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I. Principles and Values

This document describes the process of annual faculty review and promotion and tenure consideration within the College of Engineering, Forestry & Natural Sciences (CEFNS); acknowledging the diversity of our strengths and reflecting our individual, collegial and institutional values. In this context, the process of faculty reviews and evaluations within all CEFNS units shall include:

- clarity of expectations
- constructive, proactive evaluation and formative feedback
- objective appraisal by peers
- consistent and high standards.

The CEFNS values diversity in the ways an individual faculty member develops excellence in his or her academic career and contributes to the collective success of the department and college. In particular, the CEFNS encourages:

- an emphasis on students
- cross-disciplinary activities
- commitment to scholarship and professional involvement
- assessment for continuous improvement
- collegiality and professionalism
- service to the university and community.

II. General Process Guidelines for Academic Units of the CEFNS

Academic units shall have written criteria for composition of faculty review committees, for submission of materials for evaluation, and for evaluating faculty performance, retention, promotion, tenure, and sabbatical applications. In particular, departments shall establish criteria for promotion for all ranks for which they would ordinarily employ faculty (e.g., assistant professor, assistant professor of research, assistant professor of practice, lecturer, etc.)

Departmental criteria will be submitted to the CEFNS dean and university provost for approval. All evaluation processes shall follow the annual personnel calendar finalized and distributed by the provost’s office.

Where criteria, process, or academic reporting structures have changed during the period of evaluation, the faculty member may explain in the submitted materials how his or her activities were shaped by previous expectations and how they relate to the new expectations.
Conflicts of interest between evaluators and evaluation subjects should be addressed formally in a document which describes the nature of the conflict and details a plan to avoid real or perceived conflict during the evaluation process. This document should be approved by the CEFNS dean and the provost.

III. Annual Evaluation Guidelines

These guidelines apply to all faculty of each department including part-time temporary staff, lecturers, instructors, visiting and research faculty. For split appointments, the SOE and procedures for faculty evaluation should be negotiated by the respective chairs or directors in consultation with the faculty member, and be reflective of the duties and responsibilities of the faculty member within each unit.

The Statement of Expectations (SOE)

The SOE should be used as reference for the annual evaluation, in combination with the department’s criteria for performance ratings. Thus the SOE should be updated and modified as individuals’ activities vary from year to year. Each faculty member of the department, including non-tenure and part-time faculty, shall have an SOE reflective of expected appointments and assignments in the upcoming year. It is the responsibility of the department chair and faculty member to collaboratively construct an SOE that meets departmental goals and needs, while providing a pathway to success for faculty. The SOE should include all activities for which the faculty member expects to receive credit in the subsequent annual evaluation cycle. Examples of such activities include, but are not limited to:

Research and Scholarly Activity

- conducting scholarship
- disseminating scholarly results
- seeking funds for support of scholarly activities
- pursuing, gaining, and maintaining professional certification or registration (e.g. PE license)

Student-related Activities

- teaching of assigned courses
- providing for, and mentoring, undergraduate research experiences
- mentoring and advising of graduate students
- advising student professional organizations
- developing new curricula, refining existing curricula, or managing/leading existing programs
- implementing new pedagogical techniques
- assessing effectiveness of curricula, methodologies, and classroom activities

Service Activities
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- Participation in committee service at the departmental, college, or university level. Unusually demanding assignments such as committee leadership should be identified.
- Participation in recruiting, fund-raising, internationalization, or other development or outreach activities
- Active service to the broader community through membership on local boards and partnerships within one’s professional areas of expertise
- Active service to the profession through membership on national or regional-level committees, sitting on proposal review panels, serving on editorial boards, reviewing articles for publication, etc.

Baseline Performance Expectations
An appendix to this document outlines the annual baseline performance expectations for all faculty of the CEFNS to encourage a common culture of work across the College.

Annual Reviews
As required by the NAU COFS, all full-time and part-time faculty will receive an annual review. All faculty are responsible for reporting their annual accomplishments in a written document; contents and format for this document will be outlined by each unit. Faculty should provide documentary evidence of effectiveness in all activities outlined in the preceding SOE. The evaluation of teaching effectiveness and student engagement will be based upon course evaluations by students and at least one other measure.

As outlined in the NAU COFS (Section 1.4.2), annual evaluation for pre-tenure faculty must be augmented by a distinct and separate retention evaluation discussing the individual’s progress to date toward meeting the criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

For annual evaluation for purposes of performance appraisal, the department’s appraisal should be one of the following: Highly Meritorious, Meritorious, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. Split, mixed, or intermediate ratings (e.g., HM/M) will not be accepted. If the department’s evaluation process results in a numerical score, there shall be an unambiguous assignment of scores to the HM/M/S/U system.

Disputes
In accordance with the NAU COFS, the dean will normally have no active role in the annual evaluation of post-tenure and non-tenure-eligible faculty. Department performance ratings will be collected in the dean’s office to be passed on to the provost. In cases where the department chair and the department FSC differ in their performance rating of a faculty member, the department chair’s rating will be the official and reported rating, unless the faculty member has requested a formal reassessment by the dean, as specified in COFS.

Sabbatical
An individual who is on sabbatical leave during the period when annual performance reports are collected will be responsible for reporting the activities for the preceding academic year in the normal manner. The individual is also responsible for the creation of an SOE, in
consultation with the unit chair, reflecting anticipated activities and effort allocation for the upcoming sabbatical, as outlined in the sabbatical proposal. Individuals should report on their sabbatical activities and outcomes during the annual performance cycle following the sabbatical leave, and must also comply with NAU sabbatical reporting requirements (i.e., written report and public presentation).

Leave Without Pay
Normally individuals on leave without pay will not be evaluated for the leave period. However, because of the possibility of performance distribution covering the leave period, advance arrangements for this situation should be approved by the CEFNS dean and provost prior to the leave period. A memo from the provost is the official determination of whether the period of leave will or will not count towards tenure, sabbatical, or merit.

Department Chair
Ordinarily department chairs have some fraction of their assignment to "faculty duties," allocated as a mix of instruction/student related activities, research/scholarship, and service outside of administrative duties as chair. The faculty portion of the chair's activities shall be reported to and evaluated by the department FSC in the normal way. For incumbent chairs, the FSC evaluation will go straight to the dean's office; for chairs who have just stepped down, the new chair shall evaluate the faculty activities of the previous chair. In all cases the dean shall evaluate the administrative chair duties in a separate evaluation.

Split or Joint Appointments/Assignments
One unit, designated the primary unit, based on proportion of effort defined in the contract, takes the lead in evaluation. The chair/director of the secondary unit shall provide to the primary chair/director an evaluative letter highlighting and describing the significance of performance in the secondary unit. This letter should be included in the faculty member’s file, for submission to the primary FSC. The evaluation then proceeds as normal with total overall performance evaluation provided by the chair in his or her review letter for the primary unit.

IV. Promotion and Tenure

Overall Process
The CEFNS Promotion and Tenure (P&T) process follows the structure and guidelines set forth in the NAU COFS document. The overall P&T review process consists of a series of reviews of the candidate’s submitted review files, culminating with a final decision by the NAU president. Specifically, the overall steps in the review process are as follows:

1. Candidate prepares and submits file to unit chair.
2. Unit chair reviews file for format and completeness.
3. File is reviewed by unit’s FSC, which produces an evaluative letter, including a specific recommendation regarding the promotion/tenure request.
4. File is reviewed by unit chair, who produces an evaluative letter, including a specific recommendation regarding the promotion/tenure request.
5. File is reviewed by CEFNS P&T committee, which produces an evaluative letter, including a specific recommendation regarding the promotion/tenure request.

6. File is reviewed by CEFNS dean, who produces an evaluative letter, including a specific recommendation regarding the promotion/tenure request.

7. Candidate’s vitae and other materials (as requested) are passed to provost, along with evaluations and recommendations from previous levels of review. The provost produces a recommendation for action on the promotion/tenure request.

8. A final decision on the promotion/tenure request is made by the NAU president.

After each of the evaluative steps (3, 4, 5, 6) of the above process, candidates are provided with a copy of the evaluative letter and, if desired, have seven calendar days to submit to the next level of review a written intent to respond, followed by a final written response completed within twelve (12) days of receipt of the initial written recommendation. This response will be included in the candidate’s file for consideration in subsequent steps of the review process. The timeline for the review process, including deadlines for each review stage, is set by the university provost.

The following paragraphs provide further clarification on key aspects of the review process.

**Documentation: Candidate’s Review File**
The candidate for promotion and/or tenure has the right and the primary responsibility to include documentation of performance and accomplishments relevant to all aspects of the unit’s criteria, and to present the strongest possible case.

- Tenure and promotion files must adhere strictly to the content and formatting guidelines provided by the dean’s office.
- Although the unit chair provides a formatting and content review, it remains the primary responsibility of the candidate to produce a complete and properly formatted review file.
- In addition to the submitted review file, the departmental review committee, chair, college committee, and dean have the right to access the full Professional Review File for additional information relevant to faculty review.
- For split appointments, the primary unit takes the lead in the promotion and tenure process, i.e., preparation and presentation of the review file. Evaluative contributions from the secondary unit chair/director shall be included, as described in Section III above.
- Review files will be considered “closed” at the time of submission to the FSC, i.e., at the start of the formal review process. It is incumbent on the candidate to submit a complete file; no addendums or amendments will be allowed after the review file is submitted to the FSC. The sole exception will be “breaking news” that the candidate could not have knowledge of before the submission deadline, but had listed as submitted in review file, e.g., news of a grant award or paper acceptance.

**Review Letters**
Internal review letters may be an appropriate component of the review file, e.g., individuals with extensive intra-campus collaborations, or with particularly strong weighting of teaching excellence.
• Candidates should submit a list of suggested internal reviewers to the unit chair at least 60 days before the review file submission deadline. Potential reviewers should be described briefly in terms of their ability to assess the candidate's collaborative research contributions, instruction, and/or service; and in terms of their relationship with the candidate.

• Internal review letters should always be requested by the department chair; letters should never be directly solicited by the candidate.

External review letters are a critical component of a P&T review file, and must be included in all cases. By definition, external review letters are those produced by reviewers not currently employed by or associated with NAU.

• For promotion to associate professor, a minimum of three external review letters are required in the review file; at least one letter shall be from an "arms length" reviewer capable of providing an objective evaluation. By definition, an "arms length" reviewer is someone who does not currently have, or had previously, an active association with the candidate.

• For promotion to full professor, professional reputation is a key review criterion. All such promotion requests must include a minimum of five external review letters, of which three are from "arms length" reviewers.

• Candidates should submit a list of suggested reviewers to the unit chair at least 60 days before the review file submission deadline. Potential reviewers should be described briefly in terms of their ability to assess the candidate's research, instruction, and/or service; and in terms of their relationship with the candidate.

• The unit chair should develop a pool of potential reviewers based on the candidate's suggestions, as well as input from the FSC, and any added names will be shared with the candidate for consent. There should be an attempt to solicit reviews from those in "peer" departments or programs, i.e., similar to the home unit of the candidate.

• External review letters should always be requested by the department chair; letters should never be directly solicited by the candidate.

• While external reviewers will ordinarily feel most comfortable commenting upon the research and scholarly record, they should be provided with enough background material (departmental mission, general expectations of faculty in the program, etc.) to place the candidate's research in context. Additionally, some reviewers are well qualified to evaluate aspects of a person's teaching and/or professional service; thus it is appropriate to include some portions of the application package documenting these activities in the materials sent to outside reviewers.

Internal and external reviews are confidential; these review letters should never be viewed by anyone outside the legitimate review process. The unit chair should create a memo, to be included in the review file as a preface to the review letters, which briefly describes the process by which reviewers were selected (e.g., which reviewers were suggested by the candidate vs. chair/FSC) and other details relevant to the provenance of review letters (e.g., known associations between reviewers and candidates, or a description of reviewers in terms of their familiarity with the kind of department and/or institution in which the candidate works).
• The candidate shall have the opportunity to see the names of potential reviewers, but will have no knowledge of which reviewers do actually provide letters and will not have access to the letters themselves.
• Along with the list of suggested reviewers, candidate will provide unit chair with a signed disclosure form indicating their understanding that these letters are confidential and waiving all rights to access the letters; a sample waiver form is included in the CEFNS P&T guidelines packet.
• As part of the formal review request and packet, reviewers should receive written confirmation of this confidentiality and the candidate’s acknowledgment.
• Review letters are received by the chair, and are added to the candidate’s file during the chair’s content and format review, before the file is passed to the FSC for review. Such letters must be removed from the file before it is archived or returned to the candidate to maintain reviewers’ confidentiality.

College P&T Committee
The College P&T committee is typically constituted of representatives (one each) from all CEFNS units; committee representatives are chosen by the unit following procedures that the unit has approved. The Chair of the P&T committee is selected by the P&T committee annually at the first committee meeting.

• The representative from the candidate’s home department shall not participate actively in discussion of the candidate’s file, but shall stand ready to explain or interpret departmental practice and criteria, disciplinary practices or unique aspects of peer recognition and dissemination, etc. Such input will be provided only when specifically requested by other committee members.
• The representative from the candidate’s home department shall not vote on the candidate’s file, and shall not participate in drafting the committee’s letter of review.
• All P&T committee members must register a vote each file reviewed; votes should be recorded as “strong yes”, “yes”, “no”, or “abstain”. The precise tally of votes should be clearly indicated in the committee’s evaluative letter. Abstention is permitted only when the committee member had provided an internal review letter.
• Committee members absent for a vote due to special circumstances may, with the approval of the dean and committee chair, submit their votes in writing to the committee chair (assuming they have participated in discussion of the file). If no such arrangements have been made, absent committee members’ votes are counted, by default, as abstentions.
• Evaluative letters produced by the committee must be reviewed and signed by all voting committee members prior to submission to the dean. An abstaining committee member cannot contribute to the evaluation letter and is not a signatory to the letter.

Evaluation Outcomes: Letters
Formal evaluative letters should be produced at each stage of the review process, highlighting key factors in the evaluation, and providing a clear recommendation for or against promotion and/or tenure. Such letter should be more than a simple aggregation or
accumulation of the annual appraisals; there should be explicit discussion of how specific elements in the documented record meet (or fail to meet) the unit’s criteria.

**Denial**
If the application for tenure is denied at the president’s level, the candidate will be informed of the decision and notified that he or she will be receiving a terminal contract for the following year. The candidate may have certain rights of appeal, as indicated in the NAU COFS. If a candidate has applied for tenure earlier than the mandatory deadline, the candidate may choose to withdraw the case at any point prior to a final decision by the president.

If the department FSC, department chair or CEFNS dean makes a negative recommendation for faculty requesting promotion to full professor status, the candidate will be allowed to withdraw the application instead of advancing it to the provost. The candidate may alternatively choose to proceed and to respond in writing to the denial, according to procedures in the NAU COFS document. Candidates who are denied promotion to full professor may choose to reapply during a subsequent review cycle.
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Appendix – Baseline Performance Expectations

This appendix outlines annual baseline performance expectations for all CEFNS faculty, divided into the standard three categories of faculty responsibility. The faculty member’s SOE will include additional expectations beyond this based upon the unit and the faculty member’s role in that unit.

Student-Related Responsibilities

The baseline performance expectations in student-related responsibilities are:

- Faculty must maintain a minimum level of effectiveness in teaching as judged by the following:
  - The creation of course-specific syllabi that are provided to the department and to students on the first day of class, and comply with approved university format and content requirements (see UCC website), as well as with other content requirements established by the unit (e.g., course learning outcomes to support accreditation)
  - The maintenance of clear records that support the assignment of final grades
  - A professional classroom environment, supportive of the learning outcomes, which includes the presentation of current and relevant information
  - The meeting of all scheduled classes (except for illness or prior notification of an absence approved by the department chair). Records of Absence (ROAs) must be filed and approved by chair for all absences
  - Holding a minimum appropriate number of office hours per week, as approved by the department chair and/or outlined by established departmental policy
  - Adherence, when possible, to course pre/co-requisite requirements

- Faculty must provide a minimum level of effective academic student advising, as judged by the following:
  - Holding the minimum office hours, as specified above
  - Maintaining appointments with students
  - Maintaining familiarity with current curricular and academic requirements of the department, college, and university; faculty knowledge must be adequate to accurately advise student where such advising is expected
  - Maintaining organized and up-to-date student files, including documentation of any exceptional decisions or situations
  - Exceptions to program requirements or departmental policy must be approved in writing by the department chair
  - Verifying advisees’ compliance with graduation requirements in a regular and timely manner, where advising duties are expected

Scholarly and Professional Development Activities

The baseline performance expectations in Scholarship and Professional Development are:
• Specific scholarly and professional development goals, projects, milestones, and anticipated deliverables, clearly articulated in each SOE
• Dissemination of results to appropriate audience
• Maintaining currency in faculty member’s area of specialty or research

Service

The *baseline performance expectations* in Service are:

• For committee work, the faculty member is expected to:
  o Attend meetings on a regular basis
  o Be on time for the start of the meetings, and remain until the meeting is adjourned
  o Provide active and constructive input in committee discussions
  o Contribute to the committee deliverables

• Attend graduation ceremonies dressed in academic regalia
• Participate in NAU mandated activities in a timely manner, e.g., Sexual Harassment Prevention (SWALE) and FERPA training
• The faculty member must actively support the unit’s self-improvement and assessment activities, including:
  o Regularly attending and participating in department meetings
  o Developing and maintaining quality curricula to effectively and efficiently meet department, college, or university goals
  o Completing regular accreditation/certification tasks in a timely manner
  o Participating in assessment and improvement activities at all levels, e.g., course, curriculum, program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item of Feedback</th>
<th>Follow-up/and/or Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. External Reviews</td>
<td>Section of this document is needed in accordance to the needs and expectations of the non-routine faculty. The document is considered to be helpful in the next revision. The feedback and reviews of the College have been a regular feature for many departments of the College. It is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Development of the Common Handout: The document is currently written in a form that is focused on tenure and career development. The phrase &quot;This document is developed to assist the faculty and members of the faculty&quot; is replaced with &quot;This document is developed to assist the faculty and members of the faculty in improving their teaching and research skills.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Graduation requirements for PhD programs: This appendix is intended to clarify the existing NAU and ABOR requirements of expectations and process by a joint task force of the faculty in the January of 2009 with 110 yes votes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debra Larson, February 5, 2009

Feedback from the January 2009 Vote for Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

CEFN Process Guidelines on the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Entry 1</th>
<th>Table Entry 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The benchmark expectations are not &quot;minimal&quot; in the same sense as being &quot;intermediated&quot;. Specific evaluation criteria are distinguished from the Handbook's more general expectations. The evaluation process is based on these expectations and forms the basis for the evaluation of performance. The criteria are designed to ensure consistency across various aspects of performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance expectations are different in one or more of the three categories of performance as well as the overall performance. The evaluation process is designed to cover these aspects comprehensively. The evaluation results are compiled by the PCC, WCE, and M. S. J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the administrative review is to conduct a comprehensive review during the year. This review is conducted by the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of the Education and Research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under &quot;Annual Reviews&quot; it should be specified that the PCC, WCE, and M. S. J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the administrative review is to conduct a comprehensive review during the year. This review is conducted by the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of the Education and Research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The document prior to being added to the faculty and committee on this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have not had the opportunity to review the document prior to being added to this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing the 2007-2008 year, the faculty and committee on the faculty and committee on this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning and work load revisions do not affect the faculty and committee on this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A concern was expressed that this is not the right time to publish this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>This process is already defined (NAVF COPS and the Provost's Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Under SOE criteria, Student Retention Advisory Undergraduate is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NAFCOP is given clear about the SOE process in Section 14.3.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The NAVCOP is informed about the SOE process per Section 14.2.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The issue can be addressed in any revision of this document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is a difficult document to deal with if it is written for two different audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please refer to your miles COP. The answer to that question is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the same, and it should not be addressed in this revision of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>document.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instructions

1. If SOE criteria is not met, the NAVCOP is informed about the SOE process in Section 14.3.1. The NAVCOP is given clear about the SOE process per Section 14.2.1.

2. The issue can be addressed in any revision of this document. This is a difficult document to deal with if it is written for two different audiences. Please refer to your miles COP. The answer to that question is the same, and it should not be addressed in this revision of the document.

3. The college is given the best practices for how to address the SOE criteria in Section 14.3.1. The answer to that question is the same, and it should not be addressed in this revision of the document.

4. The college is given the best practices for how to address the SOE criteria in Section 14.3.1. The answer to that question is the same, and it should not be addressed in this revision of the document.

5. The college is given the best practices for how to address the SOE criteria in Section 14.3.1. The answer to that question is the same, and it should not be addressed in this revision of the document.

6. The college is given the best practices for how to address the SOE criteria in Section 14.3.1. The answer to that question is the same, and it should not be addressed in this revision of the document.

7. The college is given the best practices for how to address the SOE criteria in Section 14.3.1. The answer to that question is the same, and it should not be addressed in this revision of the document.

8. The college is given the best practices for how to address the SOE criteria in Section 14.3.1. The answer to that question is the same, and it should not be addressed in this revision of the document.

9. The college is given the best practices for how to address the SOE criteria in Section 14.3.1. The answer to that question is the same, and it should not be addressed in this revision of the document.

10. The college is given the best practices for how to address the SOE criteria in Section 14.3.1. The answer to that question is the same, and it should not be addressed in this revision of the document.