NTID
Policy on Promotion in Rank of Tenured Faculty

National Technical Institute for the Deaf
Rochester Institute of Technology

November 2004: Approved by Faculty
September 2017: Revised to conform
with changes to E6.0
March 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NTID POLICY ON PROMOTION IN RANK OF TENURED FACULTY

This document begins with the relevant portions of E6.0 in the RIT Policies and Procedures Manual. The text of E.6.0 appears in italic typeface. This is followed in bold typeface by the NTID Policy on Promotion in Rank of Tenured Faculty, which applies E6.0 to the circumstances of the college. Candidates for promotion should review both the RIT and the college policy.

I. *RIT POLICIES ON FACULTY RANK AND PROMOTION*

1. Faculty Categories, Ranks and Responsibilities

   A.   Categories and Ranks

   Table 1 lists all faculty categories and ranks that may exist at the university; further classification information is described in Policy E1.0 – Employee Classification and Status.

Category	Ranks
Regular Faculty Employees	
Tenure-track faculty	*Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor**
Non-tenure track: Lecturers	*Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer*
Non-tenure track: Research faculty	*Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Research Professor*
Extended faculty	*Visiting Lecturer, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, and Visiting Professor*
Non-tenure track: Adjunct faculty	*Adjunct faculty is a category of employment as defined in E1.0 Employee Classification and Status*
Non RIT employees	
Clinical faculty	*Clinical Instructor, Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Clinical Professor*
Guest lecturer	
Affiliate	

*In this policy, "Professor" means a faculty member with the rank of professor.

………………………………………………………………………………………………………..

   B.   Faculty Responsibilities

   Faculty responsibilities are divided into the following three categories: (a) teaching; (b) scholarship; and (c) service, as defined in E4.0 Faculty Employment Policies. The balance among these responsibilities varies by category and rank. Responsibilities for non-tenure-track faculty can be found in the appropriate sections below.

   …………………………………….....

II. General Guidelines for Promotion

   Promotion to the next higher rank in a tenure-track faculty classification is based on a faculty member's academic and professional qualifications, and achievements in the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service as defined in E4.0 Faculty Employment Policies and as expected within a particular category and rank. Academic and professional qualifications refer to past and present

professional and career experiences, professional recognition in the form of licenses, honors, degree attainments, and sustained effort directed toward professional and career development.

Although engagement in teaching, scholarship and service is expected of all tenure-track faculty, no faculty member has to be deeply engaged in all of the activities identified in E4.0 at any one time.

A. *College Policy*

   Each college shall develop and publish its own specific promotion policy and expectations, including qualities and achievements as well as acceptable forms of evidence and documentation. The college promotion policy, expectations, and acceptable form of documentation shall be no less specific than, and must be consistent with this policy and E04.0 Faculty Employment Policy. Faculty within each administrative unit may define specific standards or qualities related to scholarship that are consistent with both the university and college policies. In addition, the college's schedule for promotion must be consistent with the schedule in Section II.D below, and the "Dates for Faculty Actions and Academic Ceremonies" as distributed by the Provost's Office. The college promotion policy, including the college expectations for promotion shall be approved by the voting faculty of the individual colleges.

B. *College Promotion Committee(s)*

   1. *Composition - Each college shall have a procedure for establishing one or more promotion committees as needed. The committee(s) shall be a college-wide committee which is established such that a minimum of one member returns from the previous year in order to provide continuity over time. If more than one promotion committee exists, membership on the committee(s) may overlap as necessary and appropriate. In cases where a promotion committee member cannot serve, that member shall be replaced as outlined in the college's policy. If a department head is a member of a promotion committee, he/she will recuse him/herself if a member of his/her department is a candidate for promotion.*

   The dean of the college will ensure that a promotion committee is formed according to the college policy.

   a. *Tenure Track Faculty*

      i. *For the promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor at the time of tenure, the composition, responsibility, and voting of the committee that handles the promotion is covered in policy E5.0 Policies on Tenure. In the rare case of promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor after the time of tenure, the committee structure and function will be same as described below in section II.B.a.ii.*

      ii. *The promotion committee for associate professors shall be a college-wide committee composed of six college faculty members, all of whom are tenured Professors in the college. If a college has fewer than six tenured Professors then the provost will ask the Academic Senate to establish an appropriate promotion committee that includes all the tenured Professors in the college and additional tenured Professors appointed by the Academic Senate. The committee shall select its chair from committee members within the college.*

      iii. *In the case of a joint academic appointment that spans two colleges, a joint promotion committee shall be formed according to the college policies where the candidate's primary appointment and tenure reside. The committee will be composed of four tenured Professors of the college in which the candidate's primary appointment and tenure reside and two tenured Professors from the*

3

college in which the candidate's secondary appointment resides. The committee shall select its chair from committee members within the college in which the candidate's primary appointment and tenure reside. The committee shall review the candidate based on the promotion criteria of the university as outlined in this policy, colleges' expectations, the candidate's documentation, and all internal and external letters of review or evaluation.

2. *Responsibility - The promotion committee(s) shall review the candidate based on the promotion criteria of the university as outlined in this policy, college expectations, the candidate's documentation, and all internal and external letters of review or evaluation.*

3. *Voting – Recommendation for approval for promotion by a promotion committee shall require a minimum 2/3 majority in favor as determined by secret vote. All members of the promotion committee must vote; there shall be no abstentions or avoidances of voting by absence. The promotion committee's recommendation for approval or denial of promotion shall be in writing and include a statement of reasons that support the recommendation for or against promotion as well as the committee vote. The recommendation and all supporting documentation, including letters, shall be forwarded by the chair of the promotion committee to the dean of the college.*

C. *University Promotion Review Committee*

The University Promotion Review Committee comprises the chairs of the college promotion committees. The provost may call the Committee if there is disagreement between a college promotion committee, the dean or the provost, and in other cases as deemed appropriate.

If a college has more than one promotion committee, the college's promotion committee chair representative to the University Promotion Review Committee shall be selected according to college policy. If a college does not form a promotion committee in a given year, the name of the chair from the college's most recent available promotion committee shall be included in the pool. That group shall review all the available documentation and advise the provost toward a final decision, guided by the specific promotion expectations outlined by the candidate's college. The group shall relate its findings in writing to the provost.

D. *Process and Schedule*

1. *Nomination: By May 1 of the academic year immediately prior to the academic year in which the candidate for promotion will undergo consideration for promotion, nominations for promotion will be received by the department head.*

2. *Acknowledgment: By May 15 of the academic year immediately prior to the academic year in which the candidate for promotion will undergo consideration for promotion, he/she will receive a written acknowledgement of the initiation of the promotion process and a request for materials by the department head. The department head will also inform the dean of the college about the nomination.*

3. *Formation of Promotion Committee: The dean will ensure that a promotion committee with an elected chair is in place by September 15 to receive the promotion documentation from the candidate.*

4. *Submission: By September 15, the promotion candidate submits his/her required documentation to the appropriate promotion committee chair for review.*

5. *Requests for Reviews and Letters of Support: By September 30, the promotion committee chair shall:*

    …………………………………......………………………………………………………….

    a. *For promotion to professor, solicit external reviews of the candidate and letters of recommendation for or against promotion from the candidate's department head and all the tenured Professors in the candidate's department.*

    …………………………………......………………………………………………………….

6. *Review Begins: By January 1, all materials, including all letters, should be made available for review by the promotion committee.*

7. *Review Completion: By February 1, members of the promotion committee will complete the review of all promotion materials and the promotion committee chair will submit a letter of recommendation for or against promotion to the college dean, including the tally of votes from members of the committee and from the candidate's department. This letter will be accompanied by all other letters and documentation.*

8. *College Dean: By March 1, the college dean will submit his or her letter of recommendation for or against promotion to the provost. This letter will be accompanied by all other letters and documentation.*

9. *Provost/President: Upon receipt of the recommendation from the dean, the provost and the president will work together to formulate recommendations for or against promotion. These recommendations will be informed by all other letters and documentation, including the promotion committee's vote.*

    To form a promotion recommendation, the provost may call upon the department head, the college promotion committee, or the dean for clarification or additional information and may meet with any of them to reconcile opposing views. The provost may also convene the University Promotion Review Committee as outlined in Section II.C of this policy.

10. *Final Decision: All final promotion decisions are made by the president. Notification regarding the promotion decision will be sent by the provost to the candidate for promotion by May 1.*

E. *Granting or Denial of Promotion*

    1. *Notification: The granting or denial of promotion shall be in the form of a written communication from the provost to the candidate no later than May 1. The letter from the provost will express the reasons for the decision on promotion. In the case of denial, the letter shall set forth the specific reasons and the promotion committee vote. All letters of recommendation for or against the awarding of promotion shall remain confidential and will not be made available to the candidate.*

    2. *Effective date: If awarded, the promotion becomes effective on the first day of the following academic year.*

    3. *If the promotion is denied, at least one full calendar year from the time of the notification of the promotion decision shall elapse between applications for promotion. Exceptions may be made at the discretion of the dean.*

    4. *Appeal: If a candidate wishes to appeal a promotion denial, the university faculty*

grievance procedures are available to the extent provided in E24.0 Faculty Grievance. The appeal is not to address the substance of the committee's recommendation but shall be limited to the question of whether the policies and procedures set forth in the promotion policy have been followed in the candidate's case.

F. *Access to Letters and Documentation*

1. *Access to documentation: All letters of review or assessment shall remain confidential and will not be made accessible to the candidate. Table 2[1] of this policy describes access to promotion review documentation.*

   a. *Handling of Letters: In order to assure that recommendations are completely candid and accurate, all letters of recommendation for or against the awarding of promotion shall remain confidential and will not be made available to the candidate.*

   b. *A promotion candidate will provide materials and other documentation to an office as specified in the college's promotion policy. Each college will establish its own dates for receiving materials from a promotion candidate that are consistent with the university's dates noted on the "Dates of Faculty Actions and Academic Ceremonies" which is distributed by the Provost's Office.*

2. *After the completion of the promotion process, the documentation for each promotion shall be maintained by the Office of the Dean of that faculty member's college and access to it shall be governed by the university's policy on "Access to Official Professional Staff Files" (E.31.0).*

III. *Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor*

The promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor typically occurs at the same time as tenure evaluation and is covered in policy E05.0 Policies on Tenure.

IV. *Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor*

A. *Criteria for Promotion*

The basis for the promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor is effectiveness of teaching, the quality and scope of scholarship, and service including the leadership in or contributions to professional activities on and off campus.

Since receiving tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, candidates shall be judged in terms of whether they have an established record that indicates continued growth, development and accomplishment in teaching; research, scholarship; and service including leadership, as described in E4.0 Faculty Employment Policies

Candidates for promotion shall be judged in terms of whether they have a record that is deemed excellent overall. This record does not require excellence in all three areas and may be demonstrated in multiple ways, e.g. the candidate has exhibited a balanced record of achievement in all three areas, or excelled in at least two of the three areas, with continued growth, development and accomplishment in the other, or in the rare case excelled significantly in one area with continued growth, development, and accomplishment in the other two.

---

[1] See APPENDIX D.

B.   *Nomination for Promotion*

1. *A candidate may be nominated for promotion in any one of the following ways:*

     a.   *The department head shall evaluate the rank status of each faculty member at least every two years at the time of annual review and may nominate a candidate for promotion.*

     b.   *A Professor eligible to serve on the promotion committee (see E6.II.B) may nominate a candidate for promotion.*

     c.   *A tenured faculty member may nominate him/herself for promotion.*

2. *The department head shall notify the faculty member in writing of his or her nomination for promotion or of the receipt of the self-nomination.*

C.   *Documentation and Portfolio*

Documentation includes information for each year since the last promotion.

1. *The candidate's portfolio shall include the following:*

- *all agreements relating to the faculty member's conditions of employment;*
- *plans of work (which include teaching, scholarship, and service);*
- *documentation related to the faculty member's teaching performance e.g. student evaluations, peer evaluations;*
- *academic and professional qualifications;*
- *and such other information as the faculty and administration of a given college shall deem appropriate. The candidate may also include letters of support.*

The documents provided by the dean's office which are not part of the candidate's portfolio include the following:

- *candidate's self-evaluations;*
- *department head's written evaluations.*

Note: the self-evaluations and the department head evaluations along with the evaluations noted above and plans of work together are the annual reviews.

2. *Letters of recommendation internal and external to the university:*

a. Internal Letters: The promotion committee chair shall seek letters from all tenured Professors in the candidate's department and require a letter from the candidate's department head. Each letter must have a clear statement recommending for or against the promotion of the candidate.

b. External Review Letters: The promotion committee, after consultation with the candidate's department head (or the dean in cases where the department head is the candidate), shall seek to obtain a minimum of four letters from external reviewers. The committee must seek letters from at least two reviewers suggested by the candidate.

In all cases, the external reviewers must be at the rank of Professor or equivalent, and shall not have personal ties or conflicts of interest (C4.0) with the candidate. The reviewers should have fields of study within the candidate's expertise.

Each reviewer will be requested to evaluate the candidate's scholarship according to university promotion criteria and college promotion expectations. If fewer than four letters are received, the committee chair should make an additional attempt to obtain four letters. The external review letters will be received by the dean's office of the candidate.

I. NTID TENURED FACULTY PROMOTION COMMITTEES

1. Committee Composition

In order to staff promotion committees in a fair and expeditious manner, and in accordance with the principle that service on a college promotion committee is a professional faculty responsibility, the office of the associate vice president (AVP) has assigned all eligible faculty to one of two groups of departments so that each group has a similar number of faculty at each rank. Each list is organized so that the faculty member with the longest time since serving on a College promotion committee is at the top, and the one who has served the most recently is at the bottom.[2] Henceforth, eligible faculty will be assigned to college promotion committees according to their position on their group's list, in accordance with the number and type of committees required in any given cycle.[3]

2. Term

Committee members will normally serve a two-year term. Every effort will be made to stagger membership so that there are always members from the previous cycle serving on any given committee. Each year, each college promotion committee will elect its chairperson.

3. Committee Workload

Promotion committees will normally be expected to review the documentation of up to four candidates. However, in instances where there are more than eight candidates up for review, committees may be asked to review a fifth candidate. A third committee will be formed if the number of candidates exceeds ten.

4. Committee orientation

Before a promotion committee begin its deliberations, the president/dean will call all members together to give guidance on the implementation of the college's promotion policy.

II. NTID EXPECTATIONS FOR PROMOTION OF TENURED FACULTY

In order to be promoted in the college of NTID, a candidate must have performed at a level commensurate with expectations for each rank in the following areas of review: 1) Teaching and/or Tutoring, 2) Communication, 3) Scholarship, and 4) Service. In each case, the relative weight awarded to each area is to be determined by the candidate's expectations as these are defined in the annual plan of work. For help in making judgments as to whether a candidate's overall performance warrants promotion, faculty should consult the three documents in Appendix D, "Provost Guidance."

---

[2] See Appendix C for the composition of the two groups. (Note: As the number and category of faculty in individual departments change, for example, as a result of tenure and promotion actions, retirements and new hires, the composition of the groups may need to be amended from time to time to ensure equitable representation.)

[3] Where a committee member is the department head of one of the candidates to be reviewed by the committee, he/she will be replaced on the committee by the next faculty member in the same group. Where a duly appointed member of a promotion committee is unable to serve, he/she will be replaced on the committee by the next faculty member from the same group.

1) <u>**Teaching and/or Tutoring**</u>

In general, the successful candidate for promotion to associate professor will be able to demonstrate a high level of skill in this domain, whereas the candidate for promotion to full professor will be able to demonstrate sustained excellence.

1.a Teaching

NTID faculty members are expected to demonstrate high quality and effective teaching that is respectful of students and facilitates their learning. To accomplish this, it is expected that faculty will maintain high standards in all aspects of effective teaching, including the range and depth of topics covered, the quality of course materials, and the currency of course content. In support of successful teaching, it is expected that a faculty member's teaching activities will demonstrate a commitment to student success and to continual improvement in their own teaching and learning.

Expectations for teaching extend beyond assigned courses. Faculty members are also expected to contribute to the college's mission by participating in activities which may include but are not limited to: mentoring junior faculty, directing individual studies, involving students in research, directing internships, designing and revising courses, providing thoughtful student career mentoring and advising, and participating in curriculum design or revisions.

Evidence of teaching quality and effectiveness shall be in the form of student evaluations, peer evaluations, documentation related to course/curriculum development and delivery, and supporting letters.

1.b Tutoring

Tutoring may be a major component of a faculty member's plan of work or a minor one combined with traditional classroom teaching. Effective tutoring involves the successful application of educational principles combined with an understanding of individual student needs and learning styles necessary to ensure success. Because tutoring takes place outside the traditional classroom, tutors are also expected to develop and maintain working relationships with the primary instructor/s of the courses they support. Tutors are also expected to maintain currency in the content area in which they support students, and demonstrate a continual improvement in their approach to teaching, tutoring and learning.

Expectations for tutoring extend beyond assigned courses. Faculty members are also expected to contribute to the college's mission by participating in activities which may include but are not limited to: mentoring junior faculty, directing individual studies, involving students in research, and providing thoughtful student career mentoring and advising.

2. Communication

Unlike in the other colleges of RIT, effective communication is an expectation of all NTID faculty at all ranks. For the purposes of this policy, communication refers to communication with people who are deaf and people who are hearing in all modalities combined with sensitivity to deaf cultural issues.

NTID faculty are expected to strive for, achieve, and maintain the ability to communicate in American Sign Language[4] (ASL) at a level of vocabulary, grammatical accuracy,

---

[4] According to the Communication Task Force Report, approved by the college faculty in February, 1991, "ASL fluency is defined somewhat broadly to include those who may use an English-like word order and incorporate signing space,

comprehension, and fluency that allows effective participation in communication situations applicable to work and social topics. In consideration of the needs of the academic and social environment of NTID, the target goal, established by the 1991 Communication Task Force, is an ADVANCED level of skill as measured by the Sign Language Proficiency Interview[5] (SLPI).

A rating of INTERMEDIATE PLUS is acceptable only where the candidate can clearly show strong evidence of progress and sustained effort toward an advanced rating. A candidate who does not have an SLPI rating of ADVANCED should assemble a portfolio, the contents of which cumulatively demonstrate the candidate's ability to communicate effectively in ASL inside and outside the classroom. The portfolio might include such components as SRS/SRATE ratings related to communication skills; written evaluations by proficient users of ASL; evidence of successful participation in sign communication development activities such as ASL classes, individual tutoring, and videotaping of classroom performance; records of involvement with student clubs and other extra-curricular student activities, and evidence of interactions with the deaf community on and off campus. Other forms of evidence may also be included.

NTID faculty are also expected to strive for, achieve, and maintain the ability to use spoken communication strategies and techniques. Spoken communication is considered to be speech, with or without voice, used expressively and/or receptively, alone or to complement a message communicated with signs. Although no skill level is specified, faculty are expected to participate in learning activities whereby they develop a knowledge of specific spoken communication strategies and classroom techniques and their applicability in communication situations. Accordingly, candidates must include documentation of learning activities related to spoken communication.

3. Scholarship[6]

All tenured faculty are expected to engage in scholarship. In general, the successful candidate for promotion to associate professor will be able to demonstrate significant contributions in this domain, whereas the candidate for promotion to professor will be able to demonstrate a more advanced level of sustained and impactful work.

In each case, the candidate will normally have published peer-reviewed work in journal articles, books, book chapters or other formats, and/or produced artistic or creative work, as this is defined in Appendix K. Promotion candidates will also normally have presented their work in the form of papers or workshops at state, national, or international professional society meetings. Additionally, while the candidate for promotion to associate professor may have contributed to the writing of grants, the candidate for promotion to professor may have been a principal or co-principal investigator on grants. Similarly, while the candidate for promotion to associate professor may have made significant contributions to training programs, seminars, symposia, short courses, or workshops at state or national professional meetings or at comparable educational institutions, the candidate for promotion to professor will have a record of leadership in such activities.

---

directionality, and other features which are characteristics of ASL vocabulary and its principles, and strong sign reception abilities."

[5] Candidates should refer to Appendix M for detail and clarification related to sign language achievement and SLPI ratings.

[6] See Appendices F (RIT Policy on Scholarship) and G (Administrative Guidance on NTID Scholarship Expectations).

4. Service[7]

Contributions to the college or university at large include relationships with students and colleagues outside the classroom. Such contributions may be found in academic administration,[8] college and university committee work, student advising, and student activities. Contributions to the community include activities linking the professional skills of members of the faculty to the world beyond the campus, and other community service in the public interest. In general, and as with the other three domains, while the successful candidate for promotion to associate professor will be able to demonstrate a significant level of service, the successful candidate for promotion to professor will be able to demonstrate a more substantial record of leadership.

III. NTID PROMOTION PROCESS

1. Overview

A college promotion committee for each rank representative of the college faculty is charged to provide a comprehensive review of the candidate's qualifications and peer recommendations. Based on this review, the college promotion committee renders a decision to recommend or not recommend promotion for each candidate to the president/dean.

Individual recommendations based on a review of a candidate's documentation, and personal knowledge of the candidate's qualifications are provided to the college promotion committee by sources both within and outside the department. These sources include:

a. The candidate's department head

b. Tenured faculty in the candidate's department senior in rank to the candidate
   Department colleagues share a unique working relationship with the candidate because they work in the same primary area of job responsibility and/or the same or related discipline.

c. External reviewers
   The office of the AVP solicits a list of names of potential external reviewers for review of the candidate's scholarship.

2. Initiation of Promotion Process

Tenured faculty wishing to be considered for promotion to the rank of associate or full professor must inform their department head in writing by May 1.

3. Promotion Dossier

The candidate, with the assistance of the dean's office, prepares the documentation listed below. The documentation should be provided in files uploaded in pdf format to a secure central repository online no later than September 5th. The information should be organized with the following filenames:

A. **Letter of hire** - The candidate's original letter of hire, together with copies of any agreements relating to his/her conditions of employment, and promotion letter (if applicable) (added by the dean's office).

---

[7] See Appendix L: RIT Policy on Service.

[8] Where the candidate's primary job function is academic administration, it should be given appropriate weight in any assessment of his/her qualification for promotion.

B. **Curriculum Vitae - The CV should document the candidate's entire academic career <u>with accomplishments since the last promotion clearly distinguished</u>.**
C. **Statement on Teaching and/or Tutoring[9] with related documentation including, where appropriate, a statement on the candidate's teaching philosophy, and a list of courses taught/tutored.**
D. **Statement on Communication, including SLPI rating letter and a description of the candidate's communication development and experiences.**
E. **Statement on Scholarship, with related documentation.**
F. **Statement on Service, with related documentation.**
G. **Student evaluations (for example, SRS/SRATE results) and peer evaluations since the last promotion.[10]**
H. **External peer reviews (provided by the dean's office).**
J. **Letters of support: from peers, students, and others competent to comment on the merit of the candidate's accomplishments.[11]**
K. **The candidate's annual reviews since the last promotion (added to the dossier by the dean's office after the department peer review).**

In sections C-F, the candidate should summarize his/her achievements in each area while in the current rank. The four statements combined may not exceed 20 single-sided pages, excluding the SLPI rating letter.

In addition, the candidate may submit any material in a separate electronic folder that he/she feels would advance his/her opportunity to gain promotion. The material should support and provide evidence of the statements made and the accomplishments cited in the candidate's vitae and written statement, and should be clearly labeled to support relevant sections of the statement.

Before review begins, the dean's office adds A and H from the list above to the dossier. After review of the dossier by the department peers, but before the promotion committee review, the dean's office adds the candidate's annual reviews (labelled "K" above), the department head's confidential review and the department peer reviews to the dossier.

4. Promotion Sequence of Events

A. **Establishment of College Promotion Committee/s**

   The office of the AVP coordinates the appointment process for the college promotion committees by April 15.

B. **Becoming a Candidate for Promotion**

   A faculty member who wishes to be a candidate for promotion must inform his/her department head in writing by May 1. (After the promotion process begins, a candidate can withdraw at any time.)

---

[9] For guidance on evidence related to teaching/tutoring effectiveness, see Appendix E.1.

[10] Where a candidate's responsibilities involve instruction or other services to students, Section G should include data on summative student ratings. Data should minimally reflect a summary of ratings for a representative sampling of courses or services. For some candidates, a combination of student ratings and ratings for other activities may be appropriate, including those related to academic administration and leadership.

[11] Occasionally, providers of support letters prefer to send their letter directly to the promotion committee through the office of the AVP or president/dean.

C. **Department List of Candidates**

The department head prepares a list of all department candidates and forwards this to the Office of the AVP by May 7.

D. **External Peer Review Names**

By May 14, the candidate and the candidate's department head each provide the Office of the AVP with a list of potential external reviewers. Both lists should include at least four (different) individuals who are qualified to comment on the candidate's scholarship, totaling a minimum of eight names. The Office of the AVP will reach out to these reviewers over the summer to solicit commitments to review candidate portfolios.

E. **Academic Vice President List of Candidates**

The AVP compiles and prepares a list of all college candidates and forwards this to the president/dean by May 15.

F. **President/Dean's List of Candidates**

The president/dean notifies each college promotion committee as to the candidates whom they are charged to review. The president/dean also provides each candidate with a list of the faculty on his/her promotion committee by May 30.

G. **Portfolio Submission**

The candidate submits his/her documentation on line in pdf format by September 5.

H. **External Peer Review**

On September 6, the promotion committee chair solicits confidential written assessments of the candidate's scholarship from at least four of these external peers who have agreed to write reviews, selecting, where possible, two from each list.[12] External peer reviews are due to the committee chair by October 25.

I. **Department Head Recommendation**

Using Form A,[13] the department head prepares an individual recommendation regarding the candidate's qualifications for promotion and submits this to the office of the AVP by November 12. This recommendation is not shared with the candidate.

J. **Department Peer Review**

The tenured faculty of the department senior in rank to the candidate each prepare a confidential recommendation based on their review of the candidate's documentation. Individual recommendations from the candidate's department peers are submitted directly to the college promotion committee through the office of the AVP by November 12. They are shared neither with the candidate nor the department head.

---

[12] See Appendices G and H for a sample letter and guideline sheet for external reviewers.

[13] See Appendix B.

K. Promotion Committee Review

On November 15, after the departmental level of review is completed, the office of the AVP forwards the candidate's promotion portfolio, together with the department peer recommendations and the candidate's annual appraisals for the preceding five years, to the promotion committee.

Committee review begins with consideration of the candidate's portfolio, the recommendations of the candidate's department head and department peers, annual appraisals, and external reviews.

After it has completed its preliminary review, the committee may determine that additional or clarifying information is necessary. If so, the committee develops a list of questions for the candidate and sends this to the candidate through the office of the AVP. After receipt of the request, the candidate has one week to respond, either in writing or in video format.

After all information has been collected and reviewed, the committee chair schedules a meeting to discuss the candidate's qualifications for promotion. All committee members must be present for this meeting.

L. Promotion Committee Recommendation

At the completion of its deliberations, the college promotion committee votes. A two-thirds majority is required to recommend promotion. The vote, together its rationale, is recorded on Form C. The committee chairperson sends the completed Form C to the office of the AVP by February 1.

M. NTID President/Dean's Recommendation

On February 2, the office of the AVP sends the committee recommendation to the president/dean. Included with the promotion committee recommendation are all supporting data, documentation, peer recommendations, and external reviews. (Any supplementary written material provided by the candidate during the committee review is considered part of the candidate's documentation.)

The president/dean may request further information from the college promotion committee. The president/dean then prepares a written recommendation, using Form D, which is forwarded along with all supporting documentation to the provost by March 1.

N. Decision

The provost reviews the entire promotion portfolio and makes a recommendation to the president of the university. The candidate is informed of the president's decision concerning promotion by May 1.[14]

---

[14] Where promotion is denied, at least one full calendar year must elapse before the candidate may reapply.

APPENDIX A
Calendar of Action

TIME[15]	ACTION
April 15	Appointment of college promotion committees.
May 1	A faculty member wishing to become a candidate for promotion informs his/her department head (or supervisor).
May 7	Department head prepares a list of all promotion candidates and forwards it to the office of the AVP.
May 14	Candidate and the candidate's department head provide the office of the AVP with separate lists of the names of potential external reviewers.
May 15	The office of the AVP communicates with external reviewers and secures agreement from at least four to write reviews.
May 15	The office of the AVP prepares list of all college promotion candidates and forwards it to the president/dean.
May 30	President/dean randomly assigns promotion candidates to promotion committees and notifies each committee of its assigned candidates.
May 30	President/dean notifies each candidate as to the membership of his/her assigned committee.
Sept. 1	President/dean convenes promotion committees for an organizational meeting. Each committee elects its chair.
Sept. 5	Candidate submits his/her promotion portfolio on-line in pdf format.
Sept. 6	Committee chair forwards candidate materials to external reviewers
Oct. 25	External peer reviews due.
Oct. 27	Eligible department peers and department head begin their review of the candidate's portfolio.
Nov. 12	Department peers and department head submit their recommendations to the office of the AVP.
Nov. 15	Committee receives the candidate's dossier from the office of the AVP and starts its deliberations. The dossier includes the candidate's portfolio, the assessments/ recommendations of the department peers and of the department head, the candidate's Statement of Expectations and annual reviews since the last promotion and the external review letters.
Feb. 1	Committee submits its recommendation on Form C to the office of the AVP.
Feb. 2	AVP delivers Form C to the president/dean.

---

[15] The dates given are deadlines. Next working day will be used for any date that falls on a weekend or holiday.

Feb 10-20   President/dean may seek further input from the promotion committee.

March 1   President/dean completes Form D and forwards it to the provost.

May 1   Provost sends written notification of the promotion decision to the candidate.

APPENDIX B
Form A: Department Head Recommendation

In my judgment, and after evaluating all available information,

_____ has satisfied the college expectations for promotion to the rank sought

_____ has not satisfied the college expectations for promotion to the rank sought

for the following reasons:

Department Head_____   Date _____

<u>Return this form directly to the office of the associate vice president by November 12.</u>

Form B: Department Peer Recommendation

Please report in writing whether or not you support the promotion of _____ to the rank of
_____. Your recommendation should be based upon your assessment of the candidate for
promotion as outlined in the NTID Policy of Promotion in Rank of Tenured Faculty.

Write your recommendation in the space provided below or attach it to this form. Do not feel compelled to write
an assessment for each area of promotion expectations but rather only for those areas where you consider
yourself qualified to respond. Please review the candidate's portfolio prior to completing this form.

I have worked with the candidate for _____ years in he following capacity: _____

My recommendation is based on the following:

1. Teaching and/or Tutoring

2. Communication

3. Scholarship

4. Service

Circle one: RECOMMEND   DO NOT RECOMMEND
                                    PROMOTION   PROMOTION

Name_____   Date _____

Return this form directly to the office of the associate vice president by November 12.

APPENDIX B
Form C: Promotion Committee Recommendation

It is the recommendation of the committee, on the basis of available information, that

_____ has satisfied the college expectations for promotion to the rank sought.

_____ has not satisfied the college expectations for promotion to the rank sought.

_____ number of votes in support of promotion

_____ number of votes against promotion

The rationale for this recommendation is as follows:

1. Teaching and/or Tutoring

2. Communication

3. Scholarship

4. Service

Committee chairperson: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

<u>Return this form directly to the office of the associate vice president by February 1.</u>

Form D: President/Dean Recommendation

In my judgment, and after evaluating all available information,

_____ has satisfied the college expectations for promotion to the rank sought

_____ has not satisfied the college expectations for promotion to the rank sought

for the following reasons:

President/Dean_____   Date _____

For the purpose of assigning promotion committee membership, NTID faculty have been arranged in two groups[16] as follows:

Group One

> Department of American Sign Language and Interpreting Education
> Department of Communication Studies and Services
> Department of Science and Mathematics
> Department of Visual Communications Studies
> MSSE Teacher Education Program

Group Two

> Department of Business Studies
> Department of Engineering Studies
> Department of Information and Computing Studies
> Department of Liberal Studies
> Department of Performing Arts

---

[16] As the number and category of faculty in individual departments change, for example, as a result of tenure and promotion actions, retirements and new hires, the composition of the groups may need to be amended from time to time to ensure equitable representation.

APPENDIX D
ACCESS TO DOCUMENTATION FOR PROMOTION OF TENURED FACULTY
(E6.0. TABLE 2)

Documentation	Candidate	Department Tenured Faculty Senior in Rank	Department Head	Promotion Committee	Dean	Provost
Candidate's Portfolio	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Candidate Annual Reviews	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department Faculty Recommendations	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department Head Recommendation	No	No	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
Promotion Committee Recommendation	No	No	No	-	Yes	Yes
External Review Letters	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dean Recommendation	No	No	No	No	-	Yes
Provost Evaluation	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	-

APPENDIX E.1
Guidance from the Provost
Extracts from Guidance on Documentary Evidence

Jeremy Haefner
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Summer 2012

Overview: Effective evaluation of letters in the faculty review process is critically important to insuring RIT has a system of faculty evaluation that supports sound decision-making with fair and consistent practices. Towards this objective, the following guidance is provided for effective evaluation letters. While this guidance is directed at department chairs, committees, and deans, the same guidance applies to academic unit colleagues who, according to policy, also provide evaluative input in the process.

…………

Evidence refers to the documentation and facts that support the assessment or rating. For example, multiple forms of evidence are required for an adequate assessment of teaching effectiveness—student ratings of teaching, peer-evaluation of teaching, curriculum development, etc. In particular, letters must reference the evidence used to formulate the judgment or assessment.

1. There must be multiple forms of evidence to support teaching effectiveness.

    While student ratings of teaching are one form of evidence that can be used to assess teaching, other forms are needed to provide the complete and holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness. Effective forms of evidence to support teaching assessment include:

    a. Student ratings of teaching;
    b. Collegial peer review of teaching pedagogy;
    c. Collegial peer review of the candidate's courseware, e.g.:
        i. Syllabi and assignments
        ii Text and other materials
        iii, Graded work
        iv. Exams
    d. Collegial peer outcomes assessment, e.g., student preparedness for and success in subsequent courses;
    e. Assessment results that demonstrate student learning of course outcomes;
    f. Teaching awards and other recognitions, either internal or external;
    g. Alumni evaluations/feedback;
    h. Development of curriculum and/or instructional materials;
    j. Innovations in teaching;
    k. Quality and effectiveness of mentoring graduate students on projects, MS theses and PhD theses;
    l. Student advising assessment;
    m. Student performance on standard professional examination;
    n. Student project supervision;
    o. Demonstrated effectiveness in teaching courses that are understood to be the most challenging from an instructional viewpoint;
    p. Enrollment in elective courses—i.e., a willingness to teach undesirable courses; and
    q. Active interest in and concern for student welfare.

2. Evidence to support scholarship assessment can have many forms just as the scholarship itself can have many forms. Evaluating scholarship contributions should address the significance, impact and attention of the scholar's work to the university's mission. Note that the amount of scholarship is a function of workload and many colleges have established specific expectations through the plan of work. Regardless of amount, the assessment of scholarship quality is an expectation in all letters. Examples of evidence that can be referenced for the assessment of scholarship include:

   a. External peer evaluations of published or exhibited scholarship/creative work, generally captured from external letters;
   b. External funding in support of scholarship, research, and creative work;
   c. Invention disclosures, patents or licensing agreements that demonstrate the technology transfer of ideas;
   d. Professional reputation or standing of presses (publications), journals, shows, exhibits, conferences, etc., through which the scholarship has been disseminated;
   e. Citations by other professionals of the candidate's disseminated scholarship
   f. Quantity of disseminated, peer-reviewed, and documented scholarship;
   g. Development of research laboratories;
   h. Invited seminars, presentations, exhibits, or other displays of work; and
   i. Presentation of conference papers at national and international professional meetings.

3. Contributions in the area of service work can vary according to the needs of the college or university, the interest of the faculty member, the discipline, or professional society. The evaluator typically considers all these factors, as well as the quality and impact of the work, in assessing the service component of the faculty member.

APPENDIX E.2
Guidance from the Provost
Thoughts on promotion to full professor

Jeremy Haefner
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
January 2014

Purpose: The purpose of this thought paper is to initiate a discussion with faculty and administrators regarding promotion to full professor. The ideas in this paper are the culmination of numerous discussions with faculty, deans, and the president. It is my hope that these remarks and ideas, through an informed discussion, become institutionalized in RIT policy.

The paper discusses typical time in rank for promotion and proposes minimal expectations for teaching, scholarship (including research, creative work, innovation), and service (including leadership) relative to the promotion process. When combined with compelling evidence that indicates a faculty member has a record deemed excellent overall, these minimal expectations afford a variety of pathways that a faculty member can achieve promotion.

Time at rank: Unlike tenure, there is no predetermined number of years that must pass before a candidate becomes eligible for promotion from associate to full professor. Typically, an associate professor will spend at least five years in rank. However, the candidate must ultimately determine, after consultation with colleagues, when he or she will formally seek promotion to full professor.

University criteria for promotion: RIT Policy E6.0 provides succinct language as to the standards the institution sets when considering faculty for promotion to full professor:

The basis for the promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor is effectiveness of teaching, the quality and scope of scholarship, and service including the leadership in or contributions to professional activities on and off campus.

Since receiving tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, candidates shall be judged in terms of whether they have an established record that indicates continued growth, development and accomplishment in teaching; research, scholarship or creative work; and service including leadership, as described in E4.0 Faculty Employment Policies. Candidates for promotion shall be judged in terms of whether they have a record that is deemed excellent overall.[1]

The language "judged in terms of whether they have a record that is deemed excellent overall" provides committees and other reviewers flexibility in making promotion recommendations. Specifically, this language need not be interpreted to mean that the candidate must be evaluated as excellent in all three areas to warrant promotion.

Therefore, promotion to full professor *not only* requires the candidate to document growth and contributions within each area individually, *but also* requires an assessment of "excellence overall" that may be partially driven by substantial and significant contributions in one or more particular areas.

The minimal expectations, outlined below, are in the form of questions that reviewers should keep in mind when reviewing evidence provided in the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Candidates must successfully achieve all minimal expectations within each category to be considered for promotion. However, these minimal expectations by themselves are insufficient to warrant promotion. In addition, the candidate must provide evidence that demonstrates "excellence overall". In other words, for successful promotion the candidate must provide compelling evidence beyond what is needed for these minimal expectations to demonstrate that the record, taken as whole, is deemed excellent.

---

[1] https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/e060

<div align="center">Minimal expectations for scholarship</div>

What evidence exists in the dossier to indicate that the candidate has successfully:
- Grown in their approach and contributions with their scholarship since the time of being promoted to associate professor?
- Used his/her scholarship to enhance student success?
- Had an impact (broadly defined; see the Appendix for additional explanation) with their scholarship?
- Established an intentional and coherent scholarly program or agenda?

<div align="center">Minimal expectations for teaching</div>

What evidence exists in the dossier to indicate that the candidate has successfully:
- Grown his/her teaching effectiveness and competence since the time of being promoted to associate professor, particularly by embracing a continuous improvement approach to their teaching?
- Demonstrated a commitment to student success, including student advising and by providing students with information about performance expectations and course objectives?
- Aligned his/her teaching to support the department and/or program mission?
- Contributed to existing curriculum development or the creation of new programs?

<div align="center">Minimal expectations for service</div>

What evidence exists in the dossier to indicate that the candidate has successfully:
- Grown in their approach and contributions to service and leadership for the university since the time of being promoted to associate professor?
- Contributed to or demonstrated leadership in committees, governance groups, departments, or professional societies?
- Played an active role in mentoring faculty colleagues in teaching, scholarship, and/or service?
- Served to support the effective operations of their department or academic unit?

Collegiality: One expectation that does not appear in the above list is collegiality, because it transcends all faculty categories of work. Some institutions have set collegiality as a fourth dimension of promotion criteria. However, the position of this paper is that collegiality undergirds effective performance in the three categories of faculty work and as such it is not best represented as a fourth area. The AAUP supports this position: "…collegiality is not a distinct capacity to be assessed independently of the traditional triumvirate of teaching, scholarship, and service. It is rather a quality whose value is expressed in the successful execution of these three functions."[2]

Nonetheless, the RIT Honor Code, which is articulated in policy P3.0, provides ample guidance to faculty considering promotion. The key language is excerpted here:

Integrity and strong moral character are valued and expected within and outside of the RIT community. As members of the RIT campus community, including students, trustees, faculty, staff, and administrators, we will:
- Demonstrate civility, respect, decency and sensitivity towards our fellow members of the RIT community, and recognize that all individuals at this university are part of the larger RIT family, and as such are entitled to that support and mutual respect which they deserve.
- Conduct ourselves with the highest standards of moral and ethical behavior. Such behavior includes taking responsibility for our own personal choices, decisions and academic and professional work.
- Affirm through the daily demonstration of these ideals that RIT is a university devoted to the pursuit of knowledge and a free exchange of ideas in an open and respectful climate.[3]
  All RIT faculty should adhere to the spirit and intent of the RIT Honor Code and a discussion of such adherence is appropriate during the promotion review.

---

[2] "On collegiality as a criterion for faculty evaluation", https://www.aaup.org/report/collegiality-criterion-faculty-evaluation

[3] https://www.rit.edu/academicaffairs/policiesmanual/p030

Final considerations: While this paper is intended to provoke a discussion about promotion consideration that will serve in a majority of promotion cases, there may be some exceptional cases that simply do not fit these expectations yet clearly make a compelling case for promotion. As a result, we should be flexible in our interpretation of these expectations so that these exceptional cases are not casualties of strict bureaucracy.

To summarize, these ideas are put forth for discussion purposes with the hope that the essence of these ideas become adopted as policy. It is my intent and hope that by doing so we clarify pathways that faculty can navigate towards promotion to full professor.

Appendix: A brief discussion on impact

With its experiential nature as well as its history that includes the blending of the arts and humanities curriculum of the Athenaeum and the technical training of the Mechanics Institute, RIT has, in its fundamental character, a commitment to make an impact on the world. It stands to reason, then, that RIT aspires to see that the research and scholarly work of its faculty members also have impact. A single scholarly activity may impact the faculty member's discipline, the domain of application, a specific group of stakeholders, or some combination. For example, mathematical research could impact the field of mathematics itself, but it could also impact other physical or social sciences as an application. Similarly, the work in some creative arts fields could impact the public at large or a more narrowly defined audience of some other kind.

As a result, the audience matters when talking about scholarship impact and the audience may not be solely our peers in academia. For example, many creative fields will use the review of critics, the popular press, open-channel comment areas, ratings systems, etc., to gauge the impact of the work. It is important to note that the objective is not to measure strict popularity but rather to assess how well the work engages the intended audience.

It comes as no surprise, then, that the digital environment is changing the way the scholarly world measures impact. Traditional measures including peer-review and citation indexes will continue to be used, but new alternative metrics are also emerging. These 'altmetrics' will become increasingly important and persons in review positions must be open to these alternative methods. For more information on altmetrics, read the Chronicle of Higher Education article[4], the "Altmetrics Manifesto[5]", or the article from the London School of Economics and Political Science[6]. It is healthy for RIT that we are open and flexible to measuring impact using a variety of methodologies.

---

[4] https://www.chronicle.com/article/rise-of-altmetrics-revives-questions-about-how-to-measure-impact-of-research/

[5] http://altmetrics.org/manifesto/

[6] http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2012/12/17/scott-altmetrics-central-digital-whats-missing/

APPENDIX E.3
Guidance from the Provost
4/20/15 Memo to the faculty

Colleagues,

With the promotion to full professor letters now distributed and with changes to our promotion policy (E6.0) effective this fall, this is a perfect time to discuss how those changes should impact faculty.
We have known for some time that as RIT has moved to embrace the teacher-scholar model and engage in more research across campus, many faculty have felt left behind, without sufficient support and guidance to move to full professor. While we have more work ahead of us to support our associate professors in their quest for promotion, our work to date has focused on clarifying the university criteria. In particular, since associate professors typically impact the university in a variety of ways, it is critical that we acknowledge that there are multiple pathways to becoming a full professor. This was the crux of the revision to the university criteria, which comes into effect this fall with the revised E6.0 policy and which reads:

> "Candidates for promotion shall be judged in terms of whether they have a record that is deemed excellent overall. This record does not require excellence in all three areas and may be demonstrated in multiple ways, e.g., the candidate has exhibited a balanced record of achievement in all three areas, or excelled in at least two of the three areas with continued growth, development, and accomplishment in the other, or in the rare case excelled significantly in one area with continued growth, development, and accomplishment in the other two."

Two questions that are on the minds of many is what does this change in criteria really mean and how will it really help associate professors? One source of potential answers can be found in the paper "Thoughts on promotion to full professor," available on my website. (see Appendix E2)

But while the above-mentioned document provides some guidance around minimal expectations, I strongly encourage faculty to read Pat Scanlon's paper "Reimagining Promotion to Full Professor," which has been posted online. You may know that Pat is a campus champion for faculty mentoring and was the first recipient of our faculty mentoring award. Pat's paper nicely lays out how faculty can craft a plan to attain promotion with proper advising and consultation. It is well written and helpful in the dialogue about promotion. Promotion committee members, department chairs and faculty mentors are especially encouraged to read this paper carefully.

I look forward to hosting another meeting of all the promotion committee members across the campus this coming fall where we can discuss these changes and what they mean for faculty.

APPENDIX F
RIT Policy on Scholarship – E4.0.4, section b

Scholarship

Faculty are expected to engage in disciplinary, interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary scholarship as measured by professional standards of documentation, peer review and dissemination. Colleges shall accept all categories of scholarship listed below. Priorities for scholarship at the university are to enhance the education of our students and RIT's reputation and promote strategic initiatives of the university. Each college is responsible for defining what constitutes documentation, peer review and dissemination for its faculty. The college definitions must be approved by the college's tenured faculty and made accessible. The extent to which a faculty member is involved in scholarship is dependent on several factors, including but not limited to rank, as defined in E6.0 and designation as noted above. Categories of "Scholarship" at the university include the following (in no particular order of importance):

- Scholarship of discovery: When faculty use their professional expertise to discover knowledge, invent, or create original material. Using this definition, basic research as well as, for example, the creation of innovative computer software, plays or artwork would be considered the scholarship of discovery*.
- Scholarship of teaching/pedagogy: When faculty engage in the scholarship of teaching practice through peer-reviewed activities to improve pedagogy. Using this definition, a faculty member who studies and investigates student learning to develop strategies that improve learning has engaged in the scholarship of teaching. *
- Scholarship of integration: When faculty use their professional expertise to connect, integrate, and synthesize knowledge. Using this definition, faculty members who take research findings or technological innovations and apply them to other situations would be engaging in the scholarship of integration. *
- Scholarship of application: When faculty use their professional expertise to engage in applied research, consultation, technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation, or similar activities to solve problems. This definition recognizes that new intellectual understandings arise out of the act of application. *
- Scholarship of engagement: When faculty engage in scholarship that combines rigorous academic standards in any of the four other dimensions of scholarship, and is developed in the context of reciprocal and collaborative community partnerships. Community is broadly defined to include audiences external to the campus that are part of an active collaborative process that leads to new understanding and knowledge that contributes to the public good.

Faculty engaged in either sponsored or unsponsored scholarship in any of the areas defined above are expected to disseminate the knowledge acquired in these endeavors through appropriate scholarly means.

All aspects of scholarship are important to the university and must be recognized, valued, supported, and rewarded in the tenure, promotion, and merit salary increment processes in each unit.

There will be considerable variation, however, in the amounts and types of scholarship in which different faculty engage within the same departments and colleges, as well as throughout the university.

While the university will accept externally funded proprietary and classified projects, knowledge acquired through such projects must be available within a reasonable time frame for wider dissemination through publications, classroom teaching, or application to other projects. All projects must be in compliance with C01.0 Externally Sponsored Projects Disclosure Policy.

These definitions of "Scholarship" have been partially paraphrased and modified from definitions used by the American Association for Higher Education.

APPENDIX G
Administrative guidance on scholarship expectations for NTID faculty preparing for mid-tenure, tenure, and promotion review

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to develop a scholarship/research agenda and the results of this work should be disseminated in a manner that involves the review by peers in the faculty member's field of scholarly endeavor. Given the multiple discipline areas that NTID serves, there are many different ways in which NTID faculty can develop, produce, and contribute to scholarship and research efforts. It is incumbent upon each faculty member to determine discipline-appropriate avenues (including, but not limited to, publication in recognized and reputable peer-reviewed journals, presentation at professional conferences, and public performance and exhibition of artistic creations) that can be clearly documented as involving a rigorous review by professionals in the field. The NTID Administrative Guidelines for Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor and the NTID Policy on Promotion in Rank of Tenured Faculty provide a list of appropriate scholarly activities.

Determining whether or not a scholarly product will undergo an appropriately rigorous peer review is the responsibility of the individual faculty member who should consult with others (e.g., department chairperson, journal editor, conference and event organizer, etc.) to document the manner in which a research/scholarship effort has been peer-reviewed. In submitting a portfolio for consideration for a mid-tenure, tenure, or promotion review, faculty members should present evidence to clarify the nature of the peer review their scholarship has undergone. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the university provost, through recommendations provided by a faculty member's departmental peers and chairperson, the tenure/promotion review committee, and the NTID president to determine whether or not such products have indeed been peer-reviewed and disseminated in a manner consistent with expectations for tenure or promotion.

The NTID guidelines for tenure and promotion in rank state, in part, that "tenure-track faculty are required to demonstrate excellence in the pursuit of scholarship and professional activities in accordance with both the RIT definition of scholarship and the individual candidate's annual expectations." For post-tenure promotion, the guidelines state that "all tenured faculty are expected to engage in scholarship. In general, the successful candidate for promotion to associate professor will be able to demonstrate significant contributions in this domain, whereas the candidate for promotion to professor will be able to demonstrate a more advanced level of sustained and impactful work." Given the breadth not only of faculty members' disciplines but also the ways in which research and scholarship can be conducted in any of these fields, there can be no single way to define the phrases "excellence in pursuit of scholarship," "significant contributions," and "a more advanced level of sustained and impactful work" within NTID. Rather, faculty members themselves bear the responsibility of determining a successful research agenda and in explaining how their resulting scholarly efforts satisfy the stated criteria.

NTID faculty members enjoy wide latitude in the kind of scholarly projects that they pursue and how they work with others to accomplish those projects. Work may be based on a faculty member's field of training or fields of study associated with their primary job responsibilities, whether or not these areas directly relate to the field of deaf education. Faculty should be mindful that scholarly contributions are typically assessed on significance, impact on the field, and attention to the missions of the department and the college. Therefore, candidates for tenure and promotion should indicate the manner in which their research benefits the education of deaf and hard-of-hearing students, whether directly or indirectly. Further, faculty members often will collaborate on scholarly projects such that the resulting products have multiple co-authors. The nature of co-authorship depends heavily on a given field of study as do the concepts of "sole authorship" and "first authorship." Providing a single NTID-wide definition of the relative importance of any of these methods of authoring a scholarly product is impossible. Instead, faculty members bear the responsibility of explaining the importance of their contributions to the overall product, as well as the impact of that product when submitting a portfolio for the mid-tenure, tenure and promotion, or post-tenure promotion review.

The **minimum scholarship expectations** for tenure-track and tenured faculty, as outlined in the NTID Faculty Workload Guidelines, are described below:

- At the time of the third-year review, pre-tenure faculty members should have produced at least three peer-reviewed scholarship products, one of which must be a publication. Similarly, at the time of review for tenure, faculty members should have completed a minimum of six peer-reviewed products, at least half of which are peer-reviewed publications in recognized academic/professional journals or the equivalent (e.g., monographs, book chapters and major creative works). Scholarship products other than publications may consist of peer-reviewed presentations at professional conferences or the equivalent (e.g., creative works). The faculty member must demonstrate that they have made a significant contribution and played a leadership role in the production of each scholarship product by providing specific details concerning the nature of their contributions.
- Tenured assistant professors seeking promotion to the rank of associate professor should demonstrate a clear record of professional activities since the award of tenure and have a minimum of two peer-reviewed publications in recognized academic/professional journals or the equivalent (e.g., monographs, book chapters and major creative works) and two conference presentations or the equivalent (e.g., creative works). The promotion candidate must demonstrate that he or she has made a significant contribution and played a leadership role in the production of each scholarship product by providing specific details concerning the nature of their contributions.
- Tenured associate professors seeking promotion to the rank of professor should demonstrate a sustained record of scholarship, having a minimum of three peer-reviewed publications in recognized academic/professional journals or the equivalent (e.g., monographs, book chapters and major creative works) and two conference presentations or the equivalent (e.g., creative works) in the five years prior to seeking promotion to professor. The promotion candidate must demonstrate that he or she has made a significant contribution and played a leadership role in the production of each scholarship product by providing specific details concerning the nature of their contributions.

Whether or not "excellence in pursuit of scholarship," "significant contributions," and "a more advanced level of sustained and impactful work" can be achieved by satisfying the minimum expectations indicated above as they pertain to research and scholarship depends will depend on factors such as the following: a faculty member's specific contribution to each scholarship product, the length and scope of each contribution in relation to discipline norms, the quality of contributions in terms of the publication/presentation venue, the impact of the product, and the rigor of peer review as well as other indices of quality, such as scholarship-related awards. A faculty member is responsible for clarifying and describing the venues and impact of each scholarly contribution. Finally, for specific guidance, individual faculty members should attend to feedback provided by the chairperson in the annual review.

APPENDIX H
PROMOTION REVIEW
Sample Letter to External Reviewers Who Have Agreed to Review the Candidate's Scholarship

Dear Dr. _____:

Thank you for your willingness to serve as an external reviewer of the scholarship of (*Assistant or Associate*) Professor _____, who is a candidate for promotion in rank to (*Associate or Full Professor*) in the Department of _____ at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID) a college of Rochester Institute of Technology.

NTID's mission is to: "provide deaf and hard-of-hearing students with outstanding state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, complemented by a strong arts and sciences curriculum that prepare them to live and work in the mainstream of a rapidly changing global community and enhance their lifelong learning. Secondarily, NTID prepares professionals to work in fields related to deafness; undertakes a program of applied research designed to enhance the social, economic and educational accommodation of deaf people; and shares its knowledge and expertise through outreach and other information dissemination programs."

Your name was selected from a list of several nominees submitted to me by the candidate and the candidate's department head. I trust you will feel free to express your views as frankly as possible. Your review will be seen by the faculty senior in rank to the candidate in the candidate's department, the department head, the college promotion committee as well as the president/dean of NTID and the RIT provost. It will not be seen by the candidate.

As an external reviewer, you are asked to assess the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarship in his/her field. Your assessment should include reference to the potential benefits, of either a direct or indirect nature, of the scholarship to deaf and hard-of-hearing students. The candidate's teaching ability and general contributions to the University are being assessed internally.

Enclosed are the candidate's curriculum vitae and summary of scholarly accomplishments as well as examples of the candidate's scholarship. Also enclosed is a copy of our guidelines for external reviewers, which includes the specific questions we would like you to address in your response. Finally, we also attach a copy of the RIT definition of scholarship and the standards for scholarship at NTID. Please be mindful of these documents as you prepare your evaluation.

Based on our recent (*conversation or correspondence*) confirming your agreement, we would like to receive your review by October 25 at the latest. Do not include your name or other means of identification in the report itself. Please send your review electronically to the office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs in care of: Recca Karras, rxkncx@rit.edu.

The members of the faculty and I are grateful to you for undertaking this task. You may rest assured that this procedure is not simply a formality as your views and recommendations will have an important bearing upon the result of the candidate's application for promotion.

Yours sincerely,

Promotion committee chairperson
Enclosures:
    Candidate CV
    Candidate statement (scholarship section)
    Candidate materials pertaining to scholarship
    Guidelines for external reviewers
    RIT policy on scholarship
    Administrative guidance on scholarship expectations for NTID faculty preparing for mid-tenure, tenure, and promotion review
    NTID definition of creative work (where applicable)

APPENDIX J
Guidelines for External Reviewers

1. The University is seeking an independent, unbiased evaluation of the candidate's scholarship as part of the candidate's promotion application. If you are a relative or close personal friend or if you believe that your personal relationship to the candidate is such as to affect your assessment, please disqualify yourself.

2. Prior to preparing your evaluation, please review the enclosed documents, particularly the guidance on scholarship expectations for NTID faculty and the NTID definition of creative work, which provide important detail regarding the nature of faculty work at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.

3. You are asked to provide brief comments on each of the questions listed below to the best of your knowledge. You should also feel free to refer to any other matters, which you believe may assist the university in providing appropriate feedback to the candidate. In accordance with university policy, your evaluation of the record of scholarly performance should take into account quality, creativity, and significance for the discipline in question, including the potential benefits to deaf and hard-of-hearing students.

    a) Were you aware of the candidate's scholarship before now?

    b) How significant is the candidate's scholarship to the discipline and how is it relevant to the profession?

    c) Apart from his/her scholarly work, do you know of other contributions the candidate has made to the development of the discipline, for example, through organizing conferences, activities in learned societies or governmental commissions? How significant have these activities been from the standpoint of promoting teaching and scholarship in the discipline?

    d) Assuming that the candidate meets other criteria being assessed internally, is his/her scholarship, as revealed by both the quality and quantity of publications, creative work, and unpublished work, deserving of promotion in rank? Please explain the basis of your assessment.

4. In writing your review, you are urged to be as frank and direct as possible. Please do not include your name or other means of identification in the report itself. Your review will be seen by the candidate's department peers, department head and promotion committee as well as the president/dean of NTID and the RIT provost. It will not be seen by the candidate. Please ensure that we receive your review by October 25.

APPENDIX K
NTID Definition of Creative Work

The candidate should define his/her role in the creation of the work in terms of whether it is a solo or collaborative project, and whether it was commissioned, invited, or submitted. International and national exposure or circulation is considered more significant than regional, and regional is more highly regarded than local. Evaluation of an artistic achievement will include reviews by scholars in the field and other outside evaluators solicited by the committee. Evidence includes but is not limited to the following:

1. A candidate's portfolio which reveals significant and developing achievement in the field/s of specialization. Evidence of creative work (artistic works, films, electronic media productions, literary or dramatic works, designs, invitations, or exhibitions) may be submitted in any of the following ways: critical reviews, printed color images, slides, videotapes, DVD and CD, or any other current technology.

2. Participation in exhibits may be solo or in group format. Solo participation may be invited or curated. Group participation may be invited or curated, juried or open, as follows:

   • An invited exhibition, solo or as a member of a group, will typically occur as a result of a personal invitation from a nationally or regionally recognized gallery or museum.

   • A curated exhibition, solo or as a member of a group, is an exhibition of the candidate's work, which is reviewed by an individual curator or exhibition committee for exhibition in a gallery or museum, a university exhibition space or a non-profit artist's space. Typically, the exhibition curator establishes a theme and seeks artists whose work is appropriate to the theme. Invitations to submit work for review may come from advertisements, personal contacts with artists, or other curators. Artists typically submit a set of slides, an artist's statement, and resume.

   • A juried show is an exhibition where the selection process includes the artist's submission of slides/CD that match a particular theme or medium and payment of a submission fee. The exhibition venue may hire an outside curator to jury the work. Jurors vary by experience and reputation. An artist's work achieves greater recognition if the juror is well known and represents a recognized institution or gallery and if the artist wins a prize and/or the exhibit provides a catalogue.

   • An open show is one in which there are no requirements set for acceptance other than one's membership in a group. All work is accepted since no review process exists.

3. Commissions/Freelance activities

4. Gallery affiliations

5. Grants

6. Honors & awards

APPENDIX L
RIT Policy on Service – E4.0.4, section c

Service

While teaching and scholarship are important faculty responsibilities, services performed by faculty members are an indispensable part of the university's daily life. Faculty members at all ranks are expected to provide some forms of service to the university, their college, their department, their professional community, or the community at large. They are encouraged to provide service at different levels and areas of the university. The university values all forms of faculty service. Typical faculty service activities include but are not limited to the following: committee work at the departmental, college, or university level; improving the university's program quality, reputation and operational efficiency; student academic or career advising; advising a student group; faculty mentoring; linking the professional skills of members of the faculty and students to the world beyond the campus; development of new courses and curriculum; and service to the faculty member's professional societies, such as reviewing articles, organizing professional conferences, or serving a professional organization.

APPENDIX M
Interpreting the SLPI[17]

It is the position of this Communication Task Force that faculty peers and administrators need only address two questions in developing their judgments regarding an individual's sign language skills:

1.   Has an individual fully met the university's expectations?

2.   If not, has the individual made acceptable progress toward the goal? It may be deemed appropriate in light of other qualifications and given extenuating circumstances, to accept other than the stated level at the time of the evaluation with the expectation that the individual will achieve that level of sign language in the reasonably near future.

   It is to be judged whether an individual's professional development effort up to the time of the review documents a sustained and good faith effort, as well as whether an individual's SLPI rating suggests he/she will meet the university's expectations.

The issue of sufficient documentation will probably always remain primarily a judgment call (e.g., has there been sustained participation and effort within a defined professional development plan; or spotty participation over time; or "last-minute" rush to attempt to meet expectations; etc.). Nevertheless, these judgments should be guided by the intent and spirit of the recommendations.

If an individual does not attain the expected rating on the SLPI by the time of review for tenure/promotion, and if it is determined by those conducting the review that it is appropriate to assess progress rather than current level of achievement, the question arises, "What rating is considered to be close enough to indicate that, with additional sustained effort, he/she would reasonably be able to successfully attain the expected rating in the near future?"

We make the following recommendations for interpreting achievement of SLPI ratings:

The Rating Scale
Because a rating of Advanced Plus satisfies all university ASL skill requirements, all candidates rated Advanced Plus and above will be given a rating labeled "Advanced Plus to Superior Plus Range".

Sign Language Proficiency Interview Rating Scale

Superior Plus	Able to have a fully shared and natural conversation, with in-depth elaboration for both social and work topics. All aspects of signing are native-like.
Superior	Able to have a fully shared conversation, with in-depth elaboration for both social and work topics. Very broad sign language vocabulary, near native-like production and fluency, excellent use of sign language grammatical features, and excellent comprehension for normal signing rate.
Advanced Plus	Exhibits some superior level skills, but not all and not consistently.
Advanced	Able to have a generally shared conversation with good, spontaneous elaboration for both social and work topics. Broad sign language vocabulary knowledge and clear, accurate production of signs and fingerspelling at a normal/near-normal rate; occasional misproductions do not detract from conversational flow. Good use of many sign language grammatical features and comprehension good for normal signing rate.
Intermediate Plus	Exhibits some advanced level skills, but not all and not consistently.

---

[17] Extracted verbatim from Communication Task Force Report (November, 1990), Section IVC, "Interpreting the Intent and Spirit of the Recommendations," pp. 30-31. Ratified by NTID faculty, February, 1991.

Intermediate	Able to discuss with some confidence routine social and work topics within a conversational format with some elaboration; generally 3-to-5 sentences. Good knowledge and control of everyday/basic sign language vocabulary with some sign vocabulary errors. Fairly clear signing at a moderate signing rate with some sign misproductions. Fair use of some sign language grammatical features and fairly good comprehension for a moderate-to-normal signing rate; a few repetitions and rephrasing of questions may be needed.
Survival Plus	Exhibits some intermediate level skills, but not all and not consistently.
Survival	Able to discuss basic social and work topics with responses generally 1-to-3 sentences in length. Some knowledge of basic sign language vocabulary with many sign vocabulary and/or sign production errors. Slow-to-moderate signing rate. Basic use of a few sign language grammatical features. Fair comprehension for signing produced at a slow-to-moderate rate with some repetition and rephrasing.
Novice Plus	Exhibits some survival level skills, but not all and not consistently.
Novice	Able to provide single sign and some short phrase/sentence responses to basic questions signed at a slow-to-moderate rate with frequent repetition and rephrasing. Vocabulary primarily related to everyday work and/or social areas such as basic work-related signs, family members, basic objects, colors, numbers, names of weekdays, and time. Production and fluency characterized by many sign production errors and by a slow rate with frequent inappropriate pauses/hesitations.
No Functional Skills	(May be) Able to provide short single sign and 'primarily' finger-spelled responses to some basic questions signed at a slow rate with extensive repetition and rephrasing.