

NTID
Policy on Tenure and
Simultaneous Promotion to the
Rank of Associate Professor

National Technical Institute for the Deaf
Rochester Institute of Technology

Approved by NTID Tenured Faculty
December 2014
Revised to conform with changes to E5.0
May 2016
Communication expectations revised and
approved by faculty
April 2022

Table of Contents

<i>RIT Policy on Tenure</i>	2
1. <i>Preamble</i>	2
2. <i>Conditions of Tenure Appointments</i>	2
a. <i>Appointment</i>	2
b. <i>Tenure Location</i>	3
c. <i>Probationary Period</i>	3
d. <i>Criteria for Granting Tenure</i>	5
NTID Tenure Expectations	7
3. <i>Tenure Process</i>	10
a. <i>Documentation</i>	10
NTID Tenure Documentation.....	12
b. <i>Annual and Comprehensive Mid-tenure Reviews</i>	13
1. <i>Annual Review</i>	13
2. <i>Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review</i>	13
NTID Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review	15
c. <i>Tenure Review and Recommendations</i>	16
4. <i>Expedited Tenure Review</i>	19
NTID Tenure Review	21
Appendix A Calendar of Action.....	23
Appendix B Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review.....	24
B.1 Department Head Assessment Form.....	24
B.2 Department Peer Assessment Form	26
B.3 College Tenure Committee Assessment Form.....	28
B.4 President/Dean Confidential Assessment Form.....	30
Appendix C Tenure Review	31
C.1 Department Head Recommendation Form.....	31
C.2 Department Peer Recommendation Form	33
C.3 College Tenure Committee Recommendation	35
C.4 President/Dean Confidential Recommendation Form.....	37
C.5 Sample Letter to External Reviewers.....	38
C.6 Guidelines for External Reviewers	40
C.7 Administrative Guidance on NTID Scholarship Expectations.....	41
Appendix D Access to Documentation.....	43
D.1 NTID Table: Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review	43
D.2 NTID Table: Tenure Review	44
Appendix E Tenure Committee Membership.....	45
Appendix F Interpreting Sign Language Proficiency Interview Rating Scale (SLPI)	47
Appendix G RIT Institute Policy on Scholarship	48
Appendix H Definition of Creative Work	50
Appendix J RIT Institute Policy on Service	51
Appendix K Extracts from Provost’s 2012 Guidance	52

NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor

This document contains both the text of E5.0 taken from the RIT Policies and Procedures Manual and the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor which applies E5.0 to the circumstances of the college. The text of E.5.0 appears in italic typeface. The policies and procedures specific to NTID appear in bold typeface.

RIT POLICY ON TENURE

1. Preamble

Tenure is a fundamental pillar that supports and protects RIT faculty members' freedom of inquiry and expression in teaching and scholarship, conferring the right of self-direction for faculty members without concern for the stability of their position.

The RIT tenure policy is designed to encourage and reward excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service and to promote the atmosphere of critical inquiry and creative expression that is vital to the academic and cultural life of the university. Tenure is earned by demonstrated achievements and ongoing pursuit of advancements in teaching, scholarship, and service, guided by concern for students' and colleagues' personal worth and advancement. The most important factor in the tenure decision process is the evaluation of the candidate by his/her colleagues, made in light of the candidate's individual Statement of Expectations. Colleagues' judgment of such achievements is primary, informed by an individual's Statement of Expectations.

The pursuit of excellence continues beyond the tenure decision. Tenured faculty, department heads, and other administrators share responsibility to ensure that all faculty continue to grow and develop professionally. Tenure decisions shall be based upon documentation that meet the criteria outlined in the following policy.

2. Conditions of Tenure Appointments

a. Appointment

1. Contract

Appointment to the RIT faculty shall only be consummated through a written contract approved by the provost. The contract shall clearly state whether the candidate is or is not to be offered a tenure-track appointment, and in the case of tenure-track appointments, in which college tenure would reside. In the case of a joint appointment the contract shall also clearly state in which college the secondary appointment would reside.

2. Statement of Expectations

If an appointment is to a tenure-track position, an initial written Statement of Expectations describing specific criteria for being awarded tenure shall be provided to the faculty member with the written contract provided at the time of hire. This Statement of Expectations shall inform the candidate of published tenure criteria, as well as any additional expectations specific to the candidate. The Statement of Expectations is based on an agreement made between the candidate and the dean of the college, with the recommendation from the head of the department into which the candidate is being hired, and with the approval of the provost and the president of the university. The signed Statement of Expectations document ensures that each party understands tenure expectations and clearly states how policy allows these expectations for tenure to evolve before a candidate's mid-tenure review.

The Statement of Expectations may be updated to modify the candidate-specific expectations with the mutual consent of the candidate, the department head, and the dean. Before the Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review, the candidate, department head, or dean may initiate a modification. After the Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review, only the candidate may initiate a modification. In either case, a

signed copy of the updated Statement of Expectations with the modified candidate-specific expectations, agreed to by all parties, shall be provided to the candidate. The initial Statement of Expectations, and any updates to that Statement, provides a frame of reference for those evaluating each faculty member throughout the tenure review process.

All Statements of Expectations shall be governed by university criteria and individual college expectations for meeting the criteria.

b. Tenure Location

- 1. A faculty member shall be granted tenure in one of the colleges of the university or in the Golisano Institute for Sustainability. Throughout this policy, the word 'college' will include the Golisano Institute for Sustainability.*
- 2. In the case of a tenured faculty member changing from a single to a joint appointment or of a tenured faculty member who moves from one college to another, the location(s) and status of the faculty member's tenure shall be established by following the provisions of E.21 Policy on Assignment and Transfer of Tenure-Track Faculty.*

c. Probationary Period

1. Length of the Probationary Period

The probationary period before granting of tenure is normally six contract years for a faculty member who has had no teaching experience before appointment to the university faculty. For candidates with no reduction of the probationary period, the tenure consideration and evaluation shall be made in the sixth year. If tenure is granted, it is effective at the start of the following contract year.

2. Reducing Probationary Period

a. Equivalency Credit

- i. For each year of equivalent teaching experience, the probationary period may be reduced by one year. Equivalent teaching experience normally shall be full-time teaching at the rank of Instructor or above in a regionally accredited institution of higher learning, or full-time teaching in a non-tenure-track position at RIT.*
- ii. A reduction in the probationary period may also be given for scholarship in the subject-matter field in which the candidate is expected to teach and conduct scholarship.*
- iii. The equivalency of previous teaching and/or scholarship shall be evaluated by the department head and dean, and approved by the provost.*
- iv. The probationary period may be reduced by a maximum of two years, except by action of the provost in special circumstances, or in accordance with the Expedited Tenure Process section of this Policy.*

b. Reduction in Equivalency Credit

Faculty members with equivalency credit may reduce their initial equivalency credit by one year by written notice to the dean. Such notice must be made before the first day of the spring term before their scheduled tenure review. Further reductions in equivalency credit may only be granted with the written agreement of the dean. The dean shall notify Human Resources and the Office of the Provost of any reduction in equivalency credit.

3. *Hiring with Tenure*

A faculty member may only be hired with tenure under the provisions of Section 4 of this policy, "Expedited Tenure Process."

4. *Extension of Probationary Period*

- a. *A pre-tenured faculty member who becomes a parent by birth or adoption before the tenure documentation is due is automatically granted a one-year extension to the tenure probationary period upon providing written notice of each birth or adoption to the department head, dean, and provost within six months of the birth or adoption and before the tenure documentation is due. The automatic extensions may be waived if the faculty member so desires and so indicates in writing to the dean before the first day of the spring term preceding the requested tenure consideration date.*
- b. *An extension of the tenure probationary period shall be provided to tenure-track faculty who apply for and are granted an approved leave of absence as defined in E.17.0, E.33.0, or E34.0. The extension of the probationary period shall be for a minimum of one year.*
- c. *Pre-tenured faculty who wish to focus on research activities and who secure external funding to support those activities (including full salary and benefits) may request temporary assignment to a non-tenure track research faculty position for one year (See E6.0). Tenure-track faculty who are accepted to research faculty positions will be given a leave of absence from their tenure-eligible faculty positions for a maximum of one year. They may also request a one-year tenure-clock extension during that period. Any scholarship completed in this period shall be considered towards tenure and promotion should the faculty member return to their tenure-track position.*
- d. *In extraordinary cases, tenure-track faculty may request an extension of the probationary period for extenuating circumstances prior to September 1 of the year of the faculty member's tenure review. A confidential written request, detailing the reasons for the extension, shall be submitted to the department head. The department head forwards the request, along with his/her written recommendation to the dean. The dean forwards the request, the department head's recommendation, and his/her written recommendation to the provost. The provost shall review the request and recommendations and make a determination. The faculty member, department head, and dean will be notified in writing of the extension decision and in the case of a positive decision, the projected tenure review date.*
- e. *A previously granted extension shall be reversed upon the candidate's request. Such a request must be made in writing to his/her dean before the first day of the spring term preceding the requested tenure consideration date. Once such a reversal is requested in writing, the extension is automatically reversed.*
- f. *Documentation associated with extensions of the probationary period for a pre-tenured faculty member as described within this section shall be maintained in the dean's office 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" (E31.0).*
- g. *Extensions to the probationary period for a pre-tenured faculty member as described within this section shall not increase the individual faculty member's expectations for achievement towards tenure.*

5. *Advanced Notice of Non-reappointment During the Probationary Period*

Except in situations of financial exigency (E22.0) or program discontinuance (E20.0), written

notice of non-reappointment to the tenure-track or of intention not to recommend reappointment to the tenure-track shall be given to the affected faculty member by the dean as follows:

- a. *In the first year of a tenure-track appointment, notice of non-reappointment must be given:*
 1. *Before the start of classes in the spring semester. In this case, the faculty member's contract ends at the end of the current contract period.*
 2. *If notice is not given by the start of classes for spring semester, notice of non-reappointment must be given before June 30. In this case, the faculty member will be offered a contract for the following fall semester only.*
- b. *In the second year of a tenure-track appointment, notice of non-reappointment must be given before the start of classes in spring semester. The faculty member's contract ends at the end of the current contract period.*
- c. *After two or more years of tenure-track service, notice of intent not to reappoint to the tenure-track must be given by 30 June of the current contract year; in which case the tenure-track faculty member will be offered a terminal contract for one additional academic year.*

d. *Criteria for Granting Tenure*

The view that teaching is the foremost activity of the RIT faculty is deeply rooted in the university's traditions. While teaching will continue to be a hallmark of RIT, scholarship is of significant importance, and service is also central to the academic endeavor.

1. *Criteria*

a. *University Criteria*

i. *Teaching*

Teaching, see E4.0: An effective teacher, among other things, communicates special knowledge and expertise with sensitivity towards students' needs and abilities. This entails selection and use of appropriate instructional methods and materials and providing fair, useful and timely evaluation of the quality of the learner's work.

Evaluation of teaching must include a conscientious effort to obtain and consider information that relates directly to teaching and learning and makes effective classroom performance possible. This includes the review of student and peer evaluations.

ii. *Scholarship*

Scholarship, (see E4.0): Documented, peer-reviewed, and disseminated disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship of discovery, teaching/pedagogy, integration, and/or application form a foundational component of a faculty member's career activities.

iii. *Service*

Service, (see E4.0): While teaching and scholarship are the fundamental tenure-track faculty responsibilities, service performed by faculty members is also an indispensable part of the university's daily life. Tenure-track faculty at all ranks are expected to engage in service, though the type and amount of service will vary over a faculty member's career.

iv. *Balance*

No faculty member has to be deeply engaged in all of the foregoing activities at any one time. Rather, specific forms of endeavor should be planned and agreed upon to the end that full opportunity is provided for individual and professional development and enhancement.

b. *College Expectations*

Each college shall develop and publish its own specific tenure expectations, as well as acceptable forms of documentation based on the general criteria of this policy. Expectations shall be approved by the tenure-track faculty of the individual colleges and then be approved by the Academic Senate. College expectations for tenure and for acceptable forms of documentation shall be no less specific than, and must be consistent with, this policy. The expectations used for granting tenure, including specific qualities sought and achievements shall be defined in each college's published tenure policies. Faculty within each administrative unit may define specific standards or qualities related to scholarship that are consistent with college policy. All college tenure policies shall be reviewed by the university president and made available through the provost's office.

2. *Statement of Expectations and Plan of Work*

The initial Statement of Expectations provides the framework, or general parameters, for the faculty member's agreement for hire and initial appointment. Updated Statements of Expectations may modify the candidate-specific expectations, and changes to university and college tenure policy that take effect before a candidate's Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review may affect the policy and criteria used in evaluating that candidate. Changes to university and college tenure policy that take effect after a candidate's Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review will not be used in the candidate's tenure evaluation process. The annual Plan of Work (E7.0) includes specific annual goals toward meeting the Statement of Expectations. In the Statement of Expectations, the dean, department head and the tenure-track faculty member might choose to weight items for subsequent annual Plans of Work. Each year, tenure-track faculty should reflect on the past year's teaching, scholarship and service. In a written assessment, they should show how those activities met goals in the previous Plan of Work.

NTID Tenure Expectations

The primary context for tenure review is the candidate's Statement(s) of Expectations as well as his/her annual expectations during the probationary period. While individual expectations will differ in detail, in general, a candidate must satisfy expectations defined under each of following four categories: 1) Teaching and/or Tutoring, 2) Communication, 3) Scholarship, and 4) Service.

1. Teaching and/or Tutoring

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 required 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 supporting letters.

1.b Tutoring

Tutoring may be a major component of their primary responsibility 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 student success. Because tutoring takes place outside of the traditional classroom, tutors are also expected to develop and maintain working relationships with the primary instructor 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 required 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

At NTID, communication is understood to mean 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 Language¹ (ASL) at a level of vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, 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 Interview² (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.

¹ 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, directionality, and other features which are characteristics of ASL vocabulary and its principles, and strong sign reception abilities."

² Candidates should refer to Appendix F for detail and clarification related to sign language achievement and SLPI ratings.

FOR FACULTY HIRED JULY 1, 2022 AND LATER

NTID faculty are expected to strive for, achieve, and maintain the ability to communicate in American Sign Language (ASL) at a level of vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, comprehension, and fluency that allows effective participation in communication situations applicable to work and social topics. A candidate is required to demonstrate an ADVANCED level of skill as measured by the Sign Language Proficiency Interview (SLPI).

In addition to the SLPI rating of ADVANCED, a candidate is required to provide documentation of the ability to communicate effectively in ASL inside and outside the classroom. Such documentation might include SRS 1:1/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; results from other American Sign Language assessments; 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

Tenure-track faculty are required to demonstrate excellence in the pursuit of scholarship and professional activities in accordance with both the RIT definition of scholarship³ and the individual candidate's annual expectations. The expectation is that scholarship will be peer-reviewed and disseminated. Scholarship which has been disseminated but not yet reviewed by peers external to the Institute may be submitted as part of the candidate's portfolio, but will not carry equal weight. Scholarly activities should have some relevance to the primary area of professional responsibility. Materials stemming from these activities may be produced in traditional, digital or other electronic formats. For the purpose of tenure consideration, the major elements of endeavor related to scholarship and professional activities may include one or more of the following:

- (a) primary or joint authorship of articles in professional journals, books, book chapters or other peer-reviewed publications.**
- (b) creation of work⁴ shown in international, national, state, or regional galleries, museums and public display areas and/or demonstration of participation in other related artistic endeavors at an equivalent level.**
- (c) presentation of papers, workshops and other training activities at state, national or international professional society meetings.**

³ See Appendix G for the RIT definition of scholarship.

⁴ See Appendix H for guidance on the definition of "creative work."

- (d) primary or joint authorship, direction, design, or performance in theatre production.**
- (e) receipt or award of grants which support scholarship.**

4. Service

Following the RIT definition of service,⁵ the tenure candidate should have made meritorious contributions to the college or university at large in one or more of the following ways:

- (a) service as department chair⁶**
- (b) service within the department, e.g., department coordinator, department committees.**
- (c) service on college or university committees.**
- (d) contributions towards student recruitment, retention, and placement.**
- (e) service that supports and enhances the campus community through complementary education, student organizations, and special programs and events.**
- (f) service to the community that advances public confidence in NTID as a college and RIT as an institute of higher education.**
- (g) service to community agencies and organizations that advance special NTID and RIT interests.**
- (h) service to the profession through participation in state, national or international societies, committees, or organizations.**
- (j) other community service in the public interest.**

e. The Tenure Process

The administration of the tenure granting process shall be consistent with university policy and under the direction of the provost.

a. Documentation

1. Content

All tenure recommendations shall be supported by available documentation. At a minimum, this shall include:

- all agreements relating to the faculty member's conditions of employment (provided by dean's office);*
- the current and if applicable previous version(s) of the Statement of Expectations and requirements with respect to tenure (provided by dean's office);*

⁵ See Appendix J for the RIT definition of service.

⁶ In very unusual circumstances, the primary responsibility of a pre-tenured faculty member, as laid out in his/her Statement of Expectations and annual plans of work, may be academic administration. Where such a case arises, corresponding weight to the performance of those responsibilities must be given in any tenure-related evaluation.

- *annual reviews on record (provided by dean's office);*
- *appropriate and reliable documentation related to the faculty member's teaching performance, academic and professional qualifications, scholarship, and service (provided by candidate);*
- *materials submitted by the candidate for mid-tenure review (provided by candidate);*
- *other material as specified in college tenure policies.*

Additional information and guidance may be provided by the Office of the Provost. The candidate's complete tenure review file will be assembled by his/her dean's office.

All documents provided by the candidate will be available to all internal reviewers until the tenure decision is made. Review committees and recommending administrators shall use this documentation at the appropriate and necessary points in the tenure process.

2. File Location

The documentation, as defined above, for each faculty member with a tenure-track appointment shall be maintained by the dean's office 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" (E31.0).

3. Confidentiality

In order to assure that recommendations are completely candid and accurate, all letters and recommendations for or against the awarding of tenure shall remain confidential and shall be made accessible only as specified in Tables 1 and 2. For access to Comprehensive Mid-tenure review documentation see Sec. 3.b.(2)(i) and for tenure review documentation see Sec. 3.c.(2)(e).

4. Final Disposition of Documents

At the candidate's request, the provost shall summarize the content of all letters of review or assessment with the candidate while maintaining the confidentiality of all internal and external evaluators. At the conclusion of the Mid-Tenure Comprehensive Review and the tenure review processes, all documentation shall be kept on file in the Office of the Dean of the respective college and in accordance with C22.0, Records Management Policy.

NTID Tenure Documentation

Upon notification by the president/dean that he/she will be reviewed for either mid-tenure comprehensive review or full tenure, the candidate, with the assistance of the dean's office, prepares the documentation listed below in the form of a dossier. The documentation should be provided in files uploaded to a secure central repository online. The information should be organized with the following filenames:

- A. The candidate's original letter of hire and Statement of Expectations with any revisions thereto (added by the dean's office).
- B. Curriculum Vitae – The CV should document the candidate's entire academic career with accomplishments since entry onto the tenure track clearly distinguished.
- C. Statement on Teaching and/or Tutoring, 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 (SRS/SRATE results)⁷ and peer reviews of teaching (if applicable).
- H. External peer reviews (added by the dean's office).⁸
- J. Letters of support from peers, students, and others competent to comment on the merit of the candidate's accomplishments.⁹
- K. The candidate's annual reviews (added to the dossier by the dean's office after the department peer review).

In files C-F, the candidate should summarize his/her achievements in each area since entry onto the tenure track. The four statements combined may not exceed eight single-spaced pages for the comprehensive mid-tenure review and 20 pages for full tenure review, 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 be awarded tenure. 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 narrative.¹⁰

Before mid-tenure review begins, the dean's office adds A from the list above to the dossier. Before tenure 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 tenure committee review, the dean's office adds the candidate's annual reviews (labeled "K" above), the department head's confidential review and the department peer reviews to the dossier.

⁷ 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.

⁸ For tenure candidates only.

⁹ Occasionally, providers of support letters prefer to send their letter directly to the tenure committee through the office of the AVP or president/dean.

¹⁰ Candidates should expect that additional material or clarification may be requested by peers during the departmental review period and/or by the college tenure committee. Candidates are therefore advised that they may wish to have supporting documentation prepared in advance so that, if requested, they can provide information in a timely manner.

b. Annual and Comprehensive Mid-tenure Reviews

1. Annual Review

The content and process for annual reviews are given in E7.0. Although tenure-review committees are not bound by any tenure implication contained in annual reviews, such reviews made during a candidate's probationary period are an important measure of a candidate's progress toward tenure and must be considered along with all other evidence. If the college has special areas of competence to be emphasized or if there is any change in the original Statement of Expectations with respect to tenure, candidates must be clearly informed of this and they must be consistent with Section 2.a.2 of this policy.

During the tenure probationary period, the annual reviews will conclude with a statement indicating whether current performance would normally lead to a recommendation for tenure. Colleges that have their own annual tenure review process that leads to a separate annual tenure review letter for tenure-track faculty may use that letter in lieu of a statement in the annual review referenced in E7.0.

2. Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review

The purpose of the comprehensive mid-tenure review is to provide preliminary feedback to the candidate midway through his or her probationary period on the degree to which the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure. The review shall cover all performance in all the areas required for tenure. It will provide advice and counsel regarding achievement of tenure. [These provisions apply only to those who enter the tenure track in fall 2009 and beyond.]

- a. Timing: As part of the tenure process, tenure-track faculty members will undergo a comprehensive review process during the third year of their six-year probationary period. Tenure-track faculty who were granted credit towards tenure will undergo the comprehensive review process during the second year of their probationary period.*
- b. Documentation: Candidates will provide documentation as specified in the college's tenure guidelines. External letters shall not be a component of the required documentation for mid-tenure comprehensive review.*
- c. Department Head: The department head shall provide a written assessment of the candidate's appropriate progress towards tenure from the perspective of colleague, supervisor, and administrator based upon the candidate's documentation. The department head's written assessment of whether the candidate is making satisfactory or unsatisfactory progress toward tenure shall be forwarded with the candidate's documentation to the college tenure committee.*
- d. Input from Department Tenured Faculty: The committee shall seek letters from tenured department members that contain comments that can be substantiated regarding whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards tenure. Input from each tenured faculty member within the department shall be sought. If letters are not received from all tenured faculty members, the tenure committee should make an additional attempt to obtain input from all tenured faculty.*
- e. Committee: The review will be conducted by the college tenure committee or by another equivalent committee established by the college. The exact model for an equivalent committee must be developed and approved by the college faculty and dean.*

- f. *Schedule: Each college will establish its own dates and process for receiving documentation from candidates and for communicating with them. The schedule shall ensure that input is received by the provost no later than April 1. Upon initial communication with the candidate regarding collection of documentation, the Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review begins.*
- g. *Evaluation: In its review of the faculty documentation, the committee shall prepare a letter that discusses its analysis of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses, stating whether current performance would normally lead to a recommendation for tenure under current guidelines and offering guidance for continued improvement. The committee's letter shall include a summary of the departmental faculty letters. The committee letter should contain no information that could reveal the identity of an individual departmental faculty member because the letter will be made accessible to the candidate at the end of the mid-tenure review process. If the faculty member had received a tenure probationary period extension, the reasons behind this extension will not be disclosed within the committee's letter. The committee shall forward its letter of review and all documentation to the dean.*

After review of the candidate's complete file, the dean will forward the committee's letter, the candidate's documentation, the department head's letter and a separate dean's recommendation letter to the provost.

After review of the candidate's complete file, the provost's comments on the candidate's progress toward tenure will be sent in letter form to the dean. The dean and the candidate's department head will discuss the Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review with the candidate.

Like annual reviews, a Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review is a measure of a candidate's progress toward tenure and an opportunity to provide guidance for continued growth. It cannot, however, predict the eventual tenure decision, whether positive or negative.

- h. *Access to Comprehensive Mid-Tenure Review Documents: The letters of review or assessment from the department head, dean, committee, and provost shall be made accessible to the candidate by the dean at the end of the mid-tenure review process. However, all other letters, including those from individual department members shall remain confidential and will not be made accessible to the candidate. The purpose of the Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review process is to provide advice and council regarding the achievement of tenure. To maximize the value of that advice and council, at the conclusion of the process, the candidate's department head shall receive the department faculty letters. The letters of review or assessment from the department head, dean, committee, and provost from the Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review shall be included in the tenure documentation at the end of the probationary period when the candidate is considered for tenure. See Table 1 of this policy for a table describing access to documentation.*

NTID Comprehensive Mid-Tenure Review

The Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review of tenure-track faculty will be conducted by the NTID tenure committee at the beginning of a candidate's third year in a tenure-track position. (Where faculty have been given credit towards tenure, the above-cited RIT policy will apply.) The review will include documentation submitted by the candidate and a series of assessments of the candidate's progress to date toward achievement of the kind of performance that would normally lead to a recommendation for tenure.¹¹

The candidate submits his/her portfolio on-line in pdf format by September 1.

- Department head review

The candidate's department head prepares an assessment of the candidate's performance to date relative to each of the four major expectations for tenure (Appendix B.1). The review is submitted to the office of the president/dean by October 20.

- Department peer review

On October 5, the tenured faculty of the department begin their individual review of the candidate's portfolio. Each faculty member submits his/her assessment of the candidate's performance relative to each of the four major expectations for tenure to the office of the AVP on the Peer Recommendation Form (Appendix B.2) by October 20.

- Tenure committee review

On October 25, the president/dean submits the candidate's dossier to the tenure committee including the candidate's portfolio, the assessments of the candidate's department peers and of the department head, and copies of the candidate's annual reviews.

The committee schedules a meeting to begin review of the documentation. At this meeting, it clarifies the candidate's primary area of job responsibility and associated expectations.

After it has completed its preliminary review of the candidate's dossier, the committee determines if 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. The candidate has one week to respond, either in writing or in video format, after receipt of the request.

The committee next conducts at least one meeting during which it develops a report reflecting its judgment as to the candidate's progress towards tenure. The report, written by the committee chairperson¹² using the form provided (Appendix B.3) identifies the strengths and weaknesses in the candidate's performance to date and offers an opinion as to whether he/she is making satisfactory progress towards tenure. Conflicting opinions among committee members should be clearly stated. The form is signed by each committee member and delivered to the office of the president/dean by January 15.

¹¹ See Appendix D.1

¹² In cases where the committee chair and the candidate belong to the same academic unit, the chairperson delegates the preparation of the final committee report to another member of the committee.

- **President/dean confidential review**

After reviewing all the documentation, the president/dean prepares his/her own summary (Appendix B.4). This summary, together with all associated documentation pertaining to the candidate, is forwarded to the provost by April 1.

- **Provost review**

Having reviewed all the documentation, the provost prepares a letter summarizing his/her assessment of the candidate's performance to date. The letter is forwarded to the president/dean, who meets with the candidate and the candidate's department head to review it and the separate assessments of the tenure committee, the candidate's department head, and the president/dean. At the end of this meeting, a copy of the provost's letter is made available to the candidate.

c. Tenure Review and Recommendations

When an Assistant Professor is being evaluated for tenure, s/he must be simultaneously evaluated for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Each college will establish a procedure to ensure that it recommends to the provost either approval or denial of both tenure and promotion. In addition, each college will establish a schedule consistent with university policy to receive and process materials that support the review for tenure and simultaneous promotion (when appropriate) of the tenure-track faculty within the academic unit. This schedule shall ensure that the College Tenure Committee's recommendation is forwarded to the college dean no later than 15 January and the dean's letter is forward to the provost no later than 8 February.

1. Department

The candidate's department head assesses the candidate's performance throughout the probationary period as part of the annual review process. The department head shall provide a written assessment of the candidate's progress towards tenure from the perspective of colleague, supervisor, and administrator based upon the candidate's documentation. The department head's letter shall include a clear vote (yes or no) in regards to tenure attainment of the candidate followed by an explanation of the vote. The department head's written assessment of the candidate's progress toward tenure shall be forwarded to the college tenure committee according to the college schedule that ensures the committee can complete their review and letter to the college dean no later than 15 January.

2. College Tenure Committee

The committee shall evaluate the dossier, weighing the strengths and weaknesses of the tenure candidate in fulfilling their personal Statement of Expectations and with respect to university tenure criteria, expectations of the candidate's college expressed in college tenure policy, and administrative-unit specific standards or qualities, where applicable.

- a. Membership: When there are candidates for tenure in a college, a committee shall be assembled - six tenured members from the candidate's college and another appointed by the Academic Senate from a list of nominees elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of each college. Department heads may serve on tenure committees except in cases where the faculty candidate's appointment resides within the same department as the department head. Each college shall determine its procedure for electing the members, ensuring that there is at least one continuing member to provide for continuity over time. The Academic Senate shall determine its procedure for appointing the outside member specified above. The committee shall hold its initial meeting according to college policy. It is recommended that the initial meeting be held by the end of the spring semester prior to the academic year in which the tenure evaluation is to occur, but no*

later than 15 September of the evaluation year. The committee shall select its chair from its membership.

Elections for each tenure committee shall be conducted before 1 March of the prior academic year. The college tenure policy shall ensure that the composition of the college tenure committee has broad representation and avoids undue weighting of a single unit.

In the case of a college with fewer than eighteen (18) tenured faculty eligible to serve on a tenure committee and with fewer than six departments or academic units, a special tenure committee shall be formed. The special committee shall be comprised of four tenured members of the faculty of the college, two tenured faculty with at least two years' experience on tenure committees from other colleges appointed by the Academic Senate from a list of nominees elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of each college, and another faculty member appointed by the Academic Senate from a list of nominees elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of each college. Colleges with fewer than eighteen (18) tenured faculty shall not provide representatives to other small college special committees, but those colleges may choose to nominate tenured faculty to serve as external members on other college tenure committees if desired.

- b. Input from Tenured Department Faculty: It is the responsibility of the tenured faculty to participate in the tenure process at RIT. The tenure committee, therefore, shall solicit a confidential letter from each tenured faculty member within the candidate's department. The letter should include a clear recommendation for or against tenure accompanied by a supporting explanation. If letters are not received from all tenured faculty members within the department, the tenure committee shall attempt to obtain input from those faculty who did not respond.*
- c. External Review Letters: The committee shall obtain a list of five names of external reviewers from the candidate. After consultation with the candidate's department head, the committee shall seek to obtain a minimum of four letters from external reviewers in the candidate's field of scholarship.*

The committee shall seek two letters from the list of reviewers suggested by the candidate and at least two letters from reviewers not on the candidate's list. A maximum of one reviewer may be a co-author and all other external reviewers shall not have personal ties or conflicts of interest (C4.0) with the candidate. In all cases, the reviewers should have fields of study within the candidate's expertise. Letters from thesis advisors are not to be used in the official list of external letters; they may, however, be included in the dossier as further evidence of the candidate's work.

Each reviewer will be requested to evaluate the candidate's scholarship according to university tenure criteria and college tenure expectations. If fewer than four letters are received, the committee chair should make an additional attempt to obtain four letters, making a reasonable effort to ensure two letters are from the candidate's list of potential reviewers. The external review letters will be received by the dean's office of the candidate.

- d. Evaluation: Recommendation for approval for tenure by the college tenure committee shall require a minimum 2/3 majority in favor as determined by secret vote. All members of the committee must vote; there shall be no abstentions or avoidances of voting by absence. Recommendation for approval or non-approval of tenure, a written statement of reasons for approval or non-approval, and the vote shall be forwarded by the chair of the tenure committee to the dean of the college by 15 January. If the candidate for tenure had received an extension to his/her tenure probationary period, the reasons behind this extension will not be disclosed within the committee's letter.*

- e. *Access to Tenure Review Documents: All letters of review or assessment shall remain confidential and will not be made accessible to the candidate. See Table 2 of this policy for a table describing access to documentation.*
- f. *Joint Appointments: In the case of a joint academic appointment that crosses two colleges, a joint tenure review committee shall be formed and hold its initial meeting according to college schedule of the candidate's primary appointment. The joint committee shall be comprised of four tenured members of the faculty of the college in which the candidate's primary appointment resides (and in which tenure will reside, if granted), two members from the college in which the candidate's secondary appointment resides, and another appointed by the Academic Senate from a list of nominees elected by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of each college. The committee shall review the candidate based on university tenure criteria and college tenure expectations of the primary college, the candidate's documentation, and the letters of review or assessment from the department head, dean, committee, and provost from the Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review.*

3. *Dean of the College*

- a. *Shortly after the membership of the college tenure committee is determined by the above process, the dean shall announce to the college the names of the committee members. (The records of the election process shall be kept on file in the dean's office until 15 November and be placed at the disposal of those who wish to examine the process.)*
- b. *The dean will also call the committee to its initial organizational meeting. This meeting shall be called according to college schedule of the candidate's primary appointment, but no later than 30 September of the academic year in which the tenure evaluation is to occur, and preferably by the end of the spring semester prior. During that meeting, the dean shall:*
 - *Announce to the committee the names of the candidates for tenure.*
 - *Provide the documentation, the written recommendation of the department head and the letters of review or assessment from the department head, dean, committee, and provost from the Comprehensive Mid-tenure Review.*
 - *Instruct the committee to elect a chair from the faculty elected in 3.c.2 above. The dean shall depart before the election of the chair.*
- c. *The dean of the college shall prepare a tenure recommendation, separate from that of the college tenure committee recommendation. The dean shall write a recommendation, based upon university and college tenure policy, an assessment of the candidate documentation, the tenure committee's analysis and the opinions of the external evaluators consulted during the external review. That document shall be forwarded with the committee's letter, the department head's letter, and the candidate's documentation to the provost by 8 February.*

4. *The Provost*

- a. *The provost shall review the candidate's documentation, the recommendations of the college tenure committee, department head, and dean and form a tenure recommendation. The provost may call upon the candidate, the department head, the college tenure committee, and/or the dean for clarification or additional information and may meet with any of them to reconcile opposing views.*
- b. *University Tenure Review Committee: If a college tenure committee and dean are in dispute over a candidate's viability, and/or the provost disagrees with the conclusion*

reached by the dean as representative of the college regarding the candidate's viability, the provost may convene a meeting of the chairs of all the college tenure committees. That group shall review all the available documentation and advise the provost toward a final decision, guided by the specific tenure expectations outlined by the candidate's college. The group shall relate its findings in writing to the provost.

- c. When satisfied on all points, the provost shall make an official recommendation to the president that includes all prior recommendations received.*

5. The President

The president shall make the final decision to grant or deny tenure.

d. Granting or Denial of Tenure

The granting or denial of tenure shall be in the form of a written communication from the provost to the candidate no later than 15 April. In the case of denial, the letter shall set forth the specific reasons, the college tenure committee vote, the university tenure review committee vote, if it was involved, and the recommendations from the department head and dean.

If granted, tenure becomes effective on the first day of the following contract year; if tenure is denied, the candidate shall have the option of a one-year contract for the following academic year.

If a candidate wishes to appeal a tenure denial, the Institute Faculty Grievance Procedures are available to the extent provided in E24.0. Such appeal shall be limited to the question of whether the policies and procedures set forth in this tenure policy have been followed in the candidate's case.

4. Expedited Tenure Review

a. Purpose

An expedited tenure review may be requested in the infrequent case where the university, as part of a faculty search process, wishes to hire a faculty member with tenure (see E4.0.1 and E8.0).

b. Review Process

The request for an expedited tenure review shall be initiated by the person who would become the candidate's immediate administrative supervisor, and the request for review must be approved by either the provost or the president. Upon approval, the provost or the president will ask the dean of the college in which the tenure will reside to have the college's tenure committee evaluate the candidate for tenure in an accelerated time frame.

During the evaluation process, input from committee members can occur electronically however, if one or more members of the college's tenure committee are not available during this accelerated time frame, each such member shall be substituted by an alternate elected by the faculty of the college. If one or more members of the college's tenure committee are at a faculty rank lower than that sought for the incoming candidate, each such member shall be substituted by an alternate from the college's promotion committee or elected by the faculty of the college. Each college shall ensure that a full tenure committee can be assembled as needed for the purpose of this expedited tenure review and that the committee will be available to complete the expedited review process. If the tenure committee's external member is not available during the accelerated time frame the Academic Senate shall appoint a substitute.

This expedited process is normally considered in the case where the candidate currently holds tenure at an accredited institution of higher education. In these instances, the dean will provide the tenure committee with all the application materials collected by the search committee, including at a minimum

the candidate's CV, list of scholarly work, reference letters, and teaching evaluations. The tenured faculty with equivalent or higher rank (of that sought for the faculty candidate) from the academic unit where this candidate would reside will be notified by the committee that the candidate's file is available for their review. Within seven (7) business days of the notification, each invited faculty member may submit a written recommendation (paper or electronic) to the committee. The letter should include a clear recommendation for or against expedited tenure at hire accompanied by a supporting explanation.

Within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the complete application materials from the dean, the tenure committee shall evaluate the candidate and provide the dean with a recommendation on tenure for the candidate, along with the committee vote and the signatures (physical or electronic) of all committee members. Recommendation for approval for expedited tenure by the college tenure committee shall require a minimum 2/3 majority in favor as determined by secret vote. The committee may alternatively make a recommendation for an appropriate expedited period of review for tenure upon hire.

The dean will forward the tenure committee's evaluation and recommendation as well as his/her recommendation to the provost. Based on those recommendations, the provost shall make a recommendation and forward it along with the other recommendations to the president. The president shall make the final decision on granting tenure or granting a reduced tenure probationary period in accordance with Section 2.c.2.i of this policy.

In rare and unusual cases where the candidate does not currently hold tenure at an accredited institution of higher education, the dean will provide the tenure committee with all the application materials collected by the search committee, as well as additional material provided by the candidate that is viewed by the tenure committee as necessary and consistent with the college's tenure policy. Within four weeks of the receipt of the complete application materials, using the process stipulated previously in this section, the tenure committee shall evaluate the candidate and provide the dean with a recommendation on tenure for the candidate. The dean will forward the tenure committee's evaluation and recommendation along with his/her recommendation to the provost. Based on those recommendations, the provost shall make a recommendation and forward it along with the other recommendations to the president. The president shall make the final decision on granting tenure or granting a reduced tenure probationary period in accordance with Section 2.c.2 of this policy.

NTID Tenure Review

The candidate submits his/her portfolio on-line in pdf format by September 1.

- Department head recommendation

Using the form provided in Appendix C.1, the candidate's department head submits his/her recommendation for or against tenure, supported by comments regarding the candidate's performance relative to each of the four major expectations for tenure to the office of the president/dean by October 20.

- Department peer recommendations

On October 5, the tenured faculty of the department begin their individual review of the candidate's portfolio and the external review letters. Department peer recommendations for or against tenure, supported by comments concerning the candidate's performance relative to each of the four major expectations for tenure, are submitted to the office of the AVP on the Peer Recommendation Form (Appendix C.2) by October 20.

- External review

A critical component of tenure review is the participation of a minimum of four reviewers, external to RIT, who will evaluate the candidate's scholarship. Reviewers will normally, but not necessarily, come from an academic setting, but in all cases, should have expertise in the candidate's field of scholarship.

By May 14 of his/her sixth year, the candidate for tenure review submits a list with the names, positions and contact information of four potential peer reviewers to the office of the AVP. The list may not include dissertation advisors and may include the name of only one co-author. In addition, and in the same time frame, the candidate's department head submits a different list with at least four names of potential peer reviewers to the office of the AVP. The office of the AVP immediately communicates with the individuals named to ascertain their willingness to serve as reviewers, with the goal of securing agreement to review the candidate from at least two individuals from each list.

In the event that this process fails to secure four reviewers, the office of the AVP seeks additional names, equally, from the candidate and the candidate's department head. Upon confirmation that a reviewer has accepted the invitation, the committee chairperson sends a copy of the Guidelines for External Reviewers¹³ together with a request¹⁴ to the reviewer to submit the review to the office of the president/dean by September 30. The office of the AVP must carefully document all steps to secure external review letters. In the event that the requisite number of external letters is not forthcoming, the candidate will not be penalized.

- Tenure Committee¹⁵ recommendation

On October 25, the president/dean submits the candidate's dossier to the tenure committee, including the candidate's portfolio, the recommendations of the candidate's department peers and of the department head, copies of the candidate's annual reviews, the external review letters.

The committee schedules a meeting to begin review of the candidate's dossier. At this meeting, it clarifies the candidate's primary area of job responsibility and associated expectations.

¹³ See Appendix C.6: Tenure Review: Guidelines for External Reviewers

¹⁴ See Appendix C.5.

¹⁵ See Appendix E.

After it has completed its preliminary review of the candidate's dossier, the committee determines if 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. The candidate has one week to respond, either in writing or in video format, after receipt of the request.

The full committee next conducts at least one meeting for the purpose of discussing the candidate's performance relative to the tenure expectations and arriving at a recommendation for or against the award of tenure. (A recommendation in favor of tenure requires the agreement of at least five members of the committee.) The recommendation is prepared by the committee chairperson¹⁶ using the form provided (Appendix C.3). Conflicting opinions among committee members should be clearly stated. The form is signed by each committee member and delivered to the office of the president/dean by January 15.

- **President/dean confidential recommendation**

After reviewing all of the documentation, the president/dean prepares his/her own letter of recommendation (Appendix C.4). This recommendation, together with all associated documentation pertaining to the candidate, is forwarded to the provost by February 8.

- **Provost recommendation**

After reviewing the assessment of each recommending body, together with all associated documentation pertaining to the candidate, the provost prepares his/her own recommendation for the president of the university. In the event of conflicting assessments, the provost follows the procedures outlined in paragraph E5.0.3.c.4(b) of the Institute Policies and Procedures Manual.

- **President recommendation**

The president of the university makes a recommendation for or against tenure to the board of trustees.

¹⁶ In cases where the committee chair and the candidate belong to the same academic unit, the chairperson delegates the preparation of the final committee report to another member of the committee.

APPENDIX A
Calendar of Action for Comprehensive Mid-Tenure Review & Tenure Review

TIME ¹⁷	ACTION
February	Election of tenure committee members from each of the two faculty groups is completed.
May 1	Formation of tenure committee(s) is completed with the appointment of the outside faculty member(s) by Academic Senate.
May 7	Candidate is notified of committee membership and given a copy of the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor.
May 7	President/dean convenes the tenure committee for an initial organizational meeting. The committee elects its chairperson.
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. ¹⁸
May 15	Office of AVP communicates with external reviewers and secures agreement from at least four to write reviews.
Sept. 1	Candidate submits his/her tenure portfolio on-line in pdf format.
Sept. 2	Committee chair forwards candidate materials to external reviewers.
Sept. 30	External peer reviews due.
Oct. 5	Tenured department peers and department head begin their review of the candidate's portfolio.
Oct. 20	Department faculty peers and department head submit individual recommendations to the office of the AVP.
Oct. 20	AVP submits the candidate's portfolio, the department head's recommendation, and the individual department faculty recommendations to the office of the president/dean.
Oct. 25	Committee receives the candidate's dossier from the office of the president/dean 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, and the external review letters. In the case of full tenure review, the committee also receives documentation from the candidate's comprehensive mid-tenure review.
Jan. 15	Committee submits its recommendation to the president/dean.
Feb. 8	President/dean sends his/her confidential recommendation to the provost together with the candidate's dossier.
April 15	Provost informs the candidate of the tenure decision.
May 15	Provost review letter to mid-tenure candidate.

¹⁷ The dates given are deadlines. Next working day will be used for any date that falls on a weekend or holiday.

¹⁸ Procedures regarding external letters do not apply to mid-tenure review.

APPENDIX B.1
COMPREHENSIVE MID-TENURE REVIEW
Department Head Assessment Form

Directions

The purpose of the comprehensive mid-tenure review is to provide feedback to the candidate regarding his/her progress towards tenure midway through the probationary period.

In this context, you are asked to assess to what extent, in your opinion, the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure, providing your assessment of his/her performance to date in terms of the expectations for tenure stated in the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor (pp. 7-10).

Please write your comments in the space provided below. Use additional pages as needed.

1. Teaching and/or Tutoring

2) Communication

(continue on next page)

3) Scholarship

4) Service

In my judgment

_____ is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure.

_____ is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure with concerns.

_____ is making marginal progress.

_____ is not making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure.

Prepared by _____

Department _____

Date _____

Return this form directly to the office of the associate vice president by October 20.

APPENDIX B.2
COMPREHENSIVE MID-TENURE REVIEW
Tenured Department Peer Assessment Form

Directions

The purpose of the comprehensive mid-tenure review is to provide feedback to the candidate regarding his/her progress towards tenure midway through the probationary period.

In this context, you are asked to assess to what extent, in your opinion, the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure, providing your assessment of his/her performance to date in terms of the expectations for tenure stated in the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor (pp. 7-10).

Prior to completing this form, review the candidate's portfolio and external review letters. Please write your comments in the space provided below. Use additional pages as needed.

I have worked with _____ for ____ years in the capacity of _____.

1. Teaching and/or Tutoring

2) Communication

(continue on next page)

3) Scholarship

4) Service

In my judgment

_____ is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure.

_____ is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure with concerns.

_____ is making marginal progress.

_____ is not making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure.

Prepared by _____

Department _____

Date _____

Return this form directly to the office of the associate vice president by October 20.

APPENDIX B.3
COMPREHENSIVE MID-TENURE REVIEW
Tenure Committee Assessment Form

The purpose of the comprehensive mid-tenure review is to provide feedback to the candidate regarding his/her progress towards tenure midway through the probationary period.

Our assessment of the candidate's performance relative to the expectations for tenure as these are stated in the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor (pp. 7-10) is as follows:

1. Teaching and/or Tutoring

2) Communication

(continue on next page)

3) Scholarship

4) Service

In the judgment of this committee

_____ is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure.

_____ is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure with concerns.

_____ is making marginal progress.

_____ is not making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure.

Committee chairperson: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Return this form directly to the office of the associate vice president by January 15.

APPENDIX B.4
COMPREHENSIVE MID-TENURE REVIEW
President/Dean Confidential Assessment Form

In my judgment, and on the basis of my evaluation of all available information,

_____ is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure.

_____ is making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure with concerns.

_____ is making marginal progress.

_____ is not making satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure.

My assessment of the candidate's performance relative to the expectations for tenure as these are stated in the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor (pp.7-10) is as follows:

President/dean _____

Date _____

APPENDIX C.1
TENURE REVIEW
Department Head Recommendation Form

I have worked with the candidate for _____ years in the capacity of _____

In my judgment and on the basis of my evaluation of all available information,

_____ has met the expectations for tenure.

_____ has not met the expectations for tenure.

My recommendation is based upon the following assessment of the candidate's performance relative to the expectations for tenure as these are stated in the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor (pp. 7-10).

1. Teaching and/or Tutoring

2) Communication

(continue on next page)

3) Scholarship

4) Service

Prepared by _____

Department _____

Date _____

Return this form directly to the office of the associate vice president by October 20.

APPENDIX C.2
TENURE REVIEW
Tenured Department Peer Recommendation Form

I have worked with the candidate for _____ years in the capacity of _____

In my judgment and on the basis of my evaluation of all available information,

_____ has met the expectations for tenure.

_____ has not met the expectations for tenure.

My recommendation is based upon the following assessment of the candidate's performance relative to the expectations for tenure as these are stated in the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor (pp. 7-10).

1. Teaching and/or Tutoring

2) Communication

(continue on next page)

3) Scholarship

4) Service

Prepared by _____

Department _____

Date _____

Return this form directly to the office of the associate vice president by October 20.

APPENDIX C.3
TENURE REVIEW
Tenure Committee Recommendation Form

The recommendation of this tenure committee is:

_____ number of votes in support of tenure

_____ number of votes against tenure

It is therefore the judgment of the committee, on the basis of evaluation of all available information, that

_____ has met the expectations for tenure

_____ has not met the expectations for tenure

In the following, we provide a rationale for our judgment of whether the candidate has satisfied the expectations for tenure as these are stated in the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor (pp. 7-10).

1. Teaching and/or Tutoring

2) Communication

(continue on next page)

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: _____

Return this form directly to the office of the associate vice president by January 15.

APPENDIX C.4
TENURE REVIEW
President/Dean Confidential Recommendation Form

In my judgment, and on the basis of my evaluation of all available information,

_____ has met the expectations for tenure

_____ has not met the expectations for tenure

My recommendation is based upon the following assessment of the candidate's performance relative to the expectations for tenure as these are stated in the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor (pp. 7-10).

President/Dean _____

Date _____

APPENDIX C.5
TENURE 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 Professor _____, who is undergoing tenure review. Professor _____ is a member of 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. Secondly, 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 tenured faculty in the candidate's department, the department head, and the tenure 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 candidate's scholarship in his/her field. Your assessment should include reference to the potential benefits 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.

The tenure policy for Rochester Institute of Technology requires promotion review during or before the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor. The actual timing may vary depending on personal circumstances, including possible extensions of the tenure clock due to family or medical leave, or other personal circumstances. However, the criteria for promotion and tenure remain the same for all faculty, regardless of their length of service.

Your evaluation should consider the quality of the work and the impact on the field rather than the rate or timeline of the accomplishments, particularly given the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic (refer to addendum below) and/or other personal circumstances that may have lengthened the tenure clock.

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 summary of NTID faculty expectations, and copies of the RIT definition of scholarship and the NTID definition of creative work. Please be mindful of these documents as you prepare your assessment.

Based on our recent (*conversation or correspondence*) confirming your agreement, we would like to receive your review by September 30. 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 future of the candidate.

Yours sincerely,

Tenure committee chairperson

Addendum:

There are many possible impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic that began in March 2020, including but not limited to the following examples. We ask that you consider these when evaluating the faculty candidate.

- Research labs and libraries were shut down in March 2020 and re-opened with limited capacity and service beginning ~August 2020.
- Faculty research supplies and equipment orders were delayed; lab renovations were stalled; and restrictions were placed on human subjects research.
- K-12 schools went remote from March 2020 through the end of the spring; in fall 2020, some K-12 schools in the region were fully remote and some were hybrid with several days per week in person and the remaining days remote.
- Many childcare centers were shut down from March 2020; they were slowly reopened during the summer and fall of 2020 with more limited capacity.
- Faculty dealt with possible family and health issues throughout the pandemic.
- Faculty teaching loads generally increased related to the need to offer classes in multiple modes (e.g., hybrid or HyFlex)

Enclosures:

Candidate's CV and statement (scholarship section)

Candidate materials pertaining to scholarship

Guidelines for External Reviewers

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

RIT policy on scholarship

NTID definition of creative work (where applicable)

APPENDIX C.6
TENURE REVIEW
Guidelines for External Reviewers

1. The University is seeking an independent, unbiased assessment of the candidate's scholarship and related activities as part of the candidate's tenure review. 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. If you are not familiar with tenure in an academic setting, please limit your comments to an evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work as this relates to your field of expertise.
2. Prior to preparing your evaluation, please review the enclosed document "NTID faculty expectations", which provides some important detail regarding the nature of faculty work at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.
3. You are asked to provide brief comments in your assessment 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 satisfies other expectations being assessed internally, is his/her scholarship, as revealed by both the quality and quantity of publications, creative work, and unpublished work, such that you are confident that he/she has earned the award of tenure? Please explain the basis of your assessment.
4. In writing your assessment, 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 tenured faculty in the candidate's department, the department head, and the tenure 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 September 30.

APPENDIX C.7

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 D.1
ACCESS TO DOCUMENTATION FOR NTID
COMPREHENSIVE MID-TENURE REVIEW**

	Access of each party:					
Documentation	Candidate	Department Tenured Faculty	Department Head	Tenure Committee (or equivalent)	Dean	Provost
Candidate's Portfolio	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Candidate's Annual Reviews	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department Faculty Letters	Summary provided by Tenure Committee (or equivalent)	No	Yes (at conclusion of review process)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department Head Recommendation	Yes	No	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tenure Committee (or equivalent) Recommendation	Yes	No	Yes	-	Yes	Yes
Dean Recommendation	Yes	No	Yes	No	-	Yes
Provost Evaluation	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	-

**APPENDIX D.2
ACCESS TO DOCUMENTATION FOR NTID TENURE REVIEW**

	Access of each party:					
Documentation	Candidate	Department Tenured Faculty	Department Head	Tenure Committee	Dean	Provost
Candidate's Portfolio	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Candidate's Annual Reviews	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department Faculty Letters	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department Head Recommendation	No	No	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tenure Committee (or equivalent) 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 TENURE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

A. Number of tenure committees

The number of tenure committees in any given academic year should be such that no one committee is required to conduct more than four reviews of either kind (comprehensive mid-tenure or tenure). The president/dean of NTID will determine the number of tenure committees required for each academic year. In the event that it becomes necessary to empanel more than one committee, assignment of candidates for mid-tenure and tenure review to each committee shall be conducted by the president/dean by lottery.

B. Membership

Each tenure committee will be composed of seven tenured faculty members, all of whom shall have the rank of either associate professor or full professor. Six of the members shall be elected from the college of NTID in accordance with the procedures outlined below, and the seventh shall be appointed by the Academic Senate from one of the other colleges of RIT.

C. Length of Term

In general, tenure committee members will be elected to two-year terms. To ensure compliance with RIT policy which requires that individual college procedures provide that at least one committee member will have been on the college tenure committee during the preceding year, terms will be staggered. In that way, normally, elections for only three of the needed six college-internal positions will be held in any given year. A schedule to accomplish such staggered terms will be developed by the office of the president/dean.

D. Committee Elections

NTID faculty will be arranged in two groups for the purpose of determining tenure committee membership. Three committee members will be elected from each group. In addition, to cover the eventuality that elected members may not be able to serve, one alternate will be elected from each group.

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

The associate vice president for academic affairs will solicit nominations of tenured faculty from each group and will compile a list of nominees who are willing to serve. Individuals may self-nominate.

E. Voting

The list of nominees from each group will be submitted to the tenure-track and tenured faculty of that group, and a vote by ballot will be conducted. The faculty will vote for a maximum number of individuals as determined by the number of vacancies to be filled (i.e., “Vote for two,” etc.).

F. Election

If the ballot produces a sufficient number of tenure committee representatives, the alternate(s) from that group will be determined to be the individual(s) receiving the next highest vote total(s). An alternate will replace an elected representative should one of the elected representatives from a group be unable to serve because of circumstances beyond his/her control.

G. Exceptions to Two-Year Terms

As noted above, tenure committee members will generally be elected to two-year terms, and elections will be staggered to ensure compliance with the RIT policy requiring that at least one committee member will have been on the college tenure committee during the preceding year. In order to maintain a staggered election schedule, the exceptions to the two-year election rule will occur in “off election” years when it is necessary to hold an election to accommodate the need for a larger number of tenure committees than had been used in the preceding year. In such cases, all committee members expecting to serve the second year of a two-year term will do so, but sufficient additional representation will be elected for a one-year term only.

Conversely, in years when the college has more tenure committee members expecting to continue serving the second year of a two-year term than will be needed, due to a reduction in the number of committees required, the members chosen to continue their terms will be determined by the number of votes received by each individual during the original election. Therefore, records of the election process, complete with the number of votes received by each individual, must be kept on file in the office of the associate vice president for academic affairs.

J. Department heads serving on tenure committees

Department heads with faculty rank are eligible to vote for representatives and serve on tenure committees. However, a department head may not be a member of a tenure committee, which is reviewing a candidate from his/her department. In such circumstances, the department head will be replaced by an elected alternate.

K. Ensuring Uniformity

The president/dean of NTID will bring together all tenure committees in a given year to review process and procedures in order to ensure uniformity.

APPENDIX F
 INTERPRETING SIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY INTERVIEW RATING SCALE¹⁹

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 Institute 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 Institute'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, 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:

SLPI RATING SCALE – Tenure Review and Promotion to Associate Professor	
Superior Plus Superior Advanced Plus Advanced	Meets Institute expectations.
Intermediate Plus	Acceptable if candidate shows good progress toward Advanced rating; must be accompanied by strong evidence of a variety of ongoing efforts to improve performance.
Intermediate	Generally not acceptable. (See pp. 29-30)
Survival Plus Survival Novice Plus Novice	Not acceptable regardless of job responsibilities.

¹⁹ Reference to the 1991 Communication Task Force Report, pp. 29 and 30.

APPENDIX G RIT INSTITUTE 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 H 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 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 J
RIT INSTITUTE POLICY ON SERVICE – E4.0.4, section c

c. Service

While teaching and scholarship are important faculty responsibilities, services performed by faculty members are an indispensable part of the Institute's daily life. Faculty members at all ranks are expected to provide some forms of service to the Institute, the college, the department and their professional community. They are often encouraged to provide service at different levels and areas of the Institute.

Service includes working with students and colleagues outside the classroom, such as might be found in college and Institute committee work, student advising and student activities as well as linking the professional skills of members of the faculty to the world beyond the campus.

RIT 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 Institute level; improving RIT's program quality, reputation and operational efficiency; advising a student group; development of new courses and curriculum; service to the faculty member's professional societies, such as reviewing articles, organizing professional conferences, or serving a professional organization.

APPENDIX K
EXTRACTS FROM PROVOST'S 2012 GUIDANCE

For tenured and tenure track faculty evaluation letters: Information for department chairs, peer committees, and deans regarding 3rd year review, tenure review, and promotion to full professor.

Summer 2012 Jeremy Haefner

Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Overview: Effective evaluation 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.
- 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.

