

**GUIDELINES FOR SHARED GOVERNANCE**  
*The University of Arizona*

Draft 6 1/23/97 (Senate APPC)

**I. INTRODUCTION**

*This memorandum of understanding agreed to by faculty and administration outlines principles of shared governance at The University of Arizona, entered into freely by a faculty and an administration committed to a common vision of the mission of the University. Shared governance involves mutual participation and agreement in the development of policy decisions by both faculty and administration, and requires shared confidence between faculty members and administrators. This confidence extends to short- and long-range financial priorities for the University, the creation and elimination of programs and units, and a shared understanding that faculty representatives and administrators have the support of the faculty in whose name they speak and whom they serve. The following guidelines are intended to elaborate further details in the way the faculty and administration address certain issues. It is intended that these guidelines be consistent with the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the Faculty of The University of Arizona (1) and the Revised Statutes of the State of Arizona (2).*

**II. STRUCTURE AND PROCESS FOR SHARED GOVERNANCE**

***A. Selection and Review of Academic Administrators***

~~Both~~ *In a manner consistent with Arizona Board of Regents policy, the faculty and administration will play an integral role in the recruitment, selection, retention, and review of heads of departments or academic unit directors, deans, vice provosts, and vice presidents. Except for the provisions of paragraph F, below, all such administrators will be selected and then retained or released through regular periodic review on the basis of mutual agreement of the faculty and the administrator superior to the individual in question. Processes to attain this end will be established at the University level and, mindful of appropriate to the circumstances within each college, at the college and unit levels. The selection and retention of a head or academic unit director shall require a majority vote of the faculty of the respective department or unit unless an absolute two-thirds majority of faculty of that department or unit has decided to grant their mandate to an elected committee of the department or unit. With respect to such decisions relating to academic deans, vice provosts, and vice presidents, the faculty shall be represented through faculty chosen by way of an elected faculty committee on committees at the respective college and university levels. The faculty representatives shall be approved by the Faculty Senate in the cases of vice provost and vice presidential committees and by the corresponding elected college faculty bodies in the cases of dean committees. Faculty representatives shall comprise half or more of each search committee and each review committee. It is the responsibility of these committees to ensure open faculty input, including the input of the appropriate elected faculty body. Extraordinary reviews, using the same procedures described above, may take place upon written petition of one-fifth third of the constituent faculty.*

## ***B. Budget and Strategic Planning***

With respect to budgetary and financial matters, the *projected* budget ~~projecting expenditures~~ of University funds will be formulated by the administration, publicized to both the faculty and public, and reviewed by *elected* faculty representatives. A committee on the budget and long-range strategic planning, comprised of faculty, administrators, and other sections of the University community as appropriate, shall be the forum for reaching mutual agreement on the *projected* budget. As least half of the committee will come from the faculty, chosen by way of proper faculty governance procedures. The committee will receive full and timely input from the Faculty Senate and regularly report back to the Faculty Senate. ~~A process to attain the same ends, mindful of the circumstances of each college, will be established in the colleges.~~ Records of ~~expenditures of~~ University funds will *continue to* be open to all members of the faculty and the public, *as required by law*.

## ***C. Position Searches***

All faculty and ~~key~~ *academic* administrative appointments will be made following open competitive searches with selection based on merit and due consideration of intellectual and cultural diversity. ~~and with final approval by the appropriate faculty body.~~ *This statement is not intended to prohibit target-of-opportunity appointments.*

## ***D. Faculty Representation***

Representation of the faculty at all levels of ~~the~~ University *governance* will be carried out by members of the faculty who have been elected directly by their faculty peers or *selected* by a committee on committees or other faculty body which has been elected directly by the faculty ~~by secret ballot~~ at the University, college, ~~and or~~ unit level. Faculty members have the responsibility to participate in shared governance. In work assignments and performance reviews, their participation shall be recognized as service and given the weight necessary to ensure the success of shared governance.

## ***E. Academic Policies***

Academic and curricular policies rest primarily with the faculty. The creation and elimination of programs and units, policies relating to student affairs and admissions, faculty personnel policy, and the guidelines on faculty and administration salary policy also are among those included within the jurisdiction of shared governance. When it wishes to develop a new policy or revise present policy in any of these areas, the administration shall consult with the duly constituted faculty governance committee (as defined in paragraph D) or, if one is unavailable, shall bring together a working committee on which faculty representatives, chosen through methods set forth in paragraph D, comprise at least half of the committee. ~~Recommendations from these as well as other shared governance committees shall enjoy the support of the majority of both the faculty and the administrative representatives.~~

*If a substantial minority of any shared governance committee disagrees with any action taken by the committee, their position should be stated with the committee's recommendation. These recommendations of the working committees* then will go through the normal procedure of the Faculty Senate, which is the ultimate representative of the faculty in these areas. The Faculty Senate and administration will work to resolve any differences they may have so as to attain an outcome that is mutually agreeable to both in the end. When mutual agreement on a policy is reached, the administration will suggest the steps it intends to take to implement the policy and provide a timeline so as to assure proper implementation of the policy and appropriate faculty review. ~~Shared governance on the above-mentioned policies needs also to occur within the colleges, mindful of the circumstances of each college~~ Except for review and monitoring, shared governance does not extend to management decisions, that is, to the carrying out and implementation of policy that stays clearly within the guidelines of that policy.

#### *F. Process Monitoring*

Until the point that mutual agreement is reached between the administration and the faculty, the status-quo ante prevails. Only on those rare occasions where mutual agreement between the faculty and administration cannot be reached and where the President deems action clearly necessary in order to protect or advance interests vital to the University shall the President act unilaterally. The faculty has the responsibility to determine whether such an action or series of actions has breached the spirit of shared governance. The Faculty Senate, by two-thirds vote, shall be the vehicle for undertaking such determinations. ~~Petitions from the faculty shall initiate the process.~~

#### *G. Governance Review Committee*

With the purpose of enhancing the smooth operation of shared governance, a review committee *composed of the Chair of the Faculty, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, three elected Senators, the Provost, and two other members of the administration* shall be established. *Its purpose is to address concerns raised by members of each side regarding the implementation and functioning of the procedures contained in this document and to make recommendations toward more effective working of shared governance.*

#### *H. Involvement of Students, Staff, and Professional Personnel*

~~There is a need to incorporate involvement in the process by year to year academic professionals and staff.~~ *Students, classified staff, and professional personnel should participate in the shared governance process where appropriate and in a fitting manner. A task force shall be appointed to develop further details of this participation for consideration by the Faculty Senate and the Administration. This task force should include one representative selected by each of the following groups: Appointed Personnel Organization Council, Staff Advisory Council, ASUA, GPSC, Faculty Senate, and the Provost's Office. The recommendations of this task force should be submitted to the Senate and the Administration for further action by the end of the first year of the start of the implementation of the shared governance process.*

### ***I. Consistency With Other Documents***

Anything in this document that conflicts with the Constitution and By-laws of the General Faculty, *Arizona Board of Regents Policy, the University Handbook on Appointed Personnel, or the Arizona revised Statutes* shall be made to conform with those documents. *However, the Constitution and By-Laws, and the University Handbook on Appointed Personnel may be amended to conform with the principles set forth in this document.*

### ***J. Continuing Structure and Process***

Shared governance on the above-mentioned policies needs also to occur within the colleges *and units, mindful of as appropriate to the circumstances of each college and unit, but consistent with the aims and objectives of shared governance.*

The Faculty Senate and the *administration shall consider further development of basic the structure and procedures for University policy-making and implementation. be developed. The Faculty Senate will also consider issues related to representation in the Senate.*

Since *these* may be a longer term goals, implementation of the measures described ~~in the following paragraphs~~ *above* is not dependent upon attaining this objective.

---

### **NOTES:**

1) *From The Constitution of the Faculty of the University of Arizona: "The general faculty has fundamental responsibilities in the areas of academic personnel policy, instruction and curriculum policy, research policy, student affairs policy, ethics and commitment, advice on budget and university support, and acts on such matters affecting the welfare of the University as are brought for consideration in accordance with University policy."*

2) *From Arizona Revised Statute 15-1601B: "The Universities shall have colleges, schools and departments and give courses of study and academic degrees as the Board (of regents) approves. Subject to the responsibilities and powers of the Board and the University Presidents, the faculty members of the Universities, through their elected faculty representatives, shall share responsibility for academic and educational activities and matters related to faculty personnel. The faculty members of each University, through their elected faculty representatives, shall participate in the governance of their respective Universities and shall actively participate in the development of University policy."*

THE UNIVERSITY OF  
**ARIZONA**®  
TUCSON ARIZONA

Faculty Senate

Academic Personnel Policy Committee

Mailing Address:

Faculty Center  
The University of Arizona  
PO Box 210473  
Tucson, AZ 85721-0473

E-mail: [facsen@u.arizona.edu](mailto:facsen@u.arizona.edu)

December 2, 1996

Location:

Faculty Center  
1400 E. Mabel St.  
Tucson, AZ 85721

Phone: (520) 621-1342

Fax: (520) 621-8844

MEMORANDUM TO: Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Larry C. Schooley, <sup>LS/dl</sup>Chair  
Academic Personnel Policy Committee

RE: Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Draft

The attached document on university guidelines for promotion and tenure is for your information and review. It was sent to APPC by the Conditions of Faculty Service Task Force last summer, and will be placed on the agenda for discussion during the January or February Senate meeting. We invite your comments and suggestions during our further review of these issues. Please send your thoughts to me at the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, or to [schooley@ece.arizona.edu](mailto:schooley@ece.arizona.edu), no later than Monday, January 13, 1996.

The history of this report is summarized in the forwarding letter. Earlier drafts were communicated to the General Faculty in mid-April 1996. Later in April both a meeting of the General Faculty and a special session of the Faculty Senate were held to discuss the draft proposals. Comments resulting from these meetings and from communications to the task force from individual faculty members have been incorporated in the current draft.

Thank you for your assistance with this important proposal.

dl  
Attachment

f:\appc\1202sen.doc

THE UNIVERSITY OF  
**ARIZONA**  
TUCSON ARIZONA

Faculty Senate

Faculty Center  
1400 East Mabel  
Tucson, Arizona 85721  
(602) 621-1342  
Fax (602) 621-8844

Date: August 23, 1996

To: Members, Conditions of Faculty Service Task Force

From: Members of the Promotion and Tenure Subcommittee:  
Larry Aleamoni, Betty Atwater, Martha Gilliland, Robert Hershberger, Larry Schooley, Mal Zwolinski

Re: Background and Source Materials for the Final Working Draft of  
"University Guidelines, Criteria, and Evaluation Procedures for Promotion & Tenure"

The final working draft (#9) of the "University Guidelines, Criteria, and Evaluation Procedures for Promotion & Tenure" document, dated 8/20/96, draws heavily on three recent University documents dealing with the subjects of faculty evaluation, and promotion and tenure. Also, documents such as the University of Arizona "Report of the Committee on Teaching Evaluation", April 1988, and "Reaching the Vision" (the 1991 summary report of the Arizona Board of Regents' Commission on the Status of Women) were background materials helpful to the Subcommittee. The purpose of this memorandum is to identify the key recent documents and the faculty members who participated on the committees responsible for preparing the documents.

Parts I and II of the final working draft represent a revision of the draft document, "University Guidelines and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure", dated 10/3/95. During the spring of 1995, the committee that prepared this document worked to align previous reports and outcomes from six working groups, all dealing with various aspects of promotion and tenure. The committee membership and the groups represented were:

Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Personnel Policy (APPC)	John Bradley
Faculty Reward Team	Dipankar Chakravarti
Committee on a Performance Based Compensation System	Malcolm Zwolinski
Tenure Policy Committee	J.D. Garcia
Performance Evaluation Process Improvement Team (PEPIT)	Carla Stoffle
Faculty Development Team	Martha Gilliland

Part III of the final working draft is based directly on two documents:

- (1) a document included in Appendix C of the final report from the Performance Evaluation Process Improvement Team (PEPIT). This document, dated 2/20/95, was titled: "Performance Management System: Draft - Faculty Bridge Paper".

PEPIT Committee Members:

Tom Good	Ron Peterson	Carla Stoffle	Genevieve Watson
Linda Heffernan	Dick Powell	Robert Valasco	Malcolm Zwolinski
Nancy Huber	Laura Shamas		

- (2) a report (dated 2/15/93) from the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Personnel Policy (APPC): "Development of University-Wide System for Faculty Peer Evaluation". This report was approved by the Faculty Senate at its meeting on May 3, 1993.

APPC Committee Members:

Dipankar Chakravarti (Chair)	Robert Mautner	Ed Williams
Larry Aleamoni	Gerald Monsman	Malcolm Zwolinski
Betty Atwater	Karen Sergeant (student rep)	(former APPC Chair)

## D R A F T #9 - 8/20/96

### UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES, CRITERIA, AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

#### I. General Expectations of Faculty at The University of Arizona

The University of Arizona is a major land-grant teaching and research University. Accordingly, its mission is threefold: **teaching** -- to prepare successful lifelong learners using instructional systems that respond to various student learning styles, that incorporate modern technologies, and that integrate research with instruction; **research or creative activity** -- to expand the frontiers of intellectual and creative human expertise; and **service** -- to serve on committees and in leadership positions within the university and in professional organizations, and to participate in outreach activities that serve the community constituency and its broader state, regional, national and international community.

Whatever the field of learning, the pervasive institutional values are: an interest in perpetuating and disseminating knowledge through teaching programs at all levels; a respect for research, scholarship and artistic endeavor; and a concern for the application of new knowledge and insights that will improve the human condition. To achieve success, the recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty must be given the highest priority. To ensure that the faculty is and continues to be of very high quality, effective systems for recruitment and retention, for reward and recognition (including promotion and tenure), and for faculty development must be maintained, giving proper consideration to contributions in teaching, research, and professional and public service.

To maintain an outstanding faculty, the University must insist on rigorous standards for promotion and tenure. The obvious ideal is a high level of professionalism in the categories of scholarship as reflected in teaching, research or creative activity, and service. A combination of excellence in teaching and strong research or creative activity, or strong teaching and excellence in research or creative activity, both with demonstrated service to the institution, community, and profession, will normally warrant promotion and/or tenure.

**Teaching:** The instructional function of the University requires faculty members who can effectively communicate the content of the current body of knowledge and the latest research results in the classroom, with individual student contact and through professional modes of publication (in its widest sense). Excellence in teaching includes:

- organizing and conducting a course appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
- bringing to the classroom the latest discoveries, techniques and pedagogical approaches;
- engaging the students, according to their capacities, in the current discourse and debates within a field;
- enabling students to articulate issues and solve problems on their own;
- being available outside the classroom for further instruction and advice; and
- successfully directing graduate, professional and post-doctoral students.

**Research or creative activity:** The research function of the University requires faculty members to be actively engaged in the expansion of intellectual and creative frontiers. Excellence in research includes:

- a sustained program of scholarly research and publication or creative contributions;
- the receipt and sustained renewal of grants, awards and fellowships, where appropriate;
- high quality as judged by independent peers both inside and outside the University; and
- the responsibility and recognition achieved by being named to important professional positions.

**Service/Outreach:** Service includes: service on departmental (or unit), college, and University committees; service to professional associations and on public committees where faculty disciplinary knowledge is required. Service becomes an increasingly important part of a faculty member's activities as he or she advances through the professorial ranks. Outreach is a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching and research/creative activity. It involves generating, delivering, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions. The application of one's expertise to issues in the community is encouraged and often generates research ideas and contributions. Service/outreach activities may include:

- serving on campus committees and teams;
- actively participating in faculty governance at unit, college or university levels;
- participating in activities of professional societies or organizations in one's discipline.
- applying one's expertise to address local, regional or national issues;
- providing Extended University, extension programs or short courses to governmental agencies and professional organizations: and
- presenting community lectures or performances;

The primary characteristic that The University of Arizona demands in its faculty is high quality, whatever their category and rank. Without it, we cannot be a leading institution. Tenure and promotion depend on past accomplishments *and* on the promise of continued excellence. Every member of every committee involved in promotion and tenure decisions has the responsibility to guarantee that our quality is preserved and enhanced.

## II. University Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

These guidelines for promotion and tenure provide a philosophical basis for faculty retention and advancement. They express the level of expectation that the institution holds for itself: they ensure that the activities that are to be rewarded are consistent with the overall mission of the institution: they alert faculty to first-order responsibilities and expectations: and they provide a public document that expresses The University of Arizona's seriousness in holding itself to the highest standards of a public land-grant university.

This document frames general criteria, applied by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee and employed by the Provost and the President in making final decisions. University guidelines serve as an effective reference for the development and revision of individual academic unit guidelines, which must reflect discipline-specific characteristics, defined activities, expectations, standards and criteria, and evaluative measures. All unit guidelines for promotion and tenure should uphold the general University criteria and standards. Each unit, division, school and college, in turn, should have its own approved criteria for promotion and tenure that are appropriate to its faculty.

In addition to unit-specific criteria for promotion and tenure, it is essential that a faculty member's workload responsibilities are clearly defined at the time of hire and are reviewed annually. Faculty members and unit heads are required to outline the relative importance assigned to teaching, research and service/outreach activities in relationship to the unit's mission and strategic plan. The workload assignment provides the context for evaluating a candidate's success in meeting performance expectations for promotion and/or tenure.

### A. General Criteria

The University of Arizona must insist on rigorous standards for promotion and tenure. The ideal is excellence in the categories of scholarship as reflected in teaching, original research and creative work, and service/outreach. The granting of promotion or tenure is not a decision to be made lightly, but with all due attention to the quality of performance in each of the three categories. The focus of the faculty member's efforts must support the responsibilities and objectives of his/her unit.



## **B. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

For promotion to associate professor or granting of tenure, a high quality of performance is expected in teaching, research or creative activity, and service to the institution, community or profession.

### **1. Teaching**

- Candidates must present evidence of successful teaching appropriate to the unit's mission (including undergraduate and lower division courses for units involved at this level).
- Candidates should be engaged in educating students at the highest level of their discipline at The University of Arizona and should be directing master's and doctoral work (where appropriate).

An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Faculty members must show effectiveness within the classroom in organizing and presenting material and in stimulating intellectual response. Evidence on teaching effectiveness must come from: student evaluation; a peer review of the teaching portfolio and of the quality of feedback to students on their work; in-class peer evaluation; recognition of advising responsibilities; and participation in faculty development activities. Other evidence includes: grants for teaching innovations; teaching awards; selection to teach in prestigious programs; and achievements by students. Evidence of efforts to improve teaching effectiveness (e.g., the use of technology) should be provided. Availability to students during office hours is an expectation.

### **2. Research or creative activity**

- Candidates must present evidence of having established a coherent program of research or creative activity.
- The published results and/or creative work in media of candidates must be peer-reviewed. The results need to be in sufficient quality and quantity to establish an emerging national reputation and the clear promise of sustained contribution into the future.

An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. The achievement of a candidate's stature may be measured in the quality of the specific media of publication or presentation. Other measures include: citation rates; the reception of grants, awards and fellowships in support of the candidate's work; and the attraction of advanced students to the candidate's tutelage.

### **3. Service/Outreach**

- Candidates must contribute to decision making and academic and institutional planning at the unit level and, perhaps, at the college and university levels by effectively carrying out committee assignments;
- Candidates should share their professional expertise with the public through avenues such as local schools, agencies, commissions, consulting assignments or panels.
- Candidates should participate in local, regional and national meetings, be active in professional societies, and conduct editorial reviews.

An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of the above should be provided and should reveal that assistant professors worthy of promotion to associate professor with tenure have begun to develop a habit of service, that their judgments are professionally respected and valued, and that they have demonstrated the ability and an interest in finding linkages between their discipline and public interests, needs and opportunities.

### **C. Promotion to Professor**

For promotion to full professor, performance of high quality in teaching, research and service/outreach with outstanding performance in one or more categories is required. The focus of the faculty member's efforts must support the responsibilities and objectives of his/her unit and must be agreed upon with the unit head at each annual review.

#### **1. Teaching**

- Candidates must present evidence of continued high quality teaching and mentoring, both in the classroom and through individual student contact, as appropriate to the unit's mission. This should include undergraduate and lower division courses for units involved at this level, as well as direction of master's and doctoral work, where appropriate.
- Candidates should have attained a leadership role in developing unit curricula, providing evaluation of the teaching effectiveness of other faculty, and contributing to more effective unit teaching approaches.

An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of teaching effectiveness should continue to come from student evaluations, peer evaluations, advising, achievements by students, teaching grants and awards, successful innovation, selection to teach in prestigious programs here and elsewhere, and participation in faculty development activities. Faculty are expected to continually improve their teaching by staying current with the latest developments in the discipline and with pedagogical techniques.

#### **2. Research or Creative Activity**

- Candidates must present evidence of continued high quality basic or applied research, or creative activity.
- Candidates must present evidence that the results of these efforts have positively impacted their field of study, professional discipline, or local, regional, national, or international constituencies.

An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. This level of achievement is manifested in signs such as the quality and quantity of work presented in reviewed media or means of presentation; the opinions of peers from other institutions; citations of the candidate's work in his/her discipline; evidence that the candidate's work or findings have been incorporated into the field; the attainment and/or renewal of major awards, grants, and fellowships; presentations to scholarly or artistic communities beyond the southwest region; the reprinting and/or translation of a candidate's work abroad; the invitation to serve on editorial boards or other boards of judgment, to review manuscripts for leading journals and presses, to review grant applications for national funding agencies, and to evaluate candidates from other institutions for promotion and/or tenure.

#### **3. Service/Outreach**

Candidates for full professor must have accepted much more service responsibility than that required for lower ranks. An important measure of quality is the evaluation by independent internal and external reviewers. Evidence of service/outreach may include, but is not limited to the following:

- leadership in faculty governance, in mentoring of junior faculty, and in establishing academic unit and college goals, objectives and performance standards;
- participation in professional associations, on professional review panels, and in the review of journal articles, grants and proposals;
- work with governmental and non-profit agencies that involves one's disciplinary expertise; and
- community lectures or performances.

### III. Evaluation Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

The procedural guidelines described below are intended to help each unit<sup>1</sup> establish its own standards for evaluating its faculty for promotion and tenure decisions. These guidelines will facilitate the type of faculty participation and consensus building that should allow each unit to develop a peer evaluation process that reflects its own priorities and values as well as those of the college and university.

In addition to making decisions about how the faculty evaluation system will work generally for the faculty group, it is necessary to specify an individual's role within the unit. For each performance period, there should be a written assignment clarifying expectations of each individual.

1. Determine critical dimensions of performance. The faculty evaluation plan begins with each unit determining those critical dimensions of behavior that move the goals and objectives of the unit forward. For example, traditionally with the performance review of faculty responsibilities, one includes information about teaching, research, and service dimensions. However, there are emerging interests in considering other faculty responsibilities such as professional development and these may be incorporated in performance plans consistent with objectives and budget constraints.

2. Describe activities to be included in each performance dimension. The faculty of the unit should further delineate activities to be considered for evaluation within each performance dimension. For example, teaching may include graduate and undergraduate teaching, supervising independent study courses, advising masters or doctoral students, etc. Scholarly research/creative activities may include publishing research in refereed journals, presenting exhibitions of creative works, obtaining grants or contracts, etc. In like manner units may describe more fully the nature of service by using subcategories such as outreach, community service, University service, and professional service. Additional examples of assignment activities that could become part of the faculty evaluation system are listed in Table 1. One logical starting point would be to begin with the activities listed as examples and allow the faculty to add or delete items.

3. Identify key activities to be evaluated. After the set of possible activities has been identified, the next step is to develop a process that leads to the description of those key activities that will actually be included within the evaluation system. A given academic unit might accept only one-third of the items listed in this set. In contrast, another unit might decide to adopt the entire set listed because they feel these activities are representative of their collective interests. There is no prescribed list--the issue is simply to determine what the academic unit values and how they will go about obtaining and analyzing information (the more activities included--the more time needed for data collection and evaluation).

4. Determine weight ranges for each performance dimension. A key element in adapting the faculty evaluation system to the unit focuses on determining and assigning value or "weight" ranges to each performance dimension. It should be understood that the quality of a faculty member's performance in each dimension (teaching, research/creative activity, and service) should be evaluated independently of the weighting that is then to be assigned to that dimension for that faculty member. Minimum and maximum weights for each dimension are first determined at the unit level and then negotiated to ensure that they support the mission of the college and university. For example, a unit may hold the expectation that all faculty should carry on an active program of research or creative activity, but, at the same time, recognize that faculty assignments will vary as to emphasis between teaching, research and service. This would then be reflected in a weighted range of values for evaluation purposes such that not less than 30% importance is assigned to research though it may go as high as 70%. The teaching range in the same unit may vary from 30% to perhaps 70% while service may range between 5% and 30%. Another unit heavily involved in undergraduate education may have different minimum and maximum ranges for each major dimension. Any unit may have individual faculty negotiate specific weights consistent with unit goals and individual needs. It is expected that the level of importance assigned to a given activity relates directly to the work assignment negotiated for the time period and indeed comes out of the work assignment, although the importance weights are not directly tied to time allocation.

---

<sup>1</sup> The word "unit" is used to denote the smallest academic unit (e.g., center, department or division, school).

It is important to understand that decisions regarding minimum and maximum weights are framed within the broader policy decisions that have already been established in the University community. For example, to be a ranked faculty member, a 30% teaching load is required and although the importance weight for teaching need not be 30%, for example it could be 40%, the importance weight should be related to the work assignment. University procedures and explicit policy about the allocation of resources within the University will provide boundaries within which units determine the minimum and maximum ranges for weighting of performance dimensions.

5. Determine sources of evaluation input. Next, the unit needs to determine what information must be gathered to obtain an assessment or rating of the activities included in each of the three performance dimensions. For example, if one is going to analyze teaching performance, decisions must be made about concerns such as; whether student ratings will be used and to what extent; will the unit head and/or peers be included as classroom observers; to what extent is self-evaluation of teaching considered in the process; will teaching materials and course syllabi be evaluated; how will the data be collected; etc. Examples of sources of information on which evaluations may be based are included in Table 1.

6. Incorporate the following procedural aspects in the evaluation plan. In adapting the faculty evaluation system at the unit level, the following procedures support the design elements:

- Each unit will have established by May 1 (i.e., starting in 1997) those core dimensions that will guide the faculty evaluation system for the following academic year.
- Opportunities for multiple inputs must be identified and be an explicit part of each unit plan. For example, units might consider student evaluation of teaching, an elected peer review committee for research productivity, other stakeholders in research efforts and/or outreach activities to provide information on performance, etc. The specific role of the unit head and the faculty members in evaluating faculty performance also should be clarified.
- Appropriate expectations should be negotiated annually between the unit head and each faculty member. These expectations should be based upon faculty standards and guidelines that have been created (and/or modified) by the end of the previous academic year (i.e., in May). This communication allows the faculty member and head to negotiate on an individual basis and to set clear expectations for performance outcomes. Although it may not be possible to personalize a plan that is optimally desirable for every faculty member in a given year, it is an expectation that "forward looking negotiation" may solve most disagreements.
- Standard procedures must be identified to assure fairness. That is, the performance goal-setting process involving each faculty member and the unit head will establish written expectations that are on file and open to public examination. Every effort should be made to assure that faculty concerns regarding all aspects of work assignments are addressed fairly.
- Appropriate rewards and recognition are a vital component of the faculty evaluation system. The two purposes of a faculty evaluation system are to provide feedback for self improvement and data for personnel decisions. Feedback for self improvement should provide faculty with information that assists them in enhancing current performance or correcting deficiencies in areas they and the administration consider relevant and important. Feedback for personnel decisions should provide decision-makers with relevant, reliable data concerning faculty performance on which to base decisions concerning promotion, tenure, merit pay, or continuation of appointments.

**Table I. Examples of Faculty Activities that may be Considered for Evaluation**

ASSIGNMENT ACTIVITIES	SOURCES OF EVALUATION INPUT
<b>INSTRUCTION</b>	
<u>Teaching</u>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teaching regular course offerings</li> <li>2. Developing course materials</li> <li>3. Developing replicable systems of instruction (e.g., designing TA-instructed courses)</li> <li>4. Developing new courses/labs</li> <li>5. Coordinating a multi-faceted course</li> <li>6. Teaching a multi-faceted course</li> <li>7. Clinical teaching/independent study/tutorials</li> <li>8. Supervising independent study, graduate and undergraduate research</li> <li>9. Implementing innovative technology for instruction</li> <li>10. Developing and applying educational innovations in the classroom</li> <li>11. Providing meaningful feedback to students on their work</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student evaluations of teaching</li> <li>2. Peer review</li> <li>3. Self evaluation</li> <li>4. Department/Unit Head assessment</li> <li>5. Administrative support personnel</li> <li>6. Teaching assistants</li> </ol>
<u>Advising</u>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Advising undergraduate students on programs of study</li> <li>2. Advising student groups</li> <li>3. Serving on master's or doctoral supervisory committees</li> <li>4. Advising/mentoring graduate students</li> <li>5. Advising about residency programs</li> </ol>	
<u>Special honors or recognition for teaching excellence or innovation</u>	
<b>SCHOLARLY RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES</b>	
<u>Publications</u>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Books</li> <li>2. Refereed journal articles</li> <li>3. Monographs, technical reports, etc.</li> <li>4. Exhibiting paintings, sculptures, and other creative arts</li> <li>5. Staging, directing, or acting in musical, theatrical and dance productions</li> <li>6. Reviews</li> <li>7. Software/Media</li> <li>8. Electronic or other non-refereed material</li> <li>9. Citation counts</li> <li>10. Presenting recitals and exhibitions</li> <li>11. Invited/contributed presentations/performances</li> <li>12. Invited/contributed papers</li> <li>13. Poster sessions</li> <li>14. Producing deliverable systems</li> <li>15. One-person exhibits in museums or prestigious galleries</li> <li>16. Placement of work in museums</li> <li>17. Commissions received</li> <li>18. Choreography performed by others</li> <li>19. Performances with leading professional organizations</li> <li>20. Performance of works by others</li> <li>21. Chapters in books</li> <li>22. Maps</li> <li>23. Abstracts</li> <li>24. Patents</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Faculty review committee</li> <li>2. External peer reviews of activities</li> <li>3. Self evaluation</li> <li>4. Department/Unit Head assessment</li> <li>5. Agencies supporting the activity</li> <li>6. Collaborators</li> </ol>
<u>Ongoing Research</u>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Basic investigations (theoretical/applied) in progress</li> <li>2. Investigations of educationally relevant problems</li> <li>3. Obtaining outside support for projects, especially through peer-reviewed proposals</li> <li>4. Patents and technology transfer</li> <li>5. Grants, contracts, box office receipts</li> </ol>	
<u>Professional Recognition</u>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Awards/Honors</li> <li>2. Achieving advanced degrees/certifications, etc.</li> <li>3. Special recognitions for professional accomplishments</li> <li>4. Prizes for/acceptances in juried show</li> <li>5. Awards in juried competitions</li> <li>6. Awards for compositions</li> </ol>	

Table I (continued)

ASSIGNMENT ACTIVITIES	SOURCES OF EVALUATION INPUT
<b>SERVICE ACTIVITIES</b>	
<u>Faculty Service</u>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Serving on unit, college, and/or university committees</li> <li>2. Serving in the Faculty Senate</li> <li>3. Chairing of any committee (student, faculty, etc.)</li> <li>4. Serving as a sponsor for student activities and/or groups</li> <li>5. Administrative assignments</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Faculty review committee</li> <li>2. External peer reviews</li> <li>3. Self evaluation</li> <li>4. Department/Unit Head assessment</li> <li>5. Administrative supervisor</li> <li>6. Faculty and staff colleagues</li> </ol>
<u>Professional Service</u>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Activity in professional organizations (holding office, serving on committees for federal or state government agencies or on boards)</li> <li>2. Consulting to organizations/corporations</li> <li>3. Consulting to universities/colleges, etc.</li> </ol>	
<u>Public or Community Service</u>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Participating in local, state, or national civic activities and organizations</li> <li>2. Applying one's academic expertise in the local, state, or national community without pay/profit</li> </ol>	
<u>Awards and Recognitions</u>	