as outlined by Stephen Greenblat, President of the Modern Language Association in the attached letter), making it difficult even for faculty at research-one institutions to get their manuscripts published;
• that online and other non-traditional forms of scholarship are increasingly included in evaluating faculty for merit at institutions similar to RIT (see Statement on Publication in Electronic Journals, attached);
• that, in the area of service, junior faculty are being asked to serve on committees more often here than at similar institutions, partly because of the transitions that the Institute and the College are undergoing;

then any decisions about Merit Review (and, by extension, tenure) should
• continue to honor effective teaching, and recognize that RIT and the College of Liberal Arts have made a unique commitment to the faculty-student relationship;
• recognize that the teaching of writing requires a particularly high level of commitment not only to evaluation of students, but also to providing extensive oral and written feedback to and coaching of students;
• acknowledge that the publication of a book may take several years, especially given that faculty teaching loads increase in the third year;
• value, within reasonable limits, non-traditional forms of publications such as articles in electronic journals while still valuing publication in traditional peer-refereed journals;
• reward faculty commitment to guiding RIT and the College in this time of transition and beyond.

Again, any re-evaluation of criteria for Merit Review must acknowledge the unique strengths of RIT, the College of Liberal Arts, and each Department. Given the context and expectations outlined above, we, the faculty of the Department of English, feel confident that the College will adopt reasonable expectations for Merit and tenure.

Above all, it is important to recognize that RIT is unique—it values the faculty-student relationship and the college community while it increases the scholarly profile of its faculty. This is a positive attribute of our Institute and College. However, if the growing concern for publication and research overshadows RIT’s unique commitment to its academic mission, then the disservice is done not only to the faculty being evaluated, but also to the students they serve.

I. SUGGESTED CHECKLIST FOR MERIT REVIEW

   a) TEACHING

   SUPERIOR TEACHING

   • Consistent reevaluation of one’s courses (e.g., including multicultural, international, gender of deaf culture components; use of new pedagogies of technologies; incorporating interdisciplinary perspectives, online or blended elements…)

   • Recognition by an Eisenhart or other teaching award

   • Superior student evaluations (numerical and narrative; well above the college norm)

   • Excellent peer reviews

   • Willingness to develop and teach new courses (in response to departmental or Institute demand; interdisciplinary or team-taught courses)

   b) SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH/CREATIVE PERFORMANCE
• Multiple professional papers at national/international conferences (linked to anticipated publication, or to new direction in future research)

• Significant, successful grant writing (may be collaborative, internal or external)

• Publication of a book (possible monograph; translation; anthology or collection; chapbook; textbook; coedited or coauthored)

• Contract for one or more books in progress (to be factored with release time; Institute and department service; nature of project)

• Electronic journal or book publication

• Chair of major conference

• Published poems, stories or creative non-fiction (including select online or digital materials)

• Significant creative activities (such as film scripts, poetry reading of slams, directing plays, performances in plays, musical performances, etc.)

• Writing contest and other awards

c) SERVICE
EXTRAORDINARY CONTRIBUTION TO COLLEGE, INSTITUTE OR COMMUNITY

• Significant role on, or chair of, major committee

• Creation of new facility or program

• Multiple committee memberships (demonstrated, significant time commitment)

• Community service (board memberships, new community initiatives, etc.)

• Significant advising (all levels)

• Other service to College in research, teaching, mentoring
The Department of Philosophy continues to stress the importance of all three areas on which COLA policy focuses in the determinations of merit. We judge our faculty with the understanding that we are primarily a teaching institution, and consequently, while good teaching is not necessarily the primary area of merit consideration, it is a *sine qua non*, whereas scholarly activities and service are not.

In trying to take a more fine-grained look at merit evaluations within the traditional three areas, the Department has created a list, not to be thought of as exhaustive, of many of the categories and items which are considered to be instrumental in the determination of merit evaluation. These criteria need to be view holistically, in terms of a person’s previous goals and accomplishments.

*Teaching effectiveness*
- student evaluations
- course materials
- teaching awards
- peer visitations and evaluations
- designing new courses
- modifications of existing courses
- presentations/publications about teaching
- applications of pedagogical theory
- participating or directing teaching workshops
- receipt of Kearse or similar award for a student
- number of preparations per year
- independent studies
- team teaching
- specialized forms of teaching (e.g. distance or “blended” learning environments)
- experimentation with class sizes, graders, and other ways of more efficient pedegogy.

*Academic and professional activities*
- reviewing manuscripts for professional publications
- editorial work for professional publications
- published scholarship (books, articles, reviews, etc.)
- entering into, or continuing in, a professional or scholarly program (such as certification or an advanced degree program)
- completion of a professional or scholarly program
- scholarship in progress
- public or departmental presentation of scholarship
- creative works
- preparing a grant/funding proposal
- obtaining a grant/funding for research
currency with one’s discipline; reading professional literature
co-author or co-presenter of scholarship research
consulting activities
membership in scholarly organizations
holding office in scholarly organizations.

Service to Institute, College, Department and Community
academic advising
advising/directing theses
membership in clubs, organizations and committees
chairing clubs, organizations and committees
holding other office in organizations and committees
awards for service
participation in Department, College, or Institute initiatives
leadership in, or innovations in, Department, College or Institute initiatives.

1 October, 2004

Dear Andrew,

You asked for written comments from the various departments on the issue of merit review. The following are some of the main comments and concerns raised by the Philosophy faculty during various discussions held in person and via email since last Spring.

1. It is not clear what motivates a review of the merit (and tenure and promotion) criteria. Yes, the criteria are somewhat vague. But they are always going to be somewhat vague, and so the real issue is why more specificity is being asked for. Is it because there seems to be some non-uniformity in their application across different departments? But it is not clear why, if the present merit (and tenure and promotion) criteria are in fact being used, we should not want them, and expect them, to come out in different ways in different departments — indeed, in slightly different ways for different persons within the same department. The present guidelines, for example, caution us that faculty are expected to attend to their teaching, to their service to the college and institute, and to their scholarship, yet no one area should be expected to take precedence, and so a faculty member who receives accolades for teaching is not necessarily to be praised more highly than a faculty member who publishes a book. If we want to more carefully define “superior teaching” or “sustained scholarly activity”, and a few of the other phrases which have traditionally directed our attention, then we must be very cautious to be sensitive to the variety of ways in which these notions get worked out in different departments and for different individuals (and for the same individual at different times). If Policy were to give as an explicit example of “demonstrated scholarly excellence” the publication of a book, then we are doing
two things which we may not, upon reflection, want to do: (1) we are saying what is already obvious to all academics, namely, that publication of a book is a major achievement; and (2) since that is already obvious, then its mention may serve to put an emphasis on that one thing, which may unfortunately act as an inducement to neglect, or at least to fail to be open to, other ways of being an excellent scholar.

2. With regard to specifying more precisely what counts as scholarly activity, we are going to run into problems which we may not want to try to resolve at the necessarily more abstract level of College Policy. What, for example, is to count as the publication of a book? If it is the actual date of publication, and not the publisher’s acceptance, then the author, who has spent the merit year finishing the book and having it accepted for publication, is nevertheless not to be recognized for that scholarship. Moreover, we will have to distinguish between, say, anthologies or collections on the one hand (actually, those are two hands), and non-anthologies on another hand. And will it matter who the publisher is? How long or short the book is? Surely, these are matters better decided by one’s peers, who are in the better position to assess the current state of scholarship, and the current expectations of the manifestations of scholarship (which may or may not include books), in their own areas, and consequently it is a wise College Policy which is silent on such issues.

3. We must be very careful lest we invent criteria such that it is unlikely or impossible to be consistently “outstanding” (or even “very good”).

4. We must be careful that when we recognize that one person has been “outstanding” because of, say, special teaching excellence, and another has been “outstanding” because of, say, some scholarly excellence, we do not lose sight of those faculty who, while not standing out so clearly in a particular area, nevertheless may merit an overall rating of “outstanding” because of consistently excellent ratings in more than one area.

5. The Philosophy Department is agreed that the faculty ought to elect an ad hoc committee to examine the present merit criteria (Policies and Procedures II.C) to see if any revision is advisable, and, if revisions are to be recommended, that such revisions be consistent with Institute Policy as well as with the criteria for tenure and promotion. The Committee could ask for reports from the various departments and then report back to the faculty by the penultimate faculty meeting in the Winter quarter. Until and unless new policy is approved by the faculty, the present standards for merit (and tenure and promotion) must of course be used; any new policy cannot be used until the following review period (i.e., new policy cannot be used ex post facto).

Sincerely,

David Suits, Chair
Meeting of the Political Science
Department September 17, 2004

The main agenda item was the question of how we will evaluate Merit in the Political Science Department. It was noted that this was our first attempt to take part in what will be a College-wide discussion of Merit, Promotion and Tenure during the year.

The background to this College-wide discussion was that there were two things happening in the College of Liberal Arts. First, several departments have tended to grade themselves all "Outstanding," thereby putting the rest of the faculty in the College at a disadvantage, when it came to dividing up the pool of funds for merit. Second, to address this problem, a committee of chairs was called to establish new guidelines for determining Merit. The committee did not come to a conclusion. As a consequence, the Dean set the standard for "Outstanding" as "a book in hand." This forced several departments to re-evaluate some of their decisions.

Although this requirement appears to be new, it was clear to all that the standards had been raised. However, the book-in-hand standard has met with opposition. The most common argument put forward is that this criterion does not take into account that some disciplines or fields of study due to the timeliness of their data sets emphasize the publication of articles rather than books as the most fruitful way for pursuing one's scholarly ambitions. This argument further suggests that College-wide standards of Merit may be inappropriate if they do not reflect these fundamental differences between the disciplines or areas of study.

Further, the chairs and the Dean are in discussion over the direction of the Merit evaluation. It seems the Dean believes that to set "Outstanding" at 3% does not provide an appropriate incentive for those with scholarly ambitions. Accordingly, he wants "Outstanding" to be rare and set at 7-10% thereby reflecting some kind of outstanding achievement, such as publication of a book or winning of a significant award.

At this point several questions were raised in our discussion. Should "Outstanding" relate to the College of Liberal Arts, that is, reflect some outstanding achievement relative to the whole College? Or should "Outstanding" be "measured" against the activities of the Department? How are Merit, Tenure and Promotion related? Should several years of "Outstanding" secure Tenure within the College? Moreover, if you complete your plan of work each year should this ensure Tenure and a merit evaluation of "Outstanding." If so, does this mean in the future our "Plan of Work" will be graded, i.e., evaluated as likely to get you an evaluation of "Satisfactory," "Very Good," or "Outstanding."

In the past our criteria for Merit has resembled a moving target. "Outstanding" was at times reserved for those who published a book or an article because fewer members of the faculty were engaged in scholarship. Currently, everybody seems to be engaged in some kind of scholarly activity, thereby requiring an overhaul of the Merit standards.
Members of the Department were in agreement that teaching evaluations were not a suitable instrument for estimating teaching effectiveness or the lack of teaching effectiveness. At most, the statistics collected in the teaching evaluations were thought to "measure" "student satisfaction." Nevertheless, it was proposed that as a Department we make arrangements for classroom visitations—peer review. The reservations concerning the accuracy and the reliability of student evaluations further suggested that if your teaching was sufficient, that is, there were no serious complaints from students and you serve on a some committees in the College then Scholarship is really the determining factor for a Merit Evaluation above "Satisfactory."

The Department considers that "the book-in-hand" standard is not a useful standard as noted above, namely, that some fields because of their reliance on timely data sets favor articles over books. If the book was the sole determinant of an "Outstanding" evaluation then further questions arise: What kind of book? Is the book an edited volume? What publisher? How prestigious is the publisher? Given our tremendous teaching load it was thought that these questions are inappropriate.

It was then suggested we should take the general approach of the College regarding tenure, namely, that what is expected is a steady stream of scholarly work. On several occasions, the Dean has suggested he does not want to see junior faculty come up for tenure with a book at press—he wants some results before the tenure application. If one applies this position to the question of Merit, the requirement for "Outstanding" and "Very Good" should reflect a stream of scholarly activity that includes articles published and submitted for publication, conference papers, editorial activities for journals such as peer review and books published. Accordingly, the general sense of "Outstanding" and "Very Good" should reflect that the faculty member is an active member of the discipline and keeps up with the field.

By opening up the categories of "Outstanding" and "Very Good" to take into account the heavy teaching load here at RIT it makes sense that all these activities should be counted. It was further suggested that "Outstanding" and "Very Good" could only have meaning if "Satisfactory" also means something. In other words, most of the faculty should fall within the category of "Satisfactory," reflecting that the member of the faculty is a good teacher, takes part in the governance of the College and activities of the Department. This means that performance over and above this respectable minimum given our teaching load, entitles one to be considered at the very least for "Very Good," if not "Outstanding." Significant service to the College in addition should ensure that a member of the faculty be considered for an evaluation above "Satisfactory."

In light of issues surrounding the Merit Evaluation process should it be the view of the Department as it will be the likely view of the College that the whole process and results of Merit, Promotion and Tenure ought to be transparent? Are there any compelling reasons for privacy or confidentiality that should prohibit everyone from knowing the accomplishments, that is, the reasons a faculty member was promoted, awarded tenure or given a certain merit evaluation? This might be accomplished by having a repository of these CV items available for a certain period to all faculty of the College.

To summarize, pending further discussion, our position seems to be as follows:

1. Since there is no agreed upon way to evaluate teaching effectiveness, the Student evaluations alone should not be used for Merit Evaluation. Therefore, unless other wise distinguished positive or negative teaching as a determinant should be considered a wash and Scholarship should be the determining factor.
2. Abandon the book as the sole determinant of "Outstanding" reflecting that some fields
favor articles over books.

3. Given our heavy teaching load, open up the category of "Outstanding" to include the full variety of scholarly activities.

4. "Outstanding" and "Very Good" can only have meaning if "Satisfactory" means something.

5. "Satisfactory" should reflect that the member of the faculty is a good teacher, takes part in the governance of the College and activities of the Department.

6. Finally, "Outstanding" should be reserved for those who have excelled and the remuneration should reflect this.

7. Whatever the criteria, Merit Evaluation ought to be transparent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching:</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Award</td>
<td>Criteria 3-6</td>
<td>student evaluation (average)</td>
<td>1. continued student complaints 2. unwilling to teach some courses required by the dept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 2-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. student publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. student evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. evaluating students (using professional and fair standards)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. mentor students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. available to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research/Scholarship</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. quality publication – one publication as 1st author and another collaborated article in refereed international/national journals in one’s discipline OR 2. book publication in one’s field OR 3. significant grant funded</td>
<td>papers submitted OR grant submission OR publication in press</td>
<td>working on research OR grant applications</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service:</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. served the dept with willingness and enthusiasm 2. served college/institute; showed significant contributions</td>
<td>served on committees, but no significant contributions</td>
<td>minimum service</td>
<td>unwilling to serve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advising:</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attracted and retained a significant number of students</td>
<td>good advising and rapport with students</td>
<td>perform satisfactory advising</td>
<td>unsatisfactory advising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To be outstanding one must have an outstanding rating in one category and the remaining three categories in the very good rating.

Other factors for consideration are:

**Teaching:**

1. peer evaluation – this is optional, but one can have colleagues come in to assess teaching quality
2. subject training – instructor has a PhD in Psychology, and necessary training
3. grade distribution – there is a reasonable range of grades in courses
4. philosophy of teaching – incorporating best practices in teaching
5. course content – material at an appropriate level for the course
6. taught a variety of courses – able to teach courses needed by the department

**Research/Scholarship:**

1. faculty members may use impact factors (i.e. average yearly citation rates) to support their publications
2. level of authorship (e.g. first author)

**Service:**

1. development of new practices

The above criteria are guidelines with room for flexibility. Other activities that are not included in the criteria will be considered in merit review. With this criteria system, it is possible for several faculty members to fall in any one of the merit categories.
School Psychology Program  
Merit Criteria  
Listed below are sample items, or behavioral anchors, that serve as performance indicators under the three categories appraised in merit evaluation—teaching, scholarship, and service. Outstanding is suggested by meeting more than one item across all three domains or an exceptional noteworthy achievement in any one area. Very good is recommended of obtaining more than one indicator in at least two domains, whereas Satisfactory is warranted with meeting more than one indicator in one domain.

I. Teaching

- Very good student evaluations in all courses taught
- Recipient of the Eisenheart award
- Very good peer evaluation
- Taught a variety of courses with new preps.
- Served as first reader on several completed theses.
- Served as first reader on several theses.

II. Scholarship

- A book publication
- A major grant funding
- A manuscript accepted for publication in a peer reviewed journal
- A student thesis accepted for publication that you served as first reader
- Paper presentation at a national conference
- Two manuscripts submitted for publication consideration
- A grant submission

III. Service

- Chaired several department committees
- Chaired an Institute wide public event lecture/workshop
- Served on institute committee
- Served on College committee
- Recipient of service award from national organization within the discipline
- Attended all department meetings and functions
- Help coordinate department activities and conferences
- Actively advised student academic progress
- Actively recruited students to the program
Criteria for Merit Review
As Discussed by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology
June 11, 2004

I. Teaching: Satisfactory
Average student evaluations between 3.0 and 3.5.
Commitment to assigned classes
Maintain office hours
Timely return of tests and papers
Course organization: clearly designed objectives, syllabi, handouts, and readings consistent with course description.
Clear and effective communication about the appropriate use of teaching resources
Positive attitude toward students
Mastery of subject matter

II.

III. Teaching: Very Good
Average student evaluations between 3.5 and 4.0.
Must meet all of the criteria for a Satisfactory rating.
The following criteria could contribute toward a Very Good rating:
  Participation in instructional improvement activities
  Peer recognition of teaching ability and commitment to teaching (including guest lectures)
  Ability to teach a wide variety of courses at introductory and upper division levels
  Willingness to expand expertise to meet departmental or college needs

IV.

V. Teaching: Outstanding
Average student evaluations at or above 4.0.
Must meet all of the criteria for a Very Good rating.
The following criteria could contribute toward an Outstanding rating:
  Innovation in course content
  Innovation in teaching methodology
  Development of new courses that meet the needs of majors, minors, and concentrators
  Development of new programs
  Supervision of a senior thesis or senior project
  Teaching independent study courses
  Taking instruction that facilitates communication with diverse student constituencies
  Receipt of teaching awards
VI. Scholarship: Satisfactory
The following criteria would contribute to a Satisfactory rating:
Membership in professional organizations
Attendance at professional meetings, conferences, and other scholarly gatherings
Presentation in RIT seminars and faculty colloquia
Ongoing research agenda

VII. Scholarship: Very Good
The following criteria (in addition to those listed as Satisfactory) would contribute to a Very Good rating:
Participation (as presenter, discussant, chair, or organizer) in professional meetings, conferences, and other scholarly gatherings
Presentation for a community group
Submission of a proposal for an external grant
Presentation at another college or university
Non-refereed publication, whether print or on-line
Invited lectures and/or publication in the proceedings of a national or international conference
Publication of a book review or review of a course text
Conducting a workshop, symposium, or training session
Organization of a departmental conference
Responding to media invitations to provide expert commentary (interviews, op-ed pieces)

VIII. Scholarship: Outstanding
The following criteria (in addition to those listed as Satisfactory and Very Good) would contribute to an Outstanding rating:
Award of an internal or external grant
Publication of a book
Publication of an article in a peer-reviewed journal
Publication of a chapter in a peer-reviewed volume
Serving as officer of a national or international professional organization
Membership on the editorial board of a professional journal
Serving as peer reviewer for a professional journal, publisher, or a granting agency
Receipt of professional achievement awards

IX. Service: Satisfactory
Attendance and participation in departmental and College meetings
Serving on a College or Institute committee
Advising students in the department (majors, minors, and concentrators)

X. Service: Very Good
The following criteria (in addition to those listed as Satisfactory) would contribute to a Very Good rating:
Advisor of a student organization
Advising students in the RIT Exploration, CRP, or other programs

XI. Service: Outstanding
The following criteria (in addition to those listed as Satisfactory and Very Good) would contribute to an Outstanding rating:
Chair of a College or Institute committee
Serving on a major College or Institute committee (such as Institute Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, or a committee pursuing external grants)
Creating a new facility (laboratory, center, partnership)
Serving as department or program chair

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Proposal for Determining Merit, 10/1/04

1) Use the document we drew up on 6/11/04 to determine the rating for each of the three categories of Teaching, Professional Activity and Scholarship, and Service.
2) For each of the three categories, assign 4 points for an Outstanding rating, 3 points for Very Good, 2 points for Satisfactory, and 1 point for Unsatisfactory.
3) Multiply the Teaching points by 3, multiply the Scholarship points by 2, and multiply the Service points by 1.
4) Add up all the points. A total of 20 or above merits an overall rating of Outstanding; 16-19 merits an overall rating of Very Good; 12-15 merits an overall rating of Satisfactory; 0-11 merits an overall rating of Unsatisfactory.
Appendix 1.2

COLA Department Tenure Criteria and Guidelines 2006-2

Department of Communication
College of Liberal Arts
Rochester Institute of Technology
26 October 2005

Tenure Criteria

Each of the three evaluative dimensions (Teaching Effectiveness, Academic and Professional Activities, Service) presented below are sorted in two categories: four or five criteria the Department values most highly followed by a set of criteria that may also be applied to judge a candidate’s suitability for a Departmental recommendation for tenure. In either category, the specific dimensions are designed to be as much evaluative as they are inspirational; the specific dimensions are performance categories for which a tenure applicant might present qualifications.

Teaching Effectiveness

1. course materials
2. peer visitations and evaluations
3. student evaluations
4. advising/directing theses
5. application of pedagogical theory to class designs and experiences

As well as:

- teaching awards (e.g., Eisenhart)
- presentation/publication of materials about teaching
- designing new courses
- copies of student work(s) with instructor comments
- receipt of student Kearse (and similar) Award
- modifications to existing course(s)
- independent studies sponsored/directed
- participation in team teaching
- specialized forms of teaching (e.g., distance or blended learning)
- participating or directing teaching workshops
- presentation of short courses at professional conferences
Academic and Professional Activities

1. significant peer-reviewed published scholarship, singly or as a co-author
2. peer-reviewed conference presentations
3. scholarship in progress
4. preparing a grant/funding proposal

As well as:

- reviewing manuscripts for professional journals/publishers
- editor/editing professional journals and other publications
- public presentation of scholarship
- obtaining a grant/funding for research
- creative works
- currency with one’s discipline; reading professional literature
- consulting activities with corporation or not-for-profit organization

Service: Institute, College, Department or Community

1. participating in Departmental initiatives
2. academic advising
3. membership on and chairing of committees
4. advising student clubs/organizations
5. active participation in professionally related clubs and organizations

As well as:

- membership in clubs, organizations and committees
- leadership in Departmental initiatives
- advising and recruiting efforts
- retention activities and efforts
- awards for service
Criteria Guidelines for
Annual Merit Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

Department of STS/Public Policy
Rochester Institute of Technology

Last Modified: 12 November 2004
Original Date of Document: September 7, 2004
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XII. Introduction

a) Background

This document presents criteria established by the RIT STS/Public Policy Department to help guide decisions related to annual merit review, tenure, and promotion. The document is intended to supplement policies and procedures currently identified in Institute and College policy manuals.

The STS/Public Policy Department is distinctive in that it houses an interdisciplinary faculty, each with multiple professional constituencies. Faculty in the department may have expertise in a variety of areas, including science, engineering, STS, history, anthropology, political science, environmental science, law, and public policy. For example, faculty may demonstrate expertise in technical areas, may do theoretical or applied work, or may concentrate their research in specific contexts (e.g., environmental policy, information policy, historical perspectives of S&T, etc.). For this reason, these criteria guidelines identify a broad range of activities supported within the departmental mission.

b) Faculty Responsibilities

Faculty members in the Department will be dedicated, accomplished, and viable professionals and educators. Faculty members will meet the general responsibilities of a full-time RIT faculty member as defined in the *RIT Policies and Procedures Manual*. Along with these professional responsibilities, faculty will enjoy the privileges and responsibilities of academic freedom and shared governance.

c) Criteria

The Department will use the Institute criteria categories for annual merit evaluations, tenure evaluations, and promotion recommendations. For merit evaluations, which are conducted by the Department Chair per College policy, these criteria should be used by the Chair in conducting the evaluation. Faculty are therefore encouraged to use and refer to the criteria in their annual self-evaluation reports.

Criteria are grouped into the following three categories: (a) teaching, (b) scholarly achievement and professional development, and (c) contributions to the Department, College, and Institute.

d) Flexibility of Guidelines

When developing annual merit evaluations, the Department Chair will use these evaluation guidelines to the maximum extent possible but also recognize that these standards will not capture every activity in which faculty are engaged. The Chair will be open to consideration of faculty activities that are not accounted for in these criteria in the merit review process.
e) Standards for Annual Evaluations

For annual merit evaluations, the Department Chair will evaluate each faculty member and rate that faculty member within each assessment category as: (1) Outstanding; (2) Very Good; (3) Satisfactory; (4) Needs Improvement; or, (5) Unsatisfactory. Ratings are determined by a combination of agreed upon expectations and performance with respect to these expectations. Typically, faculty who exceed expectations in a particular category will receive a VERY GOOD or OUTSTANDING rating. Faculty who meet expectations will receive a SATISFACTORY rating. And faculty who do not meet expectations will receive a NEEDS IMPROVEMENT or UNSATISFACTORY rating. Details on ratings within each category are provided in separate sections of this document.

Once a faculty member has been rated in each category the comprehensive evaluation rating will be determined as follows:

- Points are awarded based on the faculty member’s rating in each category:
  - For each OUTSTANDING rating, the faculty member receives “4” points.
  - For each VERY GOOD rating, the faculty member receives “3” points.
  - For each SATISFACTORY rating, the faculty member receives “2” points.
  - For each NEEDS IMPROVEMENT rating, the faculty member receives “1” point.
  - For each UNSATISFACTORY rating, the faculty member receives no points.

- Total points are added for the three categories and a final ranking is determined as follows:
  - OUTSTANDING: 11 or more points
  - VERY GOOD: 8-10 points
  - SATISFACTORY: 5-7 points
  - NEEDS IMPROVEMENT: 2-4 points
  - UNSATISFACTORY: 0-1 point

- Exception: No faculty can receive a SATISFACTORY evaluation if at least one of their categorical rankings is UNSATISFACTORY.

We emphasize that the criteria in this document represent guidelines. We recognize that exceptions can be made, including the consideration of activities not identified in this document that may nevertheless warrant an outstanding evaluation. In exceptional cases, evaluators may override the point system as long as sufficient rationale is made.

f) Standards for Promotion and Tenure

The Department Chair and faculty will also use these guidelines for tenure and promotion considerations. For the 2004-05 academic year, the guidelines will only be used for annual merit review. However, in the future we expect to include in this document guidance on how evaluators will use these criteria to make tenure and promotion recommendations.

g) Amendment Process

Recommendations regarding changes to these Guidelines may be submitted to the Department Chair. The Chair will raise the recommendations as motions at departmental meetings. Such motions will pass with a two-thirds vote of the Department faculty.
XIII. Teaching Standards

Specific criteria for Teaching are included in College and Institute policy manuals and are adopted here, with some additions, reflecting criteria particularly important in the STS and Public Policy fields. The following details provide information regarding ratings within the Teaching category:

1. To receive a Satisfactory rating for Teaching, a faculty member must demonstrate many of the activities listed below:
   
g) Commitment to assigned classes, e.g. thoroughness of class preparation, suitable grading practices, availability during office hours, and timely return of tests, assignments, and papers.

   h) Course organization, e.g. coverage of the approved course objectives; course content, syllabi, handouts, readings and/or textbook consistent with the approved course description; and course level and rigor consistent with student abilities and Department practice.

   i) Clear and effective communication, with appropriate use of teaching resources.

   j) Keeping course content and methods suitably updated.

   k) Student evaluations of classes over the period of review in the general range of low to mid “3s”; or an increase of at least a half a point in student evaluations from the last time the course was delivered.

   l) Positive efforts on the behalf of your students, as shown by availability outside of class, assistance with student professional development, or jobs/graduate school placement.

2. To receive a Very Good rating for Teaching, a faculty member must meet Satisfactory criteria and also demonstrate some of the activities listed below:

   k) Strongly positive student response to teaching, e.g. student-sponsored teaching awards, student evaluations in the range of high “3s” to low “4s”; or an increase of at least a full point in student evaluations from the last time the course was delivered; or unusually positive alumni comments.

   l) Peer recognition of teaching ability and commitment to teaching, e.g. highly positive reports of peer observation of teaching.

   m) Evidence of instructional vitality, e.g. development of a new course, innovations in course content or methodology, and use of a variety of teaching methods.

   n) Effective teaching in a variety of learning contexts, e.g., lectures, seminars, student research projects, independent studies, discussion groups, field teaching, etc.

   o) Engaging in additional teaching activities outside one’s normal teaching load, e.g., guest lectures, independent studies, etc.

   p) Breadth in teaching expertise, e.g. the ability to teach a variety of subject areas, at the upper and lower levels, courses for different student populations, or between theoretical and applied courses.
q) Professional development through such efforts as participation in workshops, conferences or similar activities devoted primarily to improving teaching methods and course content.

r) Receiving a FEAD grant from the College for course development.

s) Developing and delivering a new course without FEAD grant assistance.

t) Participating in regional and national pedagogical organizations.

3. To receive an Outstanding rating, the individual must meet Very Good rating criteria and also demonstrate some of the achievements listed below:

g) Publication of book chapters, textbooks, or teaching materials for classroom use.

h) Receiving recognition for work in pedagogy, e.g., through RIT or externally sponsored teaching awards.

i) Student evaluations in the range of mid “4s” to 5.0.

j) Presentations and publications on innovations in course content and teaching methodology.

k) Significant leadership demonstrated in the area of teaching, i.e., the ability to initiate and execute constructive curricular change in STS, Public Policy, the College, or RIT.

l) Working with thesis and senior project advising significantly above normal course-loads.

4. A faculty member who does not meet Satisfactory requirements will be rated as Needs Improvement. A faculty member who receives two Needs Improvement ratings in two successive years will receive an Unsatisfactory.

XIV. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Development

Specific criteria for Scholarly Achievement and Professional Development are included in College and Institute policy manuals and are adopted here, with some additions, reflecting criteria particularly important in the STS and Public Policy fields. The following details provide information regarding ratings within this category:

2. A Satisfactory rating requires evidence that the faculty member is continuing to learn and stay abreast of developments within his/her field. The activities listed below are examples of evidence that may be used to support a rating of Satisfactory. An individual is expected to show many of these activities:

i) Membership and participation in national professional meetings, field conferences, and other scholarly gatherings.

j) Research involving students in independent studies, senior projects, MS theses, or the Honors Program.

k) Presenting papers at regional meetings and publishing in non-refereed journals.

l) Demonstration of professional development through such activities as NSF short courses, attending national meetings, etc., or an organized program of self-study in a new area of research.
m) Engaging in unpublished ongoing research.

n) Presentation of faculty seminars and colloquia at RIT.

o) Receiving a Faculty Research Grant from the College.

p) Maintaining professional licensing.

2. To receive a Very Good rating for this category, a faculty member must meet Satisfactory criteria and also demonstrate some of the activities listed below:

p) Invited lectures and/or publication in the proceedings of national or international conference.

q) Publication of book reviews, discussions, and technical reports in one’s professional area(s).

r) Serving as an editorial member of a professional journal.

s) A major effort conducting workshops, symposia, and training sessions in one’s professional area(s).

t) Advising student research projects that lead to presentation or publication in a professional forum.

u) Presentation of papers at national or international professional meetings.

v) Submitting grant proposals for external funding.

w) Receiving a FEAD grant from the College for research-related activities.

x) Engaging in public media activities (e.g., op-eds, interviews, etc.) that demonstrate expertise in one’s field(s).

y) Collaborating in interdisciplinary projects with others outside one’s primary professional area.

z) Conducting professional consulting activities.

aa) Participating on an editorial board for a journal or other publication.

bb) Providing advice to policy makers and others, through invited papers, testimony, or policy formulation.

c) Reviewing proposals for sponsored government, academic, or industry programs.

d) Serving as an officer of a national or international professional organization.

5. To receive an Outstanding rating, the individual must contribute to the advancement of knowledge in the field. An Outstanding rating requires evidence from professionals external to RIT that the individual is recognized for scholarly contributions or professional expertise. The individual must demonstrate some of the achievements listed below:

j) Service as editor of a national or international journal.

k) Receiving a Miller Fellowship from the College for research-related activities.
l) Recipient of an externally sponsored grant, award, or contract, with the understanding that the size and/or quality of the grant, award, or contract justifies outstanding performance.

m) Major publication of research or other scholarly activity in refereed national or international professional journals in one’s professional field(s).

n) Publication of a book in one’s professional field(s).

o) Conducting consulting activities that demonstrate expertise and the advancement of knowledge in one’s professional field(s).

p) Serving as editor of a scholarly volume in one’s professional field(s).

q) Authoring a textbook.

r) Publishing teaching materials that are widely disseminated and used in curricula in one’s professional field(s).

6. A faculty member who does not meet Satisfactory requirements will be rated as Needs Improvement. A faculty member who receives two Needs Improvement ratings in two successive years will receive an Unsatisfactory.

XV. Contributions to the Department, College, and Institute (Service)

Specific criteria for Contributions to the Institute and College are included in College and Institute policy manuals. Here we add contributions to the Department as well. We call this category “Service”.

2. To receive a Satisfactory rating for Service, a faculty member must share in the duties needed for the effective operation of the Department and make contributions to the College and the Institute. To receive a Satisfactory rating, the individual must participate in some of the activities listed below:

f) Actively participating in day-to-day Department and Program activities, with a spirit of professionalism and collegiality.

g) Serving and participating on Departmental or Program committees.

h) Serving as an official faculty advisor to students.

i) Writing letters of recommendation for students upon request and as appropriate.

j) Advising students who are normally not currently in your class on curricular, career, or other matters.

2. To receive a Very Good rating for Service, a faculty member must meet Satisfactory criteria and also demonstrate some of the activities listed below.

h) Serving and participating on College committees.

i) Serving and participating on Institute committees.

j) Participating in student recruitment activities.

k) Initiating or leading important Departmental activities or events.

l) Participating in grant proposals for external funding.
m) Serving as a member of academic senate.

n) Serving on Institute Council.

4. To receive an Outstanding rating, the individual must demonstrate leadership in Service to the Department, College, other RIT programs, or the Institute. The individual must demonstrate some of the activities listed below.

   i) Initiating and carrying out a program which leads to a significant increase in the Department’s or RIT’s resources, or in the Department’s or RIT’s ability to perform its mission.

   j) Engaging in Service leadership within the community.

   k) Making a contribution which applies the resources of the Institute to solving a problem of national or international concern (e.g., running a symposium, workshop, or conference).

   l) Providing extraordinary service to the Department, College, or Institute, where a clear degree of leadership is sustained throughout the period of review.

   m) Serving as faculty advisor to student organizations or serving as a participant or advisor for special student functions.

   n) Providing a major service or serving an important office at the College, Institute, or state level.

   o) Participating on special projects for the Department, College, or Institute.

   p) Providing other services that the Department deems demonstrable of significant leadership contribution.

4. A faculty member who does not meet Satisfactory guidelines will be rated as Needs Improvement. A faculty member who receives two Needs Improvement ratings in a row, will receive an Unsatisfactory.
Economics Department
Rochester Institute of Technology
Merit, Tenure and Promotion Criteria
April 2006

Merit Criteria:

An “Outstanding” rating corresponds with very effective teaching, significant scholarly work, and some service.

September 3, 2004 Department faculty meeting minutes

Link between Merit Criteria and Satisfactory Progress on Tenure Track:

The Economics tenured faculty reiterated its view that tenure-track Economics faculty members should produce an average of one peer-reviewed journal article per year in order to make good progress toward tenure, and that producing such an article each year would fulfill the scholarship criteria for an “Outstanding” merit rating.

September 3, 2004 Economics Department faculty meeting minutes

Tenure Criteria:

The senior faculty reiterated its view that publishing five quality peer-reviewed journal articles (an average of one per year during the five probationary years prior to application for tenure) would fulfill the research expectations for tenure. The senior faculty, however, wished to offer a clarification to the September 3 discussion. While publishing five quality peer-reviewed journal articles should be considered a firm baseline, a candidate who does not achieve this baseline would not automatically be disqualified from tenure consideration. There is some substitutability between publishing refereed journal articles and other scholarship activities, so that each candidate will be evaluated according to the merit of his or her entire research portfolio. However, the marginal rate of substitution between the one or more articles that may be lacking and other accomplishments in one’s portfolio is very hard to quantify. Amit proposed examples of how the tradeoff could be affected by matters such as the quality of the journals in which the candidates’ papers appeared; the number of citations of the papers from sources such as SSCI (Social Science Citation Index); and the contents of the outside tenure letters of recommendation. Since these measures are important but are also, by their nature, relatively harder to synthesize into a “Yes/No” recommendation for tenure, the senior faculty strongly prefers that junior faculty focus on producing five quality refereed journal articles before the tenure evaluation and not plan on needing these additional measures to be evaluated.

September 24, 2005 Economics Department faculty meeting minutes

Criteria for promotion to Associate Professor:
The Economics Department believes that the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor are identical to the criteria for tenure; thus, these decisions should normally be made concurrently.

November 4, 2005 Economics Department faculty meeting minutes.

**Criteria for promotion to (full) Professor:**

The Economics Department expects a candidate for promotion to full Professor will have:

1). at least five more journal articles in reputable, peer-reviewed journals, with an increase in the quality of the articles (compared with those presented in the candidate’s tenure application);
2). evidence that teaching quality is at least as strong as when tenure was granted;
3). and service contributions that are at least as strong as when tenure was granted.

The Economics Department recognizes there is some substitutability between articles, books and book chapters, and this will be taken into account in the department’s decision. It is the department’s expectation that application for promotion to full Professor will occur between five and ten years after promotion to Associate Professor.

November 4, 2005 Economics Department faculty meeting minutes.
Tenure Criteria
Department of Foreign Languages

Very good achievements in all three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service (representative criteria shown below), and making a positive contribution to the Department, warrant tenure as a faculty member of the Department of Foreign Languages.

(1) Teaching

Both first two criteria must be satisfied:
- Very good peer reviews of teaching
- Consistently good student evaluations (while keeping in mind the limitation of the statistics from the small sample -- for example, a couple of students out of eighteen students giving low scores seriously skew the mean value)

In addition to the first two criteria, excellence in teaching demonstrated by (but not limited to):
- Consistent reevaluation of one's courses
- Willingness to develop and teach new courses in response to departmental or institute need
- Development of new teaching materials, which may include technology-based materials
- Willingness to apply new technology to teaching

(2) Scholarship

Consistent output of scholarly work, in English or in a foreign language, demonstrated in the form of (but not limited to) the following. Work may be published in US or abroad. Mediating factors such as teaching load and additional administrative responsibilities should also be considered.
- Conference (regional, national, and international) presentations
- Campus presentations and/or lectures
- Invited lectures
- Articles
- Books
- Translations
- Creative writing
- Textbooks
- Reference books
- Work in progress

(3) Service

Appropriate service participation in (but not limited to):
- Significant advising at all levels
- Departmental committees
- College/institute committees
- Departmental activities
- Extracurricular activities with students such as clubs, film nights, field trips, conversation tables and roundtables
- Collegiality
The Criteria for tenure and promotion in the department of political science are to be guided by fairness and equity that reflect the actual performance of faculty in their quest for tenure and promotion. The normal or expected path will be tenure, promotion to associate professor, promotion to professor. The accomplishments under each of these guidelines for this normal or expected path will be cumulative and appropriate to each level sought. These rank order guidelines, in accord with College and Institute policy are:

1. Teaching
2. Scholarship
3. Service

I. Teaching Effectiveness

“Teaching effectiveness shall be considered the most important criterion in any individual evaluation for tenure and promotion. However, what is "teaching effectiveness" is most difficult to judge and often are not observable until much later in the student's life. Never the less, it is important to identify as general guidelines for faculty classroom effectiveness, some qualities that are understood by faculty and students to be characteristic of good teaching. Within the department of political science, effective teaching will be judged within a variety of teaching styles and techniques and across a broad selection of courses. In this spirit, the following guidelines are not in rank order, nor are any specific numerical weighting assigned.

A. Classroom effectiveness refers to those activities performed in the service of teaching, such as lecturing, testing, grading, and classroom discussions, and various in-class activities.

1) Clear and effective communication of course content, with appropriate use of teaching resources
2) Interest and enthusiasm in subject and ability to generate interest in the student
3) Active and personal interest in the progress of the class, and positive attitude towards students
4) Evaluating and grading students and using fair and professional standards, along with the timely return of tests and papers
5) Use of high quality teaching materials, such as clear, up-to-date syllabi and
course reading materials

B. Interactions with Students refer to the relationship with students out of the classroom to enhance the learning experience at RIT. Typical elements of this teaching dimension include the following:

1) Mentoring Students
2) Maintaining office hours according to college requirements
3) Guiding independent study
4) Active and personal interest in students as evidenced by availability for student advising, assistance with student professional development, or jobs and graduate school placement

C. Course Development and Content Mastery refers to the development of substantive course content and its organization, as well as the descriptive characteristics of the course. Mastery refers to the acquisition of deeper subject matter knowledge in one’s discipline. Typical elements of each include the following:

1) Development/improvement of course content, including the broadening of knowledge associated with the course and consistent reevaluation of course content
2) Development of new courses
3) Development of course materials including syllabi, handouts, and readings

NB. Under these guidelines student course evaluations will be accepted as a general guide to student satisfaction. It will also be recognized that student evaluations may show wide variations from course to course and from year to year.

II. Scholarship

A. Publications generally refer to advancing knowledge in a field through written scholarly publication. Typical elements of this scholarship include the following forms:

1) Books, including scholarly texts, textbooks, edited volumes, monographs and translations
2) Chapter in an edited book
3) Refereed journal article.
4) Reviews of a book or article
5) Non-refereed publications
6) Reprinting of previously published works
7) Reference works, such as dictionary and encyclopedia entries
8) Awards for scholarly contribution

B. Presentations: Typical elements of this scholarship dimension include the following:
1) Presenting a conference paper or poster  
2) Presentations to other colleges or universities  
4) Presentations as part of being chair or discussant on a panel or symposium.  
5) Presenting an invited/keynote lectures

C. Professional development: Typical elements of this scholarship dimension include the following:  
1) Maintaining currency in one’s discipline  
2) Attendance at scholarly presentations/conferences.  
3) Attendance at a workshop to improve scholarly competence (e.g., American Political Science Association “short courses,” National Endowment for the Humanities “seminars”).

III. Service

Service to Department, College, and Institute generally refers to day-to-day activities that are essential to the ongoing operation of the Department, College, and Institute. Typical activities performed by the faculty member outside the classroom includes the following:

- Chairing committees
- Participating on committees (as appointed or elected member)
- Participating in faculty meetings
- Serving as appointed or elected member of Department, College, or Institute post
- Participating on special events organized by Department, College, and Institute
- Having major administrative duties on ad hoc committees, or special assignment
- Attending and participating in Department, College, and Institute functions
- Serving as Department or Program chair
  1) Serving on major (time intensive) standing committees (e.g. College Curriculum Committee)
  2) Executing successfully special assignments on behalf of the Department, College, and Institute

** Adopted in whole or in part with modifications from “Preliminary Report of the Standards for Professional Development Committee”**
Psychology Department Criteria for Tenure (Revised 10/17/05)

The following standards are offered as tenure guidelines for members of the Department of Psychology.

1. Relative weighting of Performance Components. When considering the three traditional areas of performance—teaching, scholarship, and service—teaching should generally be weighted more heavily than scholarship, and service should not be weighted heavily. The rationale behind this: First, RIT and the Department of Psychology place primary value upon teaching, and a close secondary value upon scholarship. Tenure criteria should reflect these values. Second, though service is also valued in the Institute and Department, time-consuming types of service may interfere with junior faculty’s primary goal in their early years at RIT: establishing themselves as exemplary teachers and scholars.

2. Yearly merit & tenure evaluations. Yearly merit & tenure evaluations during the probationary period (usually five years) preceding the tenure decision should generally be good or outstanding.

3. Teaching. The average teaching evaluation scores for all courses taught should be good or above. Other indicators of teaching excellence may include involvement with students, student learning/success, evidence of instructional mastery/development/innovation, and peer evaluations.

4. Scholarship. Scholarship should generally consist of several academic publications, some of which were published while at RIT. Better quality publications—often those that are peer-reviewed with high rejection rates, high citation impact ratings, and/or are generally considered to be of good quality—are afforded more weight. Some of these publications should be first-authored. An example of a record of scholarship that would generally be considered as sufficient would consist of five publications in peer reviewed journals, three of which were first-authored by the candidate. Other indicators of excellence in scholarship may include academic conference presentations, service in one’s disciplinary body, and efforts at writing grant proposals.

5. Service. A record of some service is important, but time-consuming service activities at the College or Institute level for untenured faculty are not encouraged. However, contributions at the Department level (e.g., meeting attendance, committee participation, fulfillment of departmental needs) are required.
School Psychology Program
Tenure and Promotion
The School Psychology faculty unanimously agreed that the criteria for tenure and promotion to be that of a candidate earning a merit rating of very good or outstanding for five consecutive years. Criteria for merit consideration are listed below. Further, the school psychology faculty agreed that both tenure and promotion be considered simultaneously.

School Psychology Program
Merit Criteria
Listed below are sample items, or behavioral anchors, that serve as performance indicators under the three categories appraised in merit evaluation—teaching, scholarship, and service. Outstanding is suggested by meeting more than one item across all three domains or an exceptional noteworthy achievement in any one area. Very good is recommended of obtaining more than one indicator in at least two domains, whereas Satisfactory is warranted with meeting more than one indicator in one domain.

I. Teaching

- Very good student evaluations in all courses taught
- Recipient of the Eisenheart award
- Very good peer evaluation
- Taught a variety of courses with new preps.
- Served as first reader on several completed theses.
- Served as first reader on several theses.

II. Scholarship

- A book publication
- A major grant funding
- A manuscript accepted for publication in a peer reviewed journal
- A student thesis accepted for publication that you served as first reader
- Paper presentation at a national conference
- Two manuscripts submitted for publication consideration
- A grant submission

III. Service

- Chaired several department committees
- Chaired an Institute wide public event lecture/workshop
- Served on institute committee
- Served on College committee
- Recipient of service award from national organization within the discipline
- Attended all department meetings and functions
- Help coordinate department activities and conferences
- Actively advised student academic progress
- Actively recruited students to the program
Two overarching principles shape our tenure guidelines. The first is that the service of academia is to the development of the public good. Both this goal and the means to achieve it, however, elude precise measurement. Attempts to do so, such as a certain number of published articles or an overall score on the student evaluation, do not necessarily serve to indicate how well we attain that goal, or if we attain it at all. It may instead result in specious exactitude. This does not mean we cannot devise measurable standards. We believe it means that no one measurement can serve as a ritualized “magic number.” Instead, we accept that our guidelines will be imprecise and that sound assessment of our peers for tenure requires consideration of numerous alternative indicators, alone or in combination.

The second principle is that RIT is first and foremost a teaching institution. While the Institute Strategic Plan calls for greater emphasis on scholarship, this scholarship is to be in the service of teaching. Thus, we assert that teaching must be the central factor in our assessments for both tenure and promotion.

I. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

The work of sociology and anthropology professors in a university whose primary mission is teaching involves developing minds. In particular, it involves nurturing in students the ability to identify and assess the strong influences of social forces, like culture and groups. The anthropologists and sociologists our College should retain and promote are those who demonstrate continued dedication to seeking out and employing the best methods of nurturing minds in those ways. In addition, this nurturing is accomplished outside of the classroom, such as in new course development, Institute conferences and special panels on topical issues, or in the form of advising for courses and for student clubs. Traditional student evaluations are not well suited to assess such accomplishments. As the Commission on Tenure in Higher Education (1973:38; here on, the Commission) stated:

There is ... proper doubt of the value of ratings expressed in numbers carried to two or three decimal places. The teaching process does not lend itself to that sort of quantification. The important parts of the teaching process that do not occur in the classroom—course planning, preparation of study materials, development of assignments, examinations—must not be neglected in evaluations...
Thus, the quality of teaching can be demonstrated in:

1) classroom instruction, including careful presentation of course material and effectiveness of presentation

2) academic advising

3) stimulation of high-quality student work

4) integration of research in the classroom

5) revision of courses to keep them updated

6) optional peer reviews

7) development of new courses and teaching of a variety of courses

8) guest presentations

9) defining educational objectives and developing teaching and evaluative materials reflecting current scholarship in the discipline

10) application of innovative teaching methods

II. ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

The subject and nature of scholarly work are to be judged by peers in the field. But, the quality of work must nevertheless be considered. Guidelines based only on the quantity of scholarship completed are fundamentally flawed because “magic numbers” of publications may be deficient in the kind of quality that serves the goals of our Department, College and Institute, or that addresses social problems and helps create a better society. The scholarly work of sociologists and anthropologists, moreover, is unique in that it studies human thought and behavior. Working with human subjects requires a great amount of time. Thus, average annual quotas are not appropriate for these circumstances. They neglect both the time demands and the quality issues that truly worthwhile scholarship entails. As the Commission (39) stated:

Evaluation too often stresses quantity rather than quality.

Review committees are impressed by the number of publications rather than by their significance. Extrinsic signs such as the general reputation of journals or publishers are often substituted for a positive assessment of the work itself.

Nontenured members of faculties, believing that largely quantitative tests of publication prevail, lose confidence in the evaluation process and are often prompted to undertake quick projects that will expand their bibliographies, rather than to work on more difficult or more long-term problems.
Thus, evidence of academic and professional activities includes selective attainment in the areas outlined below:

1) publications of significance and quality (e.g., three articles or a book)

2) research in progress

3) participation in conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings (e.g., presenting papers or posters, holding office, serving on committees or on executive boards, organizing a panel or serving as a discussant)

4) serving as peer reviewer for a professional journal, publisher, or a granting agency, or serving on an editorial board of a journal

5) attendance at conferences, conventions, seminars, and professional meetings

6) professional consultation

7) recognition of scholarship, such as special awards, scholarly citations, and the re-publication of work

8) submission of grant or fellowship proposals or award of grant or fellowship

III. CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE INSTITUTE, COLLEGE, DEPARTMENT AND COMMUNITY

Effective “academic citizenship” is a sound standard for tenure. Effective academic citizens maintain the core values of the Institute, College and Department (i.e., learning, scholarship and good governance), and, moreover, hold these groups to these core values. Committee work is a common expression of academic citizenship, and such committee work must not be an end in itself but a means of maintaining the wider Institute mission and the wider common good. But, other means of academic citizenship include service to the community and out-of-class learning opportunities. As the Commission (40-41) states:

A college or university is neither a mere collectivity of members nor an assortment of committee members and would-be administrators. Full academic citizenship includes the individual’s capacity for stimulating colleagues and students beyond the confines of classroom and laboratory, his or her ability to initiate and assist in the development of new educational programs, and his or her capacity for serious and responsible participation in institutional governance. Evidences of academic citizenship of this sort
should be sought by those responsible for recommendations on tenure.

Thus, evidence of effective service should include selective attainment in the areas outlined below:

1) Institute or College administration and committees or activities

2) departmental administration and curriculum, personnel, and policy committees or activities

3) program initiation and development

4) academic or service contributions to community organizations, either as an individual or as a representative of the Institute.

Reference

Department of Communication
College of Liberal Arts
Rochester Institute of Technology
26 October 2005

Promotion Criteria

Each of the three evaluative dimensions (Teaching Effectiveness, Academic and Professional Activities, Service) presented below are sorted in two categories: four or five criteria the Department values most highly followed by a set of criteria that may also be applied to judge a candidate’s suitability for a Departmental recommendation for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, identical criteria will be applied with the added expectation that the candidate can demonstrate substantial contributions beyond the previous promotion. In either category, the specific dimensions are designed to be as much evaluative as they are inspirational; the specific dimensions are performance categories for which a tenure applicant might present qualifications.

Teaching Effectiveness

1. course materials
2. peer visitations and evaluations
3. student evaluations
4. advising/directing theses
5. application of pedagogical theory to class designs and experiences

As well as:

- teaching awards (e.g., Eisenhart)
- presentation/publication of materials about teaching
- designing new courses
- copies of student work(s) with instructor comments
- receipt of student Kearse (and similar) Award
- modifications to existing course(s)
- independent studies sponsored/directed
- participation in team teaching
- specialized forms of teaching (e.g., distance or blended learning)
- participating or directing teaching workshops
- presentation of short courses at professional conferences

**Academic and Professional Activities**

1. significant peer-reviewed published scholarship, singly or as a co-author
2. peer-reviewed conference presentations
3. scholarship in progress
4. preparing a grant/funding proposal

As well as:

- reviewing manuscripts for professional journals/publishers
- editor/editing professional journals and other publications
- public presentation of scholarship
- obtaining a grant/funding for research
- creative works
- currency with one’s discipline; reading professional literature
- consulting activities with corporation or not-for-profit organization

**Service: Institute, College, Department or Community**

1. participating in Departmental initiatives
2. academic advising
3. membership on and chairing of committees
4. advising student clubs/organizations
5. active participation in professionally related clubs and organizations

As well as:

- membership in clubs, organizations and committees
- leadership in Departmental initiatives
- advising and recruiting efforts
- retention activities and efforts
- awards for service
Criteria Guidelines for
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XVI. Introduction

a) Background

This document presents criteria established by the RIT STS/Public Policy Department to help guide decisions related to annual merit review, tenure, and promotion. The document is intended to supplement policies and procedures currently identified in Institute and College policy manuals.

The STS/Public Policy Department is distinctive in that it houses an interdisciplinary faculty, each with multiple professional constituencies. Faculty in the department may have expertise in a variety of areas, including science, engineering, STS, history, anthropology, political science, environmental science, law, and public policy. For example, faculty may demonstrate expertise in technical areas, may do theoretical or applied work, or may concentrate their research in specific contexts (e.g., environmental policy, information policy, historical perspectives of S&T, etc.). For this reason, these criteria guidelines identify a broad range of activities supported within the departmental mission.

b) Faculty Responsibilities

Faculty members in the Department will be dedicated, accomplished, and viable professionals and educators. Faculty members will meet the general responsibilities of a full-time RIT faculty member as defined in the RIT Policies and Procedures Manual. Along with these professional responsibilities, faculty will enjoy the privileges and responsibilities of academic freedom and shared governance.

c) Criteria

The Department will use the Institute criteria categories for annual merit evaluations, tenure evaluations, and promotion recommendations. For merit evaluations, which are conducted by the Department Chair per College policy, these criteria should be used by the Chair in conducting the evaluation. Faculty are therefore encouraged to use and refer to the criteria in their annual self-evaluation reports.

Criteria are grouped into the following three categories: (a) teaching, (b) scholarly achievement and professional development, and (c) contributions to the Department, College, and Institute.

d) Flexibility of Guidelines

When developing annual merit evaluations, the Department Chair will use these evaluation guidelines to the maximum extent possible but also recognize that these standards will not capture every activity in which faculty are engaged. The Chair will be open to consideration of faculty activities that are not accounted for in these criteria in the merit review process.
Standards for Annual Evaluations

For annual merit evaluations, the Department Chair will evaluate each faculty member and rate that faculty member within each assessment category as: (1) Outstanding; (2) Very Good; (3) Satisfactory; (4) Needs Improvement; or, (5) Unsatisfactory. Ratings are determined by a combination of agreed upon expectations and performance with respect to these expectations. Typically, faculty who exceed expectations in a particular category will receive a VERY GOOD or OUTSTANDING rating. Faculty who meet expectations will receive a SATISFACTORY rating. And faculty who do not meet expectations will receive a NEEDS IMPROVEMENT or UNSATISFACTORY rating. Details on ratings within each category are provided in separate sections of this document.

Once a faculty member has been rated in each category the comprehensive evaluation rating will be determined as follows:

- Points are awarded based on the faculty member’s rating in each category:
  - For each OUTSTANDING rating, the faculty member receives “4” points.
  - For each VERY GOOD rating, the faculty member receives “3” points.
  - For each SATISFACTORY rating, the faculty member receives “2” points.
  - For each NEEDS IMPROVEMENT rating, the faculty member receives “1” point.
  - For each UNSATISFACTORY rating, the faculty member receives no points.

- Total points are added for the three categories and a final ranking is determined as follows:
  - OUTSTANDING: 11 or more points
  - VERY GOOD: 8-10 points
  - SATISFACTORY: 5-7 points
  - NEEDS IMPROVEMENT: 2-4 points
  - UNSATISFACTORY: 0-1 point

- Exception: No faculty can receive a SATISFACTORY evaluation if at least one of their categorical rankings is UNSATISFACTORY.

We emphasize that the criteria in this document represent guidelines. We recognize that exceptions can be made, including the consideration of activities not identified in this document that may nevertheless warrant an outstanding evaluation. In exceptional cases, evaluators may override the point system as long as sufficient rationale is made.

Standards for Promotion and Tenure

The Department Chair and faculty will also use these guidelines for tenure and promotion considerations. For the 2004-05 academic year, the guidelines will only be used for annual merit review. However, in the future we expect to include in this document guidance on how evaluators will use these criteria to make tenure and promotion recommendations.

Amendment Process

Recommendations regarding changes to these Guidelines may be submitted to the Department Chair. The Chair will raise the recommendations as motions at departmental meetings. Such motions will pass with a two-thirds vote of the Department faculty.
XVII. Teaching Standards

Specific criteria for Teaching are included in College and Institute policy manuals and are adopted here, with some additions, reflecting criteria particularly important in the STS and Public Policy fields. The following details provide information regarding ratings within the Teaching category:

1. To receive a Satisfactory rating for Teaching, a faculty member must demonstrate many of the activities listed below:

   m) Commitment to assigned classes, e.g. thoroughness of class preparation, suitable grading practices, availability during office hours, and timely return of tests, assignments, and papers.

   n) Course organization, e.g. coverage of the approved course objectives; course content, syllabi, handouts, readings and/or textbook consistent with the approved course description; and course level and rigor consistent with student abilities and Department practice.

   o) Clear and effective communication, with appropriate use of teaching resources.

   p) Keeping course content and methods suitably updated.

   q) Student evaluations of classes over the period of review in the general range of low to mid “3s”; or an increase of at least a half a point in student evaluations from the last time the course was delivered.

   r) Positive efforts on the behalf of your students, as shown by availability outside of class, assistance with student professional development, or jobs/graduate school placement.

2. To receive a Very Good rating for Teaching, a faculty member must meet Satisfactory criteria and also demonstrate some of the activities listed below:

   u) Strongly positive student response to teaching, e.g. student-sponsored teaching awards, student evaluations in the range of high “3s” to low “4s”; or an increase of at least a full point in student evaluations from the last time the course was delivered; or unusually positive alumni comments.

   v) Peer recognition of teaching ability and commitment to teaching, e.g. highly positive reports of peer observation of teaching.

   w) Evidence of instructional vitality, e.g. development of a new course, innovations in course content or methodology, and use of a variety of teaching methods.

   x) Effective teaching in a variety of learning contexts, e.g., lectures, seminars, student research projects, independent studies, discussion groups, field teaching, etc.

   y) Engaging in additional teaching activities outside one’s normal teaching load, e.g., guest lectures, independent studies, etc.

   z) Breadth in teaching expertise, e.g. the ability to teach a variety of subject areas, at the upper and lower levels, courses for different student populations, or between theoretical and applied courses.
aa) Professional development through such efforts as participation in workshops, conferences or similar activities devoted primarily to improving teaching methods and course content.

bb) Receiving a FEAD grant from the College for course development.

c) Developing and delivering a new course without FEAD grant assistance.

d) Participating in regional and national pedagogical organizations.

3. To receive an Outstanding rating, the individual must meet Very Good rating criteria and also demonstrate some of the achievements listed below:

m) Publication of book chapters, textbooks, or teaching materials for classroom use.

n) Receiving recognition for work in pedagogy, e.g., through RIT or externally sponsored teaching awards.

o) Student evaluations in the range of mid “4s” to 5.0.

p) Presentations and publications on innovations in course content and teaching methodology.

q) Significant leadership demonstrated in the area of teaching, i.e., the ability to initiate and execute constructive curricular change in STS, Public Policy, the College, or RIT.

r) Working with thesis and senior project advising significantly above normal course-loads.

4. A faculty member who does not meet Satisfactory requirements will be rated as Needs Improvement. A faculty member who receives two Needs Improvement ratings in two successive years will receive an Unsatisfactory.

XVIII. Scholarly Achievement and Professional Development

Specific criteria for Scholarly Achievement and Professional Development are included in College and Institute policy manuals and are adopted here, with some additions, reflecting criteria particularly important in the STS and Public Policy fields. The following details provide information regarding ratings within this category:

3. A Satisfactory rating requires evidence that the faculty member is continuing to learn and stay abreast of developments within his/her field. The activities listed below are examples of evidence that may be used to support a rating of Satisfactory. An individual is expected to show many of these activities:

q) Membership and participation in national professional meetings, field conferences, and other scholarly gatherings.

r) Research involving students in independent studies, senior projects, MS theses, or the Honors Program.

s) Presenting papers at regional meetings and publishing in non-refereed journals.

t) Demonstration of professional development through such activities as NSF short courses, attending national meetings, etc., or an organized program of self-study in a new area of research.
u) Engaging in unpublished ongoing research.
v) Presentation of faculty seminars and colloquia at RIT.
w) Receiving a Faculty Research Grant from the College.
x) Maintaining professional licensing.

2. To receive a Very Good rating for this category, a faculty member must meet Satisfactory criteria and also demonstrate some of the activities listed below:

   ee) Invited lectures and/or publication in the proceedings of national or international conference.
   ff) Publication of book reviews, discussions, and technical reports in one’s professional area(s).
   gg) Serving as an editorial member of a professional journal.
   hh) A major effort conducting workshops, symposia, and training sessions in one’s professional area(s).
   ii) Advising student research projects that lead to presentation or publication in a professional forum.
   jj) Presentation of papers at national or international professional meetings.
   kk) Submitting grant proposals for external funding.
   ll) Receiving a FEAD grant from the College for research-related activities.
   mm) Engaging in public media activities (e.g., op-eds, interviews, etc.) that demonstrate expertise in one’s field(s).
   nn) Collaborating in interdisciplinary projects with others outside one’s primary professional area.
   oo) Conducting professional consulting activities.
   pp) Participating on an editorial board for a journal or other publication.
   qq) Providing advice to policy makers and others, through invited papers, testimony, or policy formulation.
   rr) Reviewing proposals for sponsored government, academic, or industry programs.
   ss) Serving as an officer of a national or international professional organization.

7. To receive an Outstanding rating, the individual must contribute to the advancement of knowledge in the field. An Outstanding rating requires evidence from professionals external to RIT that the individual is recognized for scholarly contributions or professional expertise. The individual must demonstrate some of the achievements listed below:

   s) Service as editor of a national or international journal.
   t) Receiving a Miller Fellowship from the College for research-related activities.
u) Recipient of an externally sponsored grant, award, or contract, with the understanding that the size and/or quality of the grant, award, or contract justifies outstanding performance.

v) Major publication of research or other scholarly activity in refereed national or international professional journals in one’s professional field(s).

w) Publication of a book in one’s professional field(s).

x) Conducting consulting activities that demonstrate expertise and the advancement of knowledge in one’s professional field(s).

y) Serving as editor of a scholarly volume in one’s professional field(s).

z) Authoring a textbook.

aa) Publishing teaching materials that are widely disseminated and used in curricula in one’s professional field(s).

8. A faculty member who does not meet Satisfactory requirements will be rated as Needs Improvement. A faculty member who receives two Needs Improvement ratings in two successive years will receive an Unsatisfactory.

XIX. Contributions to the Department, College, and Institute (Service)

Specific criteria for Contributions to the Institute and College are included in College and Institute policy manuals. Here we add contributions to the Department as well. We call this category “Service”.

3. To receive a Satisfactory rating for Service, a faculty member must share in the duties needed for the effective operation of the Department and make contributions to the College and the Institute. To receive a Satisfactory rating, the individual must participate in some of the activities listed below:

k) Actively participating in day-to-day Department and Program activities, with a spirit of professionalism and collegiality.

l) Serving and participating on Departmental or Program committees.

m) Serving as an official faculty advisor to students.

n) Writing letters of recommendation for students upon request and as appropriate.

o) Advising students who are normally not currently in your class on curricular, career, or other matters.

2. To receive a Very Good rating for Service, a faculty member must meet Satisfactory criteria and also demonstrate some of the activities listed below.

o) Serving and participating on College committees.

p) Serving and participating on Institute committees.

q) Participating in student recruitment activities.

r) Initiating or leading important Departmental activities or events.

s) Participating in grant proposals for external funding.
t) Serving as a member of academic senate.

u) Serving on Institute Council.

5. To receive an Outstanding rating, the individual must demonstrate leadership in Service to the Department, College, other RIT programs, or the Institute. The individual must demonstrate some of the activities listed below.

q) Initiating and carrying out a program which leads to a significant increase in the Department’s or RIT’s resources, or in the Department’s or RIT’s ability to perform its mission.

r) Engaging in Service leadership within the community.

s) Making a contribution which applies the resources of the Institute to solving a problem of national or international concern (e.g., running a symposium, workshop, or conference).

t) Providing extraordinary service to the Department, College, or Institute, where a clear degree of leadership is sustained throughout the period of review.

u) Serving as faculty advisor to student organizations or serving as a participant or advisor for special student functions.

v) Providing a major service or serving an important office at the College, Institute, or state level.

w) Participating on special projects for the Department, College, or Institute.

x) Providing other services that the Department deems demonstrable of significant leadership contribution.

4. A faculty member who does not meet Satisfactory guidelines will be rated as Needs Improvement. A faculty member who receives two Needs Improvement ratings in a row, will receive an Unsatisfactory.
Economics Department
Rochester Institute of Technology
Merit, Tenure and Promotion Criteria
April 2006

Merit Criteria:

An “Outstanding” rating corresponds with very effective teaching, significant scholarly work, and some service.

September 3, 2004 Department faculty meeting minutes

Link between Merit Criteria and Satisfactory Progress on Tenure Track:

The Economics tenured faculty reiterated its view that tenure-track Economics faculty members should produce an average of one peer-reviewed journal article per year in order to make good progress toward tenure, and that producing such an article each year would fulfill the scholarship criteria for an “Outstanding” merit rating.

September 3, 2004 Economics Department faculty meeting minutes

Tenure Criteria:

The senior faculty reiterated its view that publishing five quality peer-reviewed journal articles (an average of one per year during the five probationary years prior to application for tenure) would fulfill the research expectations for tenure. The senior faculty, however, wished to offer a clarification to the September 3 discussion. While publishing five quality peer-reviewed journal articles should be considered a firm baseline, a candidate who does not achieve this baseline would not automatically be disqualified from tenure consideration. There is some substitutability between publishing refereed journal articles and other scholarship activities, so that each candidate will be evaluated according to the merit of his or her entire research portfolio. However, the marginal rate of substitution between the one or more articles that may be lacking and other accomplishments in one’s portfolio is very hard to quantify. Amit proposed examples of how the tradeoff could be affected by matters such as the quality of the journals in which the candidates’ papers appeared; the number of citations of the papers from sources such as SSCI (Social Science Citation Index); and the contents of the outside tenure letters of recommendation. Since these measures are important but are also, by their nature, relatively harder to synthesize into a “Yes/No” recommendation for tenure, the senior faculty strongly prefers that junior faculty focus on producing five quality refereed journal articles before the tenure evaluation and not plan on needing these additional measures to be evaluated.

September 24, 2005 Economics Department faculty meeting minutes

Criteria for promotion to Associate Professor:
The Economics Department believes that the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor are identical to the criteria for tenure; thus, these decisions should normally be made concurrently.

November 4, 2005 Economics Department faculty meeting minutes.

**Criteria for promotion to (full) Professor:**

The Economics Department expects a candidate for promotion to full Professor will have:

1). at least five more journal articles in reputable, peer-reviewed journals, with an increase in the quality of the articles (compared with those presented in the candidate’s tenure application);
2). evidence that teaching quality is at least as strong as when tenure was granted;
3). and service contributions that are at least as strong as when tenure was granted.

The Economics Department recognizes there is some substitutability between articles, books and book chapters, and this will be taken into account in the department’s decision. It is the department’s expectation that application for promotion to full Professor will occur between five and ten years after promotion to Associate Professor.

November 4, 2005 Economics Department faculty meeting minutes.
Promotion Criteria from the Department of English  
November 18, 2005

The English Department supports COLA policies on promotion. Further, guidelines for promotion in the department reflect specified tenure guidelines submitted to the Dean on October 28, 2005. In addition, we recommend the following:

An individual holding the rank of Assistant Professor who is eligible to be considered for tenure will be simultaneously considered for promotion to Associate Professor. The granting of tenure will, therefore, mean promotion to Associate Professor.

Rationale:

- The standards of teaching, research, and service have been elevated, and now deserve recognition by both tenure and promotion.

- This would bring COLA closer to the received norms of comparable departments and institutions in the United States.

- This would benefit faculty recruitment, retention, and morale.

- This would give faculty the opportunity to apply for research awards and fellowships, as well as PI status on grants with outside funding that require “associate” rank.

Further, we recognize that promotion from Associate Professor to Professor involves excellent teaching, service, and a demonstrated commitment to scholarship in the form of publications, involvement in professional organizations, and recognition by peers in the field.
The Criteria for tenure and promotion in the department of political science are to be guided by fairness and equity that reflect the actual performance of faculty in their quest for tenure and promotion. The normal or expected path will be tenure, promotion to associate professor, promotion to professor. The accomplishments under each of these guidelines for this normal or expected path will be cumulative and appropriate to each level sought. These rank order guidelines, in accord with College and Institute policy are:

4. Teaching
5. Scholarship
6. Service

I. Teaching Effectiveness

“Teaching effectiveness shall be considered the most important criterion in any individual evaluation for tenure and promotion. However, what is "teaching effectiveness" is most difficult to judge and often are not observable until much later in the student's life. Never the less, it is important to identify as general guidelines for faculty classroom effectiveness, some qualities that are understood by faculty and students to be characteristic of good teaching. Within the department of political science, effective teaching will be judged within a variety of teaching styles and techniques and across a broad selection of courses. In this spirit, the following guidelines are not in rank order, nor are any specific numerical weighting assigned.

A. Classroom effectiveness refers to those activities performed in the service of teaching, such as lecturing, testing, grading, and classroom discussions, and various in-class activities.

1) Clear and effective communication of course content, with appropriate use of teaching resources
2) Interest and enthusiasm in subject and ability to generate interest in the student
3) Active and personal interest in the progress of the class, and positive attitude towards students
4) Evaluating and grading students and using fair and professional standards, along with the timely return of tests and papers
5) Use of high quality teaching materials, such as clear, up-to-date syllabi and course reading materials
B. Interactions with Students refer to the relationship with students out of the classroom to enhance the learning experience at RIT. Typical elements of this teaching dimension include the following:

1) Mentoring Students
2) Maintaining office hours according to college requirements
3) Guiding independent study
4) Active and personal interest in students as evidenced by availability for student advising, assistance with student professional development, or jobs and graduate school placement

C. Course Development and Content Mastery refers to the development of substantive course content and its organization, as well as the descriptive characteristics of the course. Mastery refers to the acquisition of deeper subject matter knowledge in one’s discipline. Typical elements of each include the following:

1) Development/improvement of course content, including the broadening of knowledge associated with the course and consistent reevaluation of course content
2) Development of new courses
3) Development of course materials including syllabi, handouts, and readings

**NB.** Under these guidelines student course evaluations will be accepted as a general guide to student satisfaction. It will also be recognized that student evaluations may show wide variations from course to course and from year to year.

II. Scholarship

A. Publications generally refer to advancing knowledge in a field through written scholarly publication. Typical elements of this scholarship include the following forms:

2) Books, including scholarly texts, textbooks, edited volumes, monographs and translations
2) Chapter in an edited book
3) Refereed journal article.
4) Reviews of a book or article
5) Non-refereed publications
6) Reprinting of previously published works
7) Reference works, such as dictionary and encyclopedia entries
8) Awards for scholarly contribution

B. Presentations: Typical elements of this scholarship dimension include the following:

1) Presenting a conference paper or poster
2) Presentations to other colleges or universities
4) Presentations as part of being chair or discussant on a panel or symposium.
5) Presenting an invited/keynote lectures

C. Professional development: Typical elements of this scholarship dimension include the following:
   1) Maintaining currency in one’s discipline
   2) Attendance at scholarly presentations/conferences.
   3) Attendance at a workshop to improve scholarly competence (e.g., American Political Science Association “short courses,” National Endowment for the Humanities “seminars”).

III. Service

Service to Department, College, and Institute generally refers to day-to-day activities that are essential to the ongoing operation of the Department, College, and Institute. Typical activities performed by the faculty member outside the classroom includes the following:

• Chairing committees
• Participating on committees (as appointed or elected member)
• Participating in faculty meetings
• Serving as appointed or elected member of Department, College, or Institute post
• Participating on special events organized by Department, College, and Institute
• Having major administrative duties on ad hoc committees, or special assignment
• Attending and participating in Department, College, and Institute functions
• Serving as Department or Program chair
• Serving on major (time intensive) standing committees (e.g. College Curriculum Committee)
• Executing successfully special assignments on behalf of the Department, College, and Institute

** Adopted in whole or in part with modifications from “Preliminary Report of the Standards for Professional Development Committee”**
Revised Promotion Criteria
Department of Psychology

The general sentiment was that promotion to Associate Professor will require the demonstration of competencies similar to those required for tenure. These include becoming established as a researcher, demonstrated teaching competence, and service to the department.

Promotion to Full Professor is contingent on demonstrating excellence in Teaching, Scholarship and Service. Discussion centered on the idea that we were establishing guidelines for individuals to consider before applying for promotion to Full Professor.

Scholarship
It is expected that applicants for Full Professor will demonstrate significant contributions in their field of study. This would include being expert and established in the field of study. In part, this contribution would be documented in the content of a minimum of three letters from external referees.

These contributions to the field of study may be demonstrated in many different ways, including:
- A minimum of five first authored peer-reviewed publications after promotion to Associate (although order of authorship would not be the only consideration for publications in that authorship also relates to Principal Investigator type activity)
- Citation counts.
- Based on factors such as the impact rating of the publications.
- Editing a journal.
- Serving the discipline in some way such as acting as president of an academic organization
- Based on research advisee output, measured by their academic success and quality of placement post-graduation.
- Success in obtaining external funding.
- Professional awards
- Other recognition in one’s field of study

Teaching
It is expected that applicants for Full Professor will demonstrate teaching excellence. This may be demonstrated in a number of ways, including:
- Above average student evaluations
- Teaching award(s)
- Student publications (including coauthoring papers with students).
- Teaching innovations
- Professional development related to teaching.
- Conducting teaching workshops.

Service
Full Professor candidates will demonstrate excellence in service. This includes service to the Department of Psychology, Service to the College of Liberal Arts, and service to the Institute as a whole. This includes Agenda for Action items, Community Professional Activities, and service on committees at all levels of the institute.
School Psychology Program  
Tenure and Promotion

The School Psychology faculty unanimously agreed that the criteria for tenure and promotion to be that of a candidate earning a merit rating of very good or outstanding for five consecutive years. Criteria for merit consideration are listed below. Further, the school psychology faculty agreed that both tenure and promotion be considered simultaneously.

School Psychology Program  
Merit Criteria

Listed below are sample items, or behavioral anchors, that serve as performance indicators under the three categories appraised in merit evaluation—teaching, scholarship, and service. **Outstanding** is suggested by meeting more than one item across all three domains or an exceptional noteworthy achievement in any one area. **Very good** is recommended of obtaining more than one indicator in at least two domains, whereas **Satisfactory** is warranted with meeting more than one indicator in one domain.

I.  **Teaching**

- Very good student evaluations in all courses taught
- Recipient of the Eisenheart award
- Very good peer evaluation
- Taught a variety of courses with new preps.
- Served as first reader on several completed theses.
- Served as first reader on several theses.

II.  **Scholarship**

- A book publication
- A major grant funding
- A manuscript accepted for publication in a peer reviewed journal
- A student thesis accepted for publication that you served as first reader
- Paper presentation at a national conference
- Two manuscripts submitted for publication consideration
- A grant submission

III.  **Service**

- Chaired several department committees
- Chaired an Institute wide public event lecture/workshop
- Served on institute committee
- Served on College committee
- Recipient of service award from national organization within the discipline
- Attended all department meetings and functions
- Help coordinate department activities and conferences
- Actively advised student academic progress
- Actively recruited students to the program
GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION
Department of SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

I. Associate Professor

The College’s current practice of separating the review processes for tenure and promotion should be changed so that promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is conferred simultaneously with the award of tenure. There are several reasons for this.

For the candidate, there is unnecessary duplication of documents. The criteria for promotion established by the College and Institute are identical to those for tenure. They are also identical to those in the annual merit review process.

For the College faculty, the two separate processes entail unnecessary extra committee work.

Thus:

A. The rank of Associate Professor is achieved at the same time tenure is conferred, and will take effect at the same time tenure is effective.

B. The Tenure Committee and the Promotion Committee are to be combined into the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Tenure and Promotion Committee is charged with reviewing candidates for tenure and promotion.

C. Tenured Assistant Professors (i.e., those who received tenure under the current practice) shall be granted the rank of Associate Professor.

II. Associate Professor to Professor

The continued excellence in teaching, research and service after the receipt of tenure will be applied to the faculty member’s consideration of promotion to Professor.

A. Teaching Effectiveness

1. high degree of teaching excellence in the elements of teaching effectiveness outlined in the Department’s guidelines for tenure

B. Scholarship

1. continued scholarly activities of the kind outlined in the Department’s guidelines for tenure, as demonstrated by selective attainment in these areas:

   a. five or more publications of significance or a book published by a reputable press

C. Service

1. continued service to the Department, College, Institute and Community as outlined in the Department’s guidelines for tenure
Appendix 2: Review summaries of academic literature


This article raises the following question: In determining merit, tenure, and promotion, how much weight should be accorded to student evaluations? Some argue that student evaluations are an important part of the professor evaluation process, while others claim that they measure student satisfaction rather than teaching effectiveness. Published research in the 1970s focused on the effects of grades on ratings (the higher the grade for the student, the higher the evaluation of the professor). Although critics questioned the validity of certain studies, no one empirically refuted the results: grade inflation is much more likely to result in positive evaluations. Research in the 1980s, however, concluded that student ratings are reliable, valid and relatively free from bias. Thus, any relation between grades and evaluations might be expected and educationally appropriate.

Another question addressed is the correlation of ratings measures with other indicators of effective teaching. Studies show that there is at least a moderate correlation between student ratings and effective teaching criteria.

A third issue is that of the influence of variables unrelated to effective teaching on ratings. Research results are inconclusive in this area: higher grades might result in higher ratings, but the effect of such bias seems to be limited. Other factors including class sizes and enthusiasm have an impact on ratings.


Assessment of faculty work contains three overlapping elements: setting expectations, collecting and organizing evidence, and using evidence.

*Effective faculty assessment should meet these goals:*

1. It should promote the career development of the individual, and it should be accountable. The method of assessment should address both these goals.
2. It should reflect the complexity of faculty work. Standardized measures could be complemented by written material, demonstrations and work samples.
3. It should stress the roles of mentoring, feedback and continuous assessment on faculty member’s career development.

Institutional goals should be made very clear. It is very important to create a good atmosphere in which faculty members enjoy to work and feel like a part of the institution.

The first step in faculty assessment is defining faculty work: their roles and responsibilities, and setting expectations in terms of work and contributions (outcomes, accomplishments as a result of work). Expectations might be set in a variety of ways:

---

1 Some reviews incorporate copies of the original material; these have not been appended.
1. Different criteria and standards of excellence are needed for different faculty members; career and institutional differences should be considered in interpreting assessments of faculty achievements.
2. Colleagues should review each other’s work.
3. Feedback should be given to faculty in a non-threatening setting.
4. Faculty should meet formally with their chair at least twice a year, to set expectations and plan their work, and to review the work accomplished in the previous year.

The second step in faculty assessment is collection of evidence. Faculty are advised to think of the intended use of evidence when collecting it. Therefore faculty should talk to their chair about what kind of evidence is most appropriate. Evidence should be credible, that is, it should come from multiple sources (peers, students, self). Assessment should be useful to faculty members and should enable them to grow and improve. Faculty should be encouraged to make assessment a natural component of their work, and to routinely collect information about their work activities from students, peers and clients, and share information with a trusted colleague. The department chair will have an important role in this.


Current academic responsibilities are placed within a historical context. The authors aim to discern the tradeoffs that have occurred ever since higher education in the U.S. underwent a paradigm shift around the time of WWII, when research became the chief function of the university, and the emphasis on teaching and applied knowledge began to decrease. The following are five consequences of this realignment of priorities:

1. The low morale that typifies certain academic milieux may not be reducible to political issues related to “shared governance”. Within the context of a shift from a teaching to a research model, it can be expected that faculty who find that their commitments to teaching, service, and non-specialized forms of inquiry are undervalued (with respect to merit raises, as well as tenure and promotion decisions) will be disinclined to experience a sense of loyalty to the institution.
2. The domain of “scholarship” should be expanded to reflect the complexities of our contemporary world. In this context, “integration” should be viewed as a core dimension of scholarly activity. This entails making “connections within and between the disciplines, altering the contexts in which people view knowledge” (9).
3. Teaching should be viewed as a core dimension of “scholarship,” rather than as a separate kind of activity. This dimension might also include mentoring, advising, developing curricula and instructional materials, and collaborating with schools.
4. The authors note that the trend towards providing a systematic and structured assessment of professorial activities has, correlatively, led to a paradigm in which activities that are not easily quantified are routinely undervalued (such as teaching, integrative work, and applied work).
5. The authors suggest that “reflective critique” should be used as a dimension of assessing scholarship. This implies the need for critical evaluation of a scholar’s work by him/herself, an exercise which should result in its improvement. Works that generate public discussion and which lead to a change in the scholar’s own research trajectory seem particularly valuable.

This book is based on a 1983 survey the author conducted among 770 academic deans regarding the methods by which faculty are evaluated. It starts with a survey of the various causes behind fiscal crises faced by institutions of higher education from the 1970s into the early 1980s. It describes the different responses of institutions to face those crises, and notes that evaluation of faculty became a much more serious concern during this period than ever before. Another development of this period was the significant increase in the number of legal challenges made against particular hiring and promotion decisions. The author shows how current policies and practices in the evaluation of faculty are the result of a change in the relative weight of various criteria used in evaluating teaching, research, and service dating from the early 1970s.


This book is an overview of the numerous and constant evaluation processes to which every faculty member has to submit in his/her academic career. Some of the most pertinent issues discussed concern evaluating teaching and scholarship.

These are a couple of findings regarding teaching:
1. Research shows that student ratings are generally reliable (consistent among raters and stable over time). To be valid, student ratings should be collected from an adequate sample (not too small) and should cover different courses over the years.
2. Peer review of their teaching is less valued among faculty than peer review of their research. The quality of teaching would benefit from regular peer review. The reliability and validity of peer ratings are more difficult to establish than those for student ratings.

These are several findings regarding scholarship:
1. The definition of "scholarship" should be expanded to include the activities of faculty who seldom or never publish. The "straight counts" approach is inadequate for judging all faculty across disciplines.
2. The missions of most colleges and universities fail to acknowledge the forms of scholarship most relevant to their missions: the research university model (which emphasizes acquiring knowledge through testing and generating theory) is an inappropriate yardstick for measuring scholarly accomplishments in all colleges and universities.
3. The real issue is how to assess other forms of scholarship aside from publication. The scholarly activities which can be observed by all of the faculty who seldom or never publish should be given some weight in the tenure and promotion process.


This handbook provides a practical, proven model for developing and using a comprehensive faculty evaluation system that responds to the issues of retention, questions of fairness, validity,
objectivity, and reliability of the evaluation system. It assumes that there is no one best faculty evaluation system that could be successfully applied to any and all faculty groups. Therefore a necessary part of the process of developing a successful faculty evaluation system is the planned and systematic inclusion of the faculty’s values.


This book examines the barriers to evaluating faculty performance. These include:

1. Reliance on student evaluations: There is a correlation between class size and ratings (they are inversely proportional). On the other hand, there seems to be no connection between rating and the following: sex composition, class level, instructor's professional rank, required or elective course, student GPA, and student level of learning. Research shows that an unfavorable rating of a single class can seriously diminish a professor's chance at tenure or promotion in obtaining reliable data over a range of teaching assignments and over a period of time. Alternative methods of evaluation such as class observation, self-evaluation, and a review of course material, may be preferable to student evaluations.

2. The connection between teaching and research: Do good researchers make good teachers? Research reveals mixed results.

3. Evaluating service: Quality service is difficult to measure. It tends to be judged by the amount of it performed, because excellence in service is always expected.

4. Measuring research: Institutions should have clear standards of what they consider to constitute valuable research, aside from merely looking at the number of publications. In this regard, self-appraisal of one's work may be included in the evaluation of every faculty member’s work. Also, peer review, while useful, should use highly specific rating instruments.

Any worthwhile program recognizes faculty appraisal as part of a larger appraisal system, and acknowledges the professor's role in the department, the faculty and the institution. Solidly constructed evaluation programs provide each professor with factual information on his strengths and weaknesses, and encourage consultations with experts to improve his/her teaching performance. Any good evaluation program needs to be accepted by the faculty. This depends on the faculty's confidence in the program's relevance, utility, and integrity.
Appendix 3: Initial Sample of Academic Institutions used in External Review

California Institute of Technology
Case Western Reserve
Clarkson University
Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art
Cornell University
Drexel University
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University
Gallaudet University
Georgia Tech
Harvey Mudd College
Illinois Institute of Technology
Ithaca College
Kettering University
Lehigh University
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Milwaukee School of Engineering
New York University
Northeastern University
Northwestern University
Penn State University
Polytechnic University of New York
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
Stevens Institute of Technology
SUNY Albany
SUNY Binghamton
SUNY Buffalo
SUNY Stony Brook
Syracuse University
University of Rochester
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Worcester Polytechnic Institute