

# *Principles for Creating Criteria and Standards for Promotion & Tenure*

---

## CONTENTS:

1. **Introduction**
2. **Principles for Tenure & Promotion Unit Criteria and Standards**
3. **Procedures for Drafting & Proposing Unit Criteria and Standards**
4. **Conclusions**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This document, *Principles for Creating Criteria and Standards for Promotion & Tenure*, provides guidance for the creation and adoption of specific criteria by a unit—a discipline, college, department or school. This document is subordinate to the *Criteria for the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty* (published separately), which provides general university-wide criteria for all faculty concerning the appointment, promotion, and granting of tenure to faculty.

A university is shaped by its system of promotion and tenure. Designing that system and participating in its decisions are two of the most important ways in which faculty shape the university. This document is intended to assist faculty as they propose promotion and tenure criteria for the unit for adoption by the university. The promotion and tenure system must reflect two overlapping but distinct sets of values: those of the disciplines and those of the institution. As a public institution, Florida Atlantic University is accountable to the FAU Board of Trustees, the Florida Board of Governors, and to the Florida Legislature and, through them, the citizens of the State of Florida. Accountability requires that we are able to describe how we are expending state resources and why we are expending them as we do.

Criteria for promotion and tenure at Florida Atlantic University is part of our system of accountability. These criteria are central to fulfilling the university's missions of instruction, research, and creative accomplishments, and service to the broader community.

Tenure implies a lifelong commitment of the institution to the person. The awarding of tenure is not a simple summing of annual evaluations. There is no guarantee that

the President will grant tenure, and no person or academic unit may make a guarantee or promise, regardless of the candidate's perceived strengths or portfolio. All applicants must accept that the awarding of tenure is based upon the subjective judgment that the person will have a lifelong commitment to scholarship and teaching at the University level and to sharing in the tasks, activities and goals of the Department/School, College and University. Ultimately, only the President of the University in his/her sole discretion may grant tenure.

## **2. PRINCIPLES FOR TENURE & PROMOTION UNIT CRITERIA AND STANDARDS**

### **A. Instruction**

In order to be recommended for tenure or promotion, candidates must show that they are effective in and committed to the university's goal of quality instruction.

The activities included under the rubric of instruction include all of those endeavors by which a faculty member contributes to the learning and intellectual growth of the student. The faculty member's performance in regularly scheduled classes must be evaluated using both student and peer assessments of the courses. Instructional development activities such as pursuing professional development of teaching activities and developing new courses or new approaches to existing courses must also be expected, especially for more experienced faculty members. Work with students outside of regularly scheduled courses is also important in evaluating instruction; this category of activity includes mentoring graduate students in thesis or dissertation preparation as well as working with undergraduate students in directed independent study, internships, or other formats appropriate to the discipline. Serving as an academic advisor for students at all levels may also be an important responsibility for faculty and, if it is, the successful performance of this role is also expected.

### **B. Research, Scholarship and Other Creative Activity**

University faculty typically are assigned to conduct research, be involved in scholarly work, or be actively engaged in other creative activity appropriate to their fields. The form of this activity will vary considerably across disciplines. In most disciplines, however, it will include the development of new insights or results appropriate to the field, and the presentation of those insights or results for peer evaluation by others in the discipline. Supplemental data, such as journal acceptance rates, impact ratings, and citations, should be included in unit

guidelines if important to the discipline. Where appropriate, accomplishments such as the award of external research support, authorship of the reviews of the research of others, or organization of seminars and colloquia can serve as indicators of approbation. In the arts especially, performances and exhibitions are normal methods of presenting one's work for evaluation by appropriate audiences, and those activities should be reviewed by appropriate peers. The more detailed criteria of each unit will describe the normal methods by which the relevant discipline or disciplines recognize excellence or competence. In regard to multi-disciplinary/collaborative work, unit criteria need to address its importance to the discipline, although the portfolio needs to clearly specify individual contributions in such projects. What is critical is the demonstration that the individual is an **active and creative participant in the growth of the knowledge in his or her field.**

### **C. Service**

The weighting of service in promotion and tenure decisions will vary significantly across candidates. Because most untenured faculty have a modest service assignment, service generally is not a major component of the tenure decision. Nevertheless, the candidate for tenure must demonstrate a commitment and ability to contribute to the university, college, and department/school through participation in collegial decision-making and service as well as demonstrated willingness to abide by university rules and the outcomes of collegial decisions. In some colleges, criteria for tenure may also specify the demonstration of willingness and ability to contribute to the community (including, for example, the public schools) or the discipline.

In promotion decisions, the weighting of service will vary. In most cases, Assistant Professors will have a modest service assignment. Expectations for institutional and other service generally will increase with rank, with Associate Professors expected to do more service work than Assistant Professors. . The evaluation of service accomplishments must be rigorous, particularly if service/administration was a significant component of the assignment.

### **D. Tenure**

Tenure is the most significant commitment that the university can make to a faculty member. Decisions on tenure are different in kind from those on promotion. Tenure, in fact, is more exacting. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of Instruction, Research and Creative Activity, and Service, the

candidate for tenure must demonstrate a willingness to share in the tasks, activities and goals of the unit and do so with professional integrity. The awarding of tenure is not a simple summing of annual evaluation. Tenure is recommended when the university's academic community agrees that the faculty member is committed to the missions of the university and will make significant contributions to them across his or her career. A judgment must be made that the faculty member's record represents a pattern indicative of a lifetime of continued accomplishment and productivity. In all cases, the guiding question is a simple one: "Will the university be made better and stronger by its relationship with this professor over the remainder of her or his academic career?"

Unit criteria for tenure should reflect the accomplishments appropriate to the rank of the candidate seeking tenure. All candidates for tenure must be evaluated on the basis of their assignments.

As stated in the University Criteria document and throughout these Principles, there is no guarantee that the President will grant tenure, and no person or academic unit may make a guarantee or promise, regardless of the candidate's perceived strengths or portfolio.

## **1. Untenured Assistant Professors**

For untenured assistant professors, the tenure decision generally will be based largely on: instructional activities (classroom teaching, course development, development of laboratories or teaching software, mentoring of students, assigned advising, etc.); accomplishments in the discipline or across disciplines (as appropriate, research, other forms of scholarship, and other creative activities). All candidates must demonstrate competency in and commitment to both instructional activities and appropriate disciplinary/professional activities. Both instructional and research/scholarly/creative activities must be evaluated with equal rigor.

### **a. Must Demonstrate Ability in and Commitment to Instructional Activities**

The untenured assistant professor seeking tenure needs to demonstrate that she or he has made a successful transition from student to teacher. The candidate needs to demonstrate the ability and motivation to develop new course material and effectively impart it to students. In programs with both graduate and undergraduate components, the candidate should show success in mentoring

graduate students as well as teaching scheduled classes. Tenure criteria for evaluating instructional accomplishments should include the entire range of relevant activities. Criteria should provide a basis for evaluating the candidate's ability to make successful and lifelong contributions to the university's instructional programs.

**b. Must Demonstrate Successful Transition to Independent Research, Scholarly, or Creative Work**

The untenured assistant professor seeking tenure needs to demonstrate that he or she has made a successful transition from graduate student to mature and independent researcher, scholar or artist. The candidate needs to demonstrate that he or she is capable of developing projects and bringing them to successful conclusion. The candidate needs to demonstrate active engagement in activities central to the disciplines or professions appropriate to his or her faculty appointment. Tenure criteria for evaluating research, scholarly or creative work should include the entire range of appropriate activities. Criteria should provide a basis for evaluating the candidate's ability to make successful and lifelong contributions to recognized fields of academic knowledge or creative arts.

**c. Must Demonstrate Commitment to and Ability in Service**

As noted above, service generally is a modest part of the assignment of Assistant Professors. Nevertheless, candidates should provide evidence of their potential for productive service to the institution and, in some colleges or departments/schools, profession and community.

**d. Must Meet Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor**

Only those candidates who are Associate Professors or who meet the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor will be considered for tenure. Part of the evidence considered in every tenure decision is whether the candidate meets the criteria for Associate Professor. An untenured assistant professor must apply for promotion at the same time as she or he applies for tenure. The promotion application

will be considered first and, if a positive recommendation is made, the candidate has met the first criterion for tenure. While both promotion and tenure may be considered at the same meeting of a promotion and tenure committee, the general principle is that promotion should be discussed and voted on before tenure.

Promotion to Associate Professor is not sufficient for a recommendation of tenure. Additional tenure criteria will be set, as specified above, by colleges and/or schools/departments. Promotion is based on accomplishments to date but tenure recommendations are based on collegial judgments about the likelihood that the candidate will make continuing and valuable contributions to the institution and the discipline(s).

## **2. Untenured Associate Professors and Professors**

Generally, newly-hired senior faculty must demonstrate over a number of years that they are capable of high-quality work at and sustained contributions to Florida Atlantic University. The tenure decision requires evidence of the candidate's ability and willingness to improve the quality of this institution through instruction, research, scholarly and/or other creative accomplishments, and service. This decision cannot be made without careful consideration of the candidate's record over a sufficient period of time.

No later than during their sixth year at Florida Atlantic University, a faculty member hired as or promoted to Associate Professor or Professor must apply for tenure. Tenure at these ranks involves considerations beyond those appropriate to the rank of Assistant Professor. If assigned research or other creative work, the candidate must have demonstrated the ability to continue and extend his or her research, scholarly or creative activities while at this institution. If assigned instruction, the candidate must have demonstrated the motivation and ability to be a competent and effective teacher of the students at Florida Atlantic University and be involved in the full range of appropriate instructional activities. Additionally, if assigned service, the candidate must have demonstrated the ability and motivation to make responsible and effective contributions to university, college, and other institutional service, administration and governance. While the tenure decision considers the entire academic career, it should weigh heavily the candidate's accomplishments and activities while at Florida Atlantic University.

Occasionally, tenure may be recommended upon hire. In such cases, the recommendation will be based upon agreement that the candidate has provided strong evidence that she or he is likely to do high-quality work at Florida Atlantic University and to make the strong institutional commitment expected of a tenured faculty member.

### **3. Role of Annual Evaluations and Third Year Reviews**

It is essential that Annual Evaluations and Third Year Reviews be conducted within the context of the academic unit's tenure and promotion criteria. Faculty need to be afforded guidance on what is essential for achievement of tenure and promotion. Such guidance may be offered by the direct supervisor and/or a personnel committee.

An Annual Progress Toward Tenure Appraisal Form needs to be completed for every tenure track faculty member. This form will provide constructive advice and a plan of action for the coming year(s) so the candidate will be able to make the best possible case for promotion and tenure.

Candidates must understand, and mentors should explain, that positive annual evaluations and a positive successful third year review does not guarantee tenure will be recommended by any reviewer or granted by the President. There is no guarantee of continued employment at the University, and tenure track faculty remain subject to all non-reappointment policies and collective bargaining agreement articles until tenure is granted.

## **E. Promotion**

### **1. Promotion to Associate Professor**

Promotion to Associate Professor recognizes that the candidate has achieved a level of academic accomplishment in instructional and research, scholarly or creative work that is appropriate to the senior ranks of Florida Atlantic University. In all colleges, promotion to Associate Professor requires documentation of effectiveness in both instructional and research/scholarly/creative work. As the missions of and assignments across colleges vary, colleges legitimately may vary in what is required as evidence of effectiveness. As assignments may vary within and between colleges, evaluation must be carefully based on assignment.

### a. **Criteria Should Focus on Accomplishments**

Unit criteria for promotion to Associate Professor should focus on the magnitude and pattern of accomplishments over the years in Assistant Professor rank. Promotion to Associate Professor is not a simple summing of annual evaluations. College statements (and/or department or school statements) should explicitly address how annual evaluations will be considered. If annual evaluations do not include all of the dimensions of the faculty role that are evaluated in the promotion decision, the decision must consider items beyond them. For example, many annual evaluation systems only consider the calendar year's accomplishments. The promotion decision legitimately may consider the degree to which the candidate's research or other creative activities are a cumulative series of projects rather than a set of unrelated products. It may consider efforts towards and rates of improvement in instructional performance. It may consider how each year's accomplishments are related to the previous year's activities. Promotion decisions may look at patterns of activity that are not evaluated annually.

## 2. **Promotion to Professor**

Promotion to Professor is recognition of the candidate's academic maturity. Because of the nature of academic careers and institutional needs, there is more variability in the kinds of candidates who will be promoted to Professor than those promoted to Associate Professor. **As promotion to Professor is largely based on accomplishments since promotion to Associate**, unit criteria for this promotion must be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the legitimate variations in faculty assignments and activity within the rank of Associate Professor. There are multiple routes to meeting the standard of distinguished accomplishment required for promotion to Professor.\*

### a. **Multiple Routes**

Promotion to Professor may be based on different patterns of outstanding accomplishment. Some positive recommendations may be based on evidence that a candidate has developed her or his range and level of accomplishment in all of the dimensions of the faculty role: research/scholarly/creative activity in or across appropriate disciplines; teaching and related instructional activity, including curricular and program development; the development or administration of professional associations, department/school, college and university. Some positive recommendations may be based on evidence that a

candidate has achieved distinction primarily in one dimension, while continuing to be active and competent in the other dimensions of the faculty role.

\*Faculty will no longer be able to submit a promotion to Professor portfolio based on Multiple Routes after the 2017-2018 promotion cycle. Starting with the 2018-2019 cycle, all promotion to Professor will be based on outstanding scholarship in research, creative activity, instruction or service.

## **b. Recognizing Variability in Instructional Expectations of Associate Professors**

In creating unit criteria for promotion to Professor, faculty should consider how the institution's expectations of and assignments to Associate Professors differ from those for Assistant Professors. For example, Associate Professors may be expected to accept significant responsibility for program development, student recruitment, supervision of theses and dissertations, and so on. Associate Professors may be asked to chair departments, coordinate programs, and accept other institutional responsibilities. Associate Professors may be expected to identify and attract outside funding. Since new dimensions often are added to all dimensions of the faculty role after promotion to Associate, they should be made explicit in the criteria for promotion to Professor.

Unit criteria for promotion to Professor must recognize that Associate Professors may have many different patterns of assignment, even within the same department/school. When variable assignments are used, criteria must be sufficiently flexible as to permit promotion on the basis of **demonstrated distinction in any of the patterns of assignment**. The statement of criteria should explicitly address the issue of variability.

## **c. "Distinction" and "Competency" in the Promotion Decision**

The traditional route to Professor emphasizes distinction in research and other appropriate forms of scholarly and creative activity, and this will remain one of the primary routes to promotion. In addition, however, a candidate may be recommended for promotion to Professor on the basis of a record of distinguished instructional or service accomplishments, provided that he or she can also meet the relevant criteria for demonstrating continued competency in and commitment to research and other creative activities in the

discipline(s). There needs to be clear evidence of longstanding leadership, national recognition, and substantial contributions both within and outside the university, in whichever route of Distinction chose by the candidate.

i. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

Unit criteria must specify the criteria for recognizing distinction in research, scholarly, and creative activity. These may include but should not be limited to letters of evaluation from demonstrably distinguished members of the field. These criteria should provide the basis for judgements of the degree to which the candidate's work has made a significant contribution to appropriate discipline(s) or art(s), is original and continuous, and has been broadly disseminated and well-received by peers. In judging whether a faculty member has attained distinction in this dimension of the faculty role, a college or department/school may also adopt criteria that include the faculty member's record of outside support in the form of grants and/or contracts. Unit criteria should provide the basis for evaluating a broad range of appropriate disciplinary activities, including activity that directly contributes to shaping the intellectual development of the candidate's discipline(s). Unit criteria should be as clear and comprehensive as possible, as specified earlier in this document.

ii. Instruction and Related Activities

Just as the standards for distinguished and competent research or creative activity differ between promotion to Associate and to Professor, so do the standards for distinguished and competent instructional activity. The candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is likely to be primarily evaluated on the basis of his or her classroom teaching. Candidates for Professor may be evaluated on the basis of a broader range of activities. Much of the institution's leadership in program and curriculum development can be expected to come from those progressing through the rank of Associate Professor and towards the rank of Professor. In particular, **significant instructional accomplishments should be documented** by those who base their application for promotion to Professor primarily on their distinguished performance in this area. Such candidates might be expected to have a record of documented instructional accomplishments in addition to outstanding classroom teaching as, for example, in: mentoring students, enhancing the instructional abilities of other faculty, successfully designing programs and curricula, taking a leadership role on curriculum

and related committees, unusual successes in working with students in disciplinary or professional clubs, building successful internship or other programs, and so on. It is expected that these candidates will have established a role of national prominence in their area through leadership in national organizations and publications in regard to instruction and curriculum issues.

iii. Institutional and Other Service

Similarly, candidates for Professor may be expected to demonstrate broader and more significant institutional service than candidates for Associate Professor. Some candidates for Professor may base their case for promotion on their distinguished service to the university in collegial governance or other arenas. Such candidates should carefully document their claims of outstanding accomplishments. In such cases, internal letters should be as careful, objective and comprehensive as is traditional for outside letters of review; moreover, a larger number of internal letters than the minimum may be useful.

Faculty applying for promotion to Professor on a record of Distinction in Service need to provide evidence of longstanding leadership and substantial contributions both within and outside the University. The portfolio must document superior performance at the highest levels of professional responsibility in the University, contributions to the community, and the academic or professional discipline, and substantial leadership at regional, state, and national, or international levels. Normally, university administrative appointments are not considered within this category.

d. **Role of Annual Evaluations**

**It is essential that Annual Evaluations be conducted within the context of the unit's promotion criteria, with the goal of guiding the faculty toward successful achievement. Such guidance may be offered by the direct supervisor and/or by a personnel committee.**

Promotion decisions are not a simple summing of annual evaluations. Promotion criteria should specify the role of annual evaluations in promotion decisions, while carefully specifying the additional considerations in such decisions. Promotion to Professor requires significant, cumulative accomplishments demonstrating that the candidate

has achieved a high level of professional maturity and accomplishment. Such a record, particularly for those whose primary distinction is in instruction or service/administration, typically requires a significant number of years in rank in order to build the sustained record of documented accomplishment that is necessary.

To be clear, as stated above, candidates must understand, and mentors should explain, that positive annual evaluations (or a positive successful third year review) does not guarantee tenure will be recommended by any reviewer or granted by the President. There is no guarantee of continued employment at the University, and tenure track faculty remain subject to all non-reappointment policies and collective bargaining agreement articles until tenure is granted.

**e. Appraisals of Progress Towards Promotion**

Appraisal of progress toward promotion to Professor should be conducted at the time of Annual Evaluation. At any time, faculty or the faculty's direct supervisor may request an appraisal of their progress toward promotion to Professor. All colleges shall establish written procedures for the evaluation of progress towards promotion to Professor.

**Procedures for Drafting & Proposing Criteria**

**A. Adoption Procedures**

Colleges should adopt a process for proposing criteria that is open, collegial, and appropriate to the needs and structure of the college. Deans and faculty are strongly encouraged to use the following procedures but, if the college can be better served by using another procedure, they can elect to do so following approval of the substitute proposal by the Provost.

All proposals to the Provost for alternate procedures should carefully describe their provisions for ensuring the maximum feasible participation of faculty in the drafting and proposing of statements of goals and criteria. All affected faculty must have an opportunity to work on developing criteria and to vote on the complete document as it is proposed.

Regardless of procedure, all statements of criteria should describe the range of activities that can or will be evaluated, what kinds of evidence will generally be presented, and how that evidence will be used to judge whether a candidate merits a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion. Criteria become effective only when approved by the Provost; and all proposed criteria will be evaluated on the basis of the standards of adequacy specified in Section 8 below.

## **B. Recommended Procedures**

### **1. Initiating the Process**

The process of creating unit criteria should be collegial and open. The dean, chair/director, or a majority of the members of a college or department/school may initiate the process of creating, revising or reconsidering the unit's (college, department/school) promotion and tenure criteria. At the beginning of the process, the appropriate administrator (generally, the dean) shall discuss the missions and goals of the unit with those who will participate in the process. Working on criteria is an opportunity to clarify the goals and values of the college and department/school, to consider how to connect the promotion/tenure system to the missions of the college and department/school, and to respond to changes in the discipline(s) constituting the unit.

### **2. Drafting the College Statement**

The process of creating college criteria begins with an elected college committee. The dean shall designate the promotion and tenure committee or convene a special committee to work on the criteria. The committee is encouraged to circulate draft documents to the faculty for comment and to fully inform the faculty of its work. It is encouraged to meet regularly with the dean to discuss its work.

The committee shall develop a general statement of the college's policy on promotion and tenure. The statement shall describe the goals towards which candidates for promotion and tenure should strive. Goals for candidates for promotion and tenure should be linked to the goals of the university, college and relevant

discipline(s) in each of the major areas of faculty activities: research and creative activities; instructional activities; institutional, professional and community service. Goals should be set for candidates for tenure, promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Professor. Goals should reflect the different considerations appropriate to each of these decisions. The statement should include criteria for evaluating the degree to which a candidate has met the college goals. The statement of criteria should describe the range of activities that can or will be evaluated, what kinds of evidence will generally be presented, and how that evidence will be used to judge whether a candidate merits a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion.

**a. Setting Goals for Promotion and Tenure Candidates, and Establishing Criteria for Evaluating the Degree to Which Candidates have Met Those Goals**

Goals are stated abstractly (e.g., "effectiveness in instruction"). Unit criteria are descriptions of how an evaluator would know if the person had met the goals (e.g., "student performance in the next course in the sequence"). In many cases, colleges will use multiple criteria for judging the degree to which a candidate has met a given goal.

Unit criteria and standards can be stated in a number of different ways. Generally, goal statements will address the university's and college's missions and long-term goals as well as those of the discipline(s). Some statements will be elaborate, while others will be relatively simple, but none should a simple checklist of items. Standards of criteria will also vary. Some statements of criteria may describe the level and kind of accomplishments expected for promotion and tenure. They may describe the characteristics of the record of a candidate who would be positively recommended for promotion and tenure, providing a list of examples of the kinds and levels of accomplishments that would constitute such a record. Some may have lists of kinds of accomplishments, as well as statements of the pattern of accomplishments that

would merit a positive recommendation. All statements of goals and criteria should reflect the missions and disciplines of the unit.

All statements of goals and criteria should recognize a range of accomplishments and activities that warrant a positive recommendation for promotion or tenure. While some kinds of accomplishments may be required of all tenure candidates, colleges are urged to consider how a range of differing but equally distinguished accomplishments might be the basis for a positive recommendation for promotion to Professor.

All college statements must be compatible and not conflict with the University Criteria, and the general statements on tenure and promotion in this document and in the *Criteria* document.

**b. Specifying What Will be Evaluated**

The college statement should clarify the activities that will be evaluated, seeking to be as comprehensive as possible. The statement should describe the range of activities performed by faculty within the college. No single faculty member would be assigned to all of these activities, but most faculty members would be assigned to many of these activities as part of their assignments to instruction, research and other scholarly and creative activities, and service. This section of the statement provides an opportunity to explicitly focus attention on significant activities that are often overlooked and therefore unrewarded.

The college statement may address the relative significance of the different kinds of faculty college and university missions as guiding principles. Thus, for example, a developing college might place a priority on the creation of new courses and internship programs; in contrast, a college implementing new graduate programs might place a priority on mentoring of graduate students

and supervision of theses and dissertations.

**c. Describing the Kind of Evidence Upon Which Evaluations Will be Based**

In addition to describing what will be evaluated, the college statement will describe how promotion and tenure applications will be evaluated. The statement will describe the kinds of evidence that typically will be part of tenure and promotion packages, so that all faculty know how to document their accomplishments and college promotion/tenure packets are comparable. For example, the statement may require a particular combination of peer and student evaluations of instruction or it may specify the documentation required for claims of significant committee service.

**3. Role of Departments/Schools**

Departments/schools have a significant role in the process of evaluation.

First, they are represented on the committee that drafts the college statement. Representatives should consult frequently with their department/school colleagues, seeking to ensure that no disciplinary or programmatic concerns of the department/school are overlooked in this process.

Second, even when college criteria are used, department/school colleagues may retain primary responsibility for using these criteria to evaluate the candidate's record. College-level criteria generally will specify a common set of procedures for gathering evidence about and rules for judging a candidate's record. They need not diminish the responsibility of department/school peers for evaluating the accomplishments of their colleagues. Often, such evaluation requires knowledge that only department/school colleagues have: for example, the appropriateness of methods for student evaluation in a course or the quality of a journal. When department/school judgments are required, department/school criteria should be developed that clearly specify the bases on

which these judgments will be made. For example, departments or schools that will evaluate the appropriateness of methods for student evaluation should propose a set of criteria for "appropriateness"; such criteria might suggest that essay exams or research projects generally were appropriate for upper-division courses in the major.

The criteria should be sufficiently clear that any qualified member of the relevant discipline(s) could apply them to the record and make a reliable judgment. They should also be clear enough to be useful guides to those who will be seeking tenure and/or promotion.

4. **Varying Balance Between College and Department/School Goals and Criteria**

The balance between college and department/school goals and criteria must be decided by the dean and the faculty of each college. In some colleges, relative homogeneity of mission and disciplines prevails. In such colleges, criteria and standards can be largely established at the college level. In other colleges, there is greater heterogeneity. In these colleges, a larger portion of the criteria will be formulated at the department/school level. Even in heterogeneous colleges, however, it may be possible and would be worthwhile to set criteria and standards in some areas at the college level. Common criteria and standards for evaluation in the areas of instruction and service might be set at the college level and, even if the criteria for evaluating research, scholarly and creative work are set at the department/school level, some or all of the standards of research, scholarly and creative work might be set at the college level. In all cases, department/school criteria and standards must be compatible with those at the college level, and all unit criteria must be compatible and not conflict with the University *Criteria* document.

College statements may and should recognize legitimate differences among disciplines and departments/schools. For example, college statements may acknowledge mission-based

differences between departments/schools with graduate programs and those with an exclusively undergraduate mission; the weight of research and other creative activities in the tenure/promotion decision might be greater in the former than in the latter.

5. Necessity of Collegial Judgment in Promotion and Tenure Process

No one involved in the promotion and tenure process should rigidly apply college or department/school criteria to any case. Even carefully drafted statements of criteria will have oversights. Occasionally, candidates may have a level of accomplishment that merits promotion or tenure even though their unusual pattern of accomplishments might not meet the written criteria for promotion and tenure. In such cases, candidates should be encouraged to provide argument and evidence that they have met the goals for promotion and tenure even if they have not met the criteria as stated. Each case should be considered carefully and on its merits.

As the Guidelines note, all letters of recommendation (beginning at the level of the department/school) must evaluate the candidate using the written standards and criteria. In unusual cases, letters should explain why the criteria are not valid for this case and how the candidate's record demonstrates that she or he has met the criteria and standards set by college or department/school. Following such cases, the criteria should be amended as necessary.

6. Criteria Proposed by a Vote of the Faculty

The college statement should be submitted to the college for a vote. The vote shall be a secret ballot of a majority of at least a quorum of the college. If department/school criteria are required, they should be developed collegially at the unit level and proposed if accepted by a secret ballot of a majority of at least a quorum of the department/school.

7. Criteria Become Effective If Accepted by Administration

To become effective, the college statement and the criteria in it must be approved by the appropriate administrator (generally, the Dean) and the Provost or his/her designees. If departmental/school criteria are required by a college statement, these criteria also must be approved. No unit criteria, or any other guidance or statements on tenure or promotion, may be applied until and unless adopted and approved by the Provost or designee.

Administrators are responsible for reviewing the criteria to ensure that they meet the following conditions: compliance with state and federal law, and University Regulations and Policies; consistency with the missions and goals of the university, college and department/school; consistency with the unit's annual assignment and evaluation practices; consistency with the standards set in this document and the for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty at Florida Atlantic University. Criteria shall not become effective until one year following adoption of the criteria, unless a more immediate date is mutually agreed to in writing. The date of adoption shall be the date on which the criteria are approved by the Provost or his/her designee.

8. Criteria Must Meet The Following Conditions:

To be accepted, criteria must meet the following conditions. Criteria must specify the ways in which faculty can demonstrate that they have met the university's high standards for promotion and tenure. Criteria should be internally consistent and consistent with appropriate college, university and state rules and laws. They should have a close relationship to appropriate department/school, program, college and university missions. They should be realistic, such that they can be achieved by talented and dedicated faculty within the constraints of available or attainable resources. They should be reliable: when applied to the same record of accomplishments, the criteria should produce the same conclusions even if the persons evaluating the record change. They should be valid, focused on central and important facets of the accomplishments expected for promotion and

tenure. They should be easily understood by those in the academic community who will employ the criteria in making judgments, and they should be equally clear to those who will be evaluated by these criteria. They should be as complete and explicit as possible, addressing the broadest possible range of activities to which faculty can be assigned and on which they can be evaluated. They should be fair, providing all faculty with equal opportunity to be objectively judged on their accomplishments. They must be of the highest professional and disciplinary standards appropriate to the department/school and college.

9. Implementation and Routine Examination of Criteria

Criteria shall not become effective until one year following adoption, unless a more immediate date is mutually agreed to in writing. The date of adoption shall be the date the criteria are approved by the Provost or his/her designee. If criteria are proposed but not accepted, they shall be referred back to the unit. That referral shall include a meeting with the relevant administrator or a written statement of the reasons for non-approval. Criteria should be routinely examined, as they will require modification when the unit's mission is changed or when there have been problems with or confusion about the criteria. They should be reconsidered whenever a recommendation departs from them on the grounds that they are invalid for a particular case. Any proposal to modify criteria shall be available for discussion by members of the affected departments/schools before adoption. Changes to criteria shall not become effective until one year following adoption of the criteria, unless a more immediate date is mutually agreed to in writing. The date of adoption shall be the date on which the modified criteria are approved by the Provost or his/her designee. When new criteria are adopted and approved, faculty submitting applications for tenure or promotion within the subsequent three years may choose to be evaluated based on the old or the new criteria. Thereafter, only the new criteria will apply.

**Conclusion**

A promotion and tenure system must be sufficiently clear to provide guidance to those whose careers will be judged by it and to those who sit in judgment, but sufficiently flexible that it can change in response to changes in disciplines and in the university. Our intention is to have a system that has both of these qualities. Each year, the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs will consult with faculty, current and past members of the University Promotion and Tenure committee, the Deans, and other affected groups. Based on this evaluation, both this document and the document can be revised if necessary.

**Revised April 2015**