

Harriet L. Wilkes Honors College

Of

Florida Atlantic University

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines¹

April 12, 2002, Revised Oct. 17, 2007.

¹ This document was initially approved by the Faculty of the Honors College on January 29th 2002. The April 12, 2002 version reflects changes made on March 27th 2002 by the HC Promotions and Tenure Guideline Committee in response to the March 13, 2002 memo from the Provost to Dean Mech and approved by the faculty on April 12, 2002. This documented was forwarded to the Deans office for onward transmission to the Provost's office on April 30, 2002.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	2
Guiding Principles for Promotion and Tenure.....	4
Relative Weights of Service, Teaching and Research in Regard to Tenure and Promotion.....	6
Relationship Between Annual Review and Promotion and Tenure.....	6
Annual Review.....	7
Criteria for Annual Evaluation.....	8
Instruction.....	8
Research.....	13
Faculty Service.....	16
Annual Appraisal of Progress Towards Tenure (AAPT).....	18
Honors College Procedures for Third-Year Review of Progress Toward Tenure	18
Deadlines for Third-Year Review Process.....	20
Criteria for Progress Towards Promotion.....	21
Teaching and Academic Activities for Promotion and Tenure.....	21
Criteria for Evaluation of Research, Scholarship and Other Creative Activity.....	24
The Role of Service in the Honors College and its Relevance to Promotion and Tenure.....	28
Promotion To Professor.....	33
Appraisal of Progress Towards Promotion.....	34
The Tenure Process.....	35
Structure of the Promotion and Tenure Process.....	35
Role of Honors College P & T Committee.....	35
The Dean.....	36
Honors College Representative on University P & T Committee.....	36

October 2007

APPENDIX A1.....	37
APPENDIX A2	44
APPENDIX A3	47
APPENDIX A4	49
APPENDIX A5	51
APPENDIX A6	53

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The Honors College (HC) is designed to be a liberal arts college set within the University. Intrinsic to this design are a broad range of responsibilities and a continuing round of activities for faculty. The responsibilities and activities fall into the realms of teaching, scholarship and service. The Honors College considers *all three areas* to be very important with regard to promotion and tenure. The HC fosters a community in which the full round of college life contributes to higher education. The three aforementioned areas naturally play a vital role in this community. As the following sections indicate, each element of this triad makes a special and vital contribution to the Honors College. In keeping with the HC's interdisciplinary curriculum, innovative forms of scholarship within and among traditional disciplines are to be valued, as is work that challenges disciplinarily altogether. Consistent with the HC's emphasis on innovative and personalized liberal-arts education, furthermore, careful attention is to be given to qualitative aspects of teaching. Commensurate with the HC's fostering of a way of life that contributes to the learning process, a variety of service activities should also be valued. Contributions in all of these areas are vital to the production of excellence in the HC community and so must be given their due weight in evaluating a candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure.

The Honors College strives to create a collegial atmosphere to facilitate teaching and research. Collegiality therefore plays a role in the promotion and tenure process. Collegiality is not congeniality. It is a quality manifested in one's willingness to serve on committees, to provide guidance and support to colleagues and to engage constructively in the collective work of the college.

Because the HC demands an extraordinary amount of service from its assistant professors, the service component should play a significant role in both Honors College annual assignment² and in the evaluation of tenure and promotion. It is expected that in the formative years of the HC the service load will be extraordinary. The load will eventually lessen but, given the nature of the HC, it will always be greater than ordinarily expected.³

The HC Faculty recognizes that different areas of specialization may have different standards of evaluation of scholarly and service activities. Candidates for tenure or promotion at the HC will be

² The Provost's annual assignment (as distinct from the state of Florida annual assignment form) will be the document used by the co-chairs and the administration to reflect accurately faculty workload and to evaluate annual assignment. This form is to be found in appendix A6 or at the provost's website. It is referred to in the rest of this document as the "HC annual assignment".

³ See "Dean's Letter to Evaluators," Appendix A4 and A5.

judged by the standards of their area of specialization. They should be evaluated in light of their actual work load and responsibilities as reflected in the HC Annual Assignment.⁴

To assist in the evaluation of a candidate's portfolio the HC, like other units of the University, uses letters of evaluation from both within and without the University. At least two letters must come from evaluators who are outside the University. These "outside" evaluators are to be selected as laid out in the section entitled "The Tenure Process" (p. 32). The outside evaluators are expected specifically to evaluate the scholarship of the candidate and to ascertain whether the candidate's work meets the standards of his or her area of specialization. At least two more letters will be solicited from University colleagues. These letters will be expected to address the entire portfolio and more specifically the candidate's contributions to the FAU community.

Responsibilities of the Candidate and of the Honors College Regarding Scholarship and Creative Activity

- 1) Candidates for tenure are responsible to pursue scholarship and creative work as assigned.
- 2) It is expected that, given a teaching load of 15 credit hours or equivalent per year, candidates will be able to produce significant scholarly or artistic work each year (based on the assumption that this load amounts to a reduction of one course in their teaching load for the purpose of scholarship or creative activity).
- 3) The significance of scholarly or artistic achievement will be evaluated in terms of the criteria stated elsewhere in these P & T guidelines regarding the quantity and quality of a candidate's work in relevant areas.
- 4) Evaluators should emphasize the quality of a candidate's record in light of the quantity of effort expected of her or him, as evidenced by her or his annual assignment and activity report.
- 5) The annual assignment will be based upon the availability of adequate resources as per the BOR/UFF Collective bargaining agreement 2001-2003 Article 9.2 A3 (p. 16). Overall, the candidate and the College should come to a fair and equitable evaluation of the individual's work in light of his or her assignment and the specific conditions (including funding and other support, time available for scholarship, etc.) affecting productivity.

⁴ In some cases the ability of faculty to engage in scholarly activity has been limited due to the lack of facilities on the new campus. Where appropriate all evaluators and the P&T committee should take this into account.

RELATIVE WEIGHTS OF SERVICE, TEACHING AND RESEARCH IN REGARD TO TENURE AND PROMOTION:

According to the mission statement above, teaching, scholarship, and service will all be very important in the determination of tenure and promotion. The relative weights of the three may vary from the portfolio of one candidate to that of another. Since the fundamental mission of the Honors College is to provide students with a quality education, it is expected that a successful candidate will have Good or Excellent ratings in all areas of the triad. There may be cases where an individual makes truly outstanding contributions in a single area while being only satisfactory⁵ in another. The committee is encouraged to take into account such exceptional circumstances.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ANNUAL REVIEW AND PROMOTION AND TENURE

As the Provost's Principles for Promotion and Tenure indicate, tenure and promotion evaluations are not merely based on an average of the assessments from a candidate's annual reviews. As the Provost's Guidelines explicitly state, "...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, scholarship 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." Therefore, Honors College annual reviews will be considered in terms of both the yearly and the cumulative pattern of a candidate's accomplishments. For example, guidelines for annual evaluations may establish that presenting papers at two international conferences in one year itself may merit an excellent evaluation in research for that year. However, a faculty member who earned five consecutive excellent ratings in research by presenting 10 papers at 10 international conferences, two per year, but who had no publications, can not expect an excellent promotion-and-tenure evaluation for research. On the other hand, a faculty member who receives 3 excellent and 3 satisfactory research evaluations over the course of 6 years as a result of publication of one book at a leading University press and two articles in leading journals published in the same year may receive an excellent promotion-and-tenure evaluation for research, even though annual evaluations would average out to a rating of 'good'. Precisely because the evaluation for promotion and tenure is not based on a simple numerical averaging of annual reports, but reflects progress over many years, faculty who occasionally are assigned significant teaching and service and insufficient time to conduct research in any given year can still reasonably hope to conduct research that would merit a

⁵ A portfolio that is comprised solely of satisfactory indicators is not sufficient for recommendation to tenure. The category of satisfactory indicates that the candidate is making progress toward indicators of a good or excellent rating.

rating of excellent for promotion and tenure so long as during their career as an untenured faculty they are assigned sufficient time for research in other years.

The Annual review of Associate Professors is to reflect the Honors College annual assignment and relevant criteria for promotion to the rank of Professor, as specified in this document. Due to the variability in assignments at the Associate level, the number of years considered relevant to the evaluation of progress toward promotion will be more variable than in the case of promotion to Associate Professor. The provost's guidelines state that the norm for consideration for promotion is no less than five years after promotion to Associate Professor.

ANNUAL REVIEW

Each faculty member's annual evaluation will be based on performance in the areas of teaching, research and service according to the criteria for of teaching, research and service enumerated in this document. Honors College internal annual assignments should reflect the need for faculty to have the opportunity to perform successfully in each of these three areas. Evaluations will take into account the difficulty of a faculty member's assignment while still reflecting the criteria for evaluation listed in this document. The Honors College annual assignment of each faculty member is to be agreed upon by the faculty member and his/her supervisor(s). The Honors College annual assignment and the evaluation will be similarly organized into the standard triad of teaching, scholarship and service.

The Dean and Associate Dean, in consultation with the faculty, will appoint three co-chairs of the Honors College. This Committee of Chairs will formulate the overall assignments for the faculty, based on the most recent memo from the Provost's office on guidelines for faculty assignments. The committee will also do the activity reporting for each semester. Faculty will be initially evaluated by the appropriate Co-Chair in the faculty's discipline where possible, or by the Co-Chair in a discipline most closely related to a faculty member's area. This Co-Chair will be considered the faculty member's primary supervisor. This Co-Chair's preliminary recommendation will be forwarded to the Committee of Chairs, which then will make the final assessment and, as a body, forward it to the Dean and Associate Dean. A faculty member may request in writing a meeting with an administrator at the next higher level to discuss concerns regarding the evaluation which were not resolved in previous discussions with the evaluator(s). In addition, each candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor may choose to have a Faculty Advisor⁶. The Faculty Advisor must be a tenured member of the HC faculty⁷. The candidate in consultation with the Associate Dean would select the Faculty Advisor. At the request of the faculty member, the advisor may attend meetings between the

⁶ The faculty advisor is an academic and professional mentor and has no supervisory responsibilities.

⁷ In instances where there are no appropriate senior members of faculty in the HC, this advisor may be chosen from the tenured FAU faculty in general.

faculty member and his or her supervisor regarding issues of assignment. The faculty advisor, however, has no supervisory responsibility.

CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION

Qualitative judgments regarding a candidate's contributions in Instruction, Scholarship and Service should be made in light of the Honors College Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure, which are to be found at the beginning of this document.

INSTRUCTION

The vast and often contradictory literature on teaching effectiveness indicates the complexity of the art of pedagogy. As teaching is fundamental to the mission of the Honors College, the college hires individuals with strong instructional skills and a commitment to teaching. We expect that faculty take an active interest in teaching, both their own and that of others, as they work together formally (e. g. cohort groups, team teaching) and informally with their colleagues to create a culture with a high awareness of pedagogy.

Evaluation offers each faculty member the opportunity to show evidence of teaching commitment, enhancement, innovation, and effectiveness. Each faculty member should highlight the aspects of her/his teaching that best demonstrate these qualities. The existence of an evaluation system should not dampen faculty members' enthusiasm for and willingness to try innovative or challenging teaching methods that students may evaluate poorly. Neither should the use of evaluations contribute to a consumerist philosophy of education.⁸

Instructional activity includes lecture, seminar, studio, laboratory, and independent study instruction and preparation, academic advising at all levels, senior thesis direction or participation, efforts associated with the improvement of teaching, as well as curriculum development and enhancement.

⁸ A consumerist educational philosophy is here understood as one sacrificing academic rigor, good curriculum design, or academic freedom in favor of pedagogical methods and courses of study that are merely popular. Proper standards of rigor, curriculum design, and intellectual freedom are to be derived from the educational mission of the liberal arts Honors College.

Materials used to Evaluate Instruction

1. Student evaluation data.
2. Evidence of curriculum/program development including the substantial revision of currently offered courses and the documented development of new teaching methods.
3. Faculty response to student reaction to those innovations (using, for example, the promotion in the section “Enhancement of Teaching Activities,” page 11)
4. Teaching and/or advising awards
5. Participation in pedagogy workshops; articles and/or presentations concerning teaching methods.
6. List of theses for which instructor has served as director or reader.
7. List of students supervised in research papers or projects.
8. List of students advised.
9. List of internships supervised.
10. List of team-taught or interdisciplinary classes.
11. List of contributions to the writing programs, e.g., teaching Gordon Rule classes, interdisciplinary writing seminars, etc.
12. List of lectures at the Honors College Forum.
13. Self-critique of a videotaped class.
14. List of grants obtained for support of curriculum and pedagogical development.
15. Report from invited peer-review.
16. List of workshops attended that relate to instructional activities.
17. List of guest lectures.
18. Documentation of review of student evaluations (both narrative and numerical) with a teaching mentor.

⁹ Articles on teaching may count either in teaching or research (but not both) at the discretion of the instructor.

19. Other materials pertaining to instruction that the faculty member deems important.

Evaluation

As a part of annual evaluation, the evaluation of teaching will be based upon the following: participation in activities that enhance an individual's teaching or contribute to teaching at the Honors College, student narrative comments on the course and the instructor, teaching and/or advising awards, and numerical results of the "student perception of teaching" form. Students complete this form at the end of each semester, using the following scale: 1 = excellent, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = fair, and 5 = poor. Due to the fact that many Honors College courses are so small that one student could significantly influence averages, outliers both high and low should be judiciously considered. While student evaluations will serve as an important factor in determining the annual evaluation rating, their interpretation will vary greatly. A simple comparison to the College mean is inadequate, because this mean combines data from courses in many different disciplines that are not directly comparable. Similarly, because of the diversity of disciplines within the College, direct comparisons between faculty members will often be inappropriate. In interpreting the student evaluation numbers, evaluators must consider factors such as patterns in student narrative comments, the size of the course (Is the course relatively large for the Honors College, or is the course so small that one student could significantly change the outcome?) and the role of the course in the curriculum (Is it a Core course, a gateway course for a concentration, a concentration requirement, or an elective?). Evaluations will be based not a pat formula, but on a consideration of a number of factors.

Moreover, while student teaching evaluations are a primary method for evaluating teaching effectiveness, they must be supplemented by evaluation of other teaching enhancement activities or contributions to Honors College teaching, in order to provide a more balanced view of a faculty member's teaching.

Ratings

Excellent:

Documented successful participation in at least one teaching enhancement activity or activity that contributes to teaching in the Honors College as listed below, and a pattern of excellent student teaching evaluations. [Excellent student evaluations may consist of one or more of the following: a majority of evaluations with a rating of excellent; an average numerical ranking that approaches excellent (as indicated by an average "overall rating of instructor-SPOT"¹⁰ Question number 8 " falling between 1 and 2"¹¹); narrative comments, and SPOT Questions 24-29 that provide significant

¹⁰ Student Perception of Teaching Survey

¹¹ The following scheme will be used to translate SPOT scores into the Promotion and Tenure categories. A SPOT score falling between 1 and 2 will be considered excellent. A SPOT score falling between 2 and 3 will be

evidence of the consistent application of highly effective but challenging teaching methods.] Other evidence that may contribute to the ranking of excellent includes the results of peer evaluation, syllabi, course assignments etc.

Or:

Documented successful participation in several teaching enhancement activities or activities that contribute to Honors College teaching,¹² and a pattern of very good student evaluations. [Very good student evaluations may consist of one or more of the following: a significant number of evaluations with a rating of excellent, a numerical ranking that approaches very good (as indicated by an average "overall rating of instructor" - SPOT Question number 8 falling between 2 and 3), significant evidence of the consistent application of highly effective but challenging teaching methods - SPOT Questions 24-29.] Other evidence that may contribute to the ranking of excellent includes the results of peer evaluation, syllabi, course assignments etc.

Good:

Documented successful participation in at least one teaching enhancement activity or activity that contributes to teaching in the Honors College as listed below, and a pattern of very good student evaluations. [Very good student evaluations may consist of one or more of the following: a majority of evaluations with a rating of very good; an average numerical ranking that approaches very good (as indicated by an average "overall rating of instructor" - SPOT Question number 8 falling between 2 and 3); evidence of the consistent application of highly effective but challenging teaching methods - SPOT Questions 24-29.]. Other evidence that may contribute to the ranking of excellent includes the results of peer evaluation, syllabi, course assignments etc.

Or

Documented successful participation in several teaching enhancement activities or activities that contribute to Honors College teaching,¹³ and a pattern of good teaching evaluations. [Good student evaluations may consist of one or more of the following: a significant number of evaluations with a rating of good; a numerical ranking that approaches good (as indicated by an average "overall rating of instructor" -SPOT Question number 8 falling between 3 and 3.5); significant evidence of the

considered good. A SPOT score falling between 3 and 4 will be considered satisfactory and a SPOT score falling between 4 and 5 will be considered unsatisfactory.

¹² It is understood that the number of such activities will be lower for someone with an overall rating of 2.1 than for someone with a 2.9. The amount of time and work needed for different activities, contributions, or awards should also be taken into consideration.

¹³ It is understood that the number of such activities will be lower for someone with an overall rating of 3.1 than for someone with a 3.9. The amount of time and work needed for different activities, contributions, or awards should also be taken into consideration.

consistent application of highly effective but challenging teaching methods- SPOT Questions 24-29.] Other evidence that may contribute to the ranking of excellent includes the results of peer evaluation, syllabi, course assignments etc.

Satisfactory:

A pattern of satisfactory student evaluations, as indicated by one or more of the following: a majority of evaluations with a rating of fair; an average numerical ranking that approaches fair. [As indicated by an average "overall rating of instructor" - SPOT Question number 8 falling between 3.5 and 4.]

Unsatisfactory:

A failure to achieve at least a satisfactory.

Teaching enhancement activities may include the following:

- Invited peer evaluation of teaching.
- Videotaping of class and self-critique.
- Curriculum/program development including the revision of currently offered courses and the development of new teaching methods.
- Evidence of innovative curricular development and pedagogical approaches (new courses or innovative and substantial revision of previously taught courses).
- Participation in a conference on pedagogy.
- Attendance at a conference on pedagogy. Participation in workshops related to instructional activities.
- A documented careful review of student evaluations in collaboration with a teaching mentor.
- A careful review of student feedback on an optional course-specific evaluation in collaboration with a teaching mentor in addition to the standard SPOT survey. The following prompt may be used: "Write for 10 minutes about your experience in this course in the space provided below"
- Other activities that enhance teaching that the faculty member deems important.

Contributions to Honors College teaching may include the following:

- Participation in team teaching.
- Supervision of independent study.
- Supervision of Honors College thesis.
- Participation in an Honors College thesis committee.
- Grant applications in support of curriculum and pedagogical development.
- Teaching of Gordon Rule or writing instructive components.

- Curriculum and concentration development.
 - Participation in the Honors College Forum.
 - Guest lectures.
 - Assuming a standard research, service, teaching and other instructional activity load as stipulated in the provost's guidelines, teaching above 15 credit hours or equivalent a year (exclusive of summer school or paid overloads).
 - Other contributions to Honors College teaching that the faculty member deems important.
- Other:** Receipt of a teaching and/or advising award.

RESEARCH

Materials used in the Evaluation of Research:

1. An annotated curriculum vitae (including an explanation of the quality of venue).
2. Copies or other appropriate documentation of published and unpublished work.
3. Critical reviews, announcements, and/or programs of books, performances, or exhibitions.
4. Letters of acceptance for publications, exhibitions, or performances.
5. Explanation, description, and evidence of research submitted and research in progress:
Letters from editors, readers, co-authors, curators, or directors attesting to the quality, process, or other attributes of work published during the period of evaluation (including explanations/descriptions of co-authorship).
6. Citation counts for a book (authored or edited) or a journal article.
7. Priority scores (e.g., for grants submitted to federal agencies).
8. Reviewers' comments on manuscripts or grant applications, regardless of whether the work is published or grant is awarded.
9. Awards or other forms of public or professional recognition, whether for a single research product or a cumulative contribution (e.g., nomination to a select professional body).
10. For a book published as part of a series, other volumes in the same series.
11. For a book, ratings of quality of publication house.
12. For a journal article, statistical indices of journal impact, selectivity, or prestige.
13. For a performance or exhibit, other performances/exhibits within a series or at a venue
14. Any other materials relevant to ongoing research/creative activity (patents etc.).

Definitions and Process:

The Honors College definition of "peer-reviewed" research includes all research reviewed by one or more reviewers. Individuals may also make a case that chapters in edited volumes, journal articles reviewed by editors, and creative work reviewed by exhibition or performance jurors represent "peer-reviewed" work. Details of the submission, editorial, and rejection processes must be included to make such a case.

Faculty members may report research during years when accepted for publication or during years when published but not both.

Annual Ratings:

Excellent: A rating of excellent will be achieved by accomplishing **one or more** of the following during the period of evaluation (as stated elsewhere, the quality of each scholarly venue should be taken into account):

1. Acceptance or publication of an article in a peer-reviewed journal.
2. Acceptance or exhibition/performance of peer-reviewed creative work at the national or International level.
3. Acceptance of a book by a University press or commercial publisher on the basis of an 4. externally peer reviewed manuscript.
4. Revision and Publication of a book by a University press or commercial publisher.
 - a. Subsequent reviews of a publication may be submitted as evidence of the quality of the work.
5. A significant¹⁴ grant or grants received as a result of an external review process.
6. Acceptance or publication of a peer-reviewed textbook by University or commercial publisher.
7. Revision and Publication of a peer-reviewed textbook by a University press or commercial publisher
8. Editing a peer-reviewed book accepted by contract for publication.
9. Jurying or curating an exhibition or performance.
10. Acceptance or publication of a peer-reviewed book chapter.

¹⁴ Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the college it is difficult to designate whether it be in dollar terms or prestige what a significant grant is across the disciplines. The Promotion and Tenure committee shall rely on the determination by the outside reviewers in the relevant academic area.

11. Acceptance of creative writing or other creative product in peer-reviewed national or international journals, books or magazines.
12. Presentation of papers at peer reviewed national or international conferences¹⁵.

Non-peer-reviewed books: In some cases a book or other scholarly product that is not peer-reviewed but which makes a significant contribution to a field or fields will be considered in evaluating research. The faculty must document the significance of the work.

Good: A rating of good will be achieved by accomplishing **one or more** of the following during the period of evaluation:¹⁶

1. Acceptance or publication of a substantial article in a magazine, or newspaper of significant academic or public interest¹⁷.
2. Acceptance or publication of a chapter in an editorially reviewed book.
3. Acceptance or exhibition/performance of peer-reviewed creative work at the local or regional level.
4. The presentation of scholarly papers at peer-reviewed professional conferences—local, state, or regional.
5. Significant favorable critical reviews and citations of the candidate's work.
6. Awards, Fellowships, and other academic honors.
7. Acceptance of creative writing or other creative product in regional or state peer-reviewed journals, books, or magazines.
8. Publication of a substantial book, exhibition, or performance review in a journal that is considered major in an area of inquiry.
9. Submitting grants for external review processes.

A faculty member may present a case for classifying these publications in the “Excellent” category based upon quantity or upon quality as evidenced by, for example, the publication, the review process, the publisher, or post publication review.

¹⁵ The significance of activities listed here may differ between areas of specialization and may be considered good or satisfactory in some areas.

¹⁶ E.g., numbers 6 and 7 would normally need to be combined with achievement in another area listed, to amount to “good,” based on the assumption that a scholar or artist must actually publish or present her/his work, or receive peer-reviewed grant support supportive of publication, in order to receive a rating of “good.”

¹⁷ The key here is the article must be of significant academic or public interest. A letter to the editor does not qualify as an article.

Satisfactory

Evidence of continuing research/creative activity and submission of research/creative product for publication; presentation of a paper at a professional conference; applying for grants; manuscript(s) or other creative work in progress. Overall, scholarly activity that has a reasonable expectation of leading to peer-reviewed publication or receipt of externally reviewed grants.

Unsatisfactory

Little evidence of efforts to develop research/creative projects or no evidence of ongoing research/creative activity.

FACULTY SERVICE

The Honors College requires an unusual amount of service activity to support its distinctive liberal-arts academic community. Therefore, service is to be considered significant in the evaluation of faculty. Service consists of those activities not clearly defined under teaching and research, which nevertheless contribute to the furtherance of the Honor's College's role and functioning as an academic institution. Service Activities include but are not necessarily limited to:

College, or University: Serving on college or University committees, ad-hoc committees, governance bodies, special task forces, participating in recruitment activities, advising and assisting student organizations, organizing seminars and conferences, organizing college events, participating in student activities, and participating in student orientations.

Professional Organizations: Participation at conferences through such activities as discussant or panel chair, serving on advisory boards for journals or other professional organizations, election to professional office, and other professional activities.

Community: Any local, national or international service as a representative of the Honors College.

Materials used to Evaluate Service:

1. List and description of University, College, search, and ad-hoc committee service.
2. List and description of Community and Professional service activities.
3. Letters, comments, programs, or any other material demonstrating service activities.

Annual Ratings:

Excellent: The following examples represent a sample of activities that would merit a rating of excellent during the period of evaluation. This list is not exhaustive, as other potential combinations of activities might also apply.

1. Providing exemplary¹⁸ service in a leadership role on an Honors College Committee.
2. Providing exemplary service in a leadership role on an Honors College Search Committee.
3. Providing exemplary service in a leadership role in organizing and encouraging student activities.
4. Providing significant¹⁹ service on multiple Honors College Committees or on Honors College and University Committees.
5. Providing exemplary service in University governance and an Honors College Committee.
6. Significant community service as well as participation on an Honors College Committee.
7. Significant professional service as well as participation on an Honors College Committee.
8. Exemplary service on an Honors College Committee as well as participation in student activities or recruitment.
9. Significant ad-hoc committee work and service on an Honors College Committee.
10. Other combinations of exemplary College, University, and Professional service.

Good: The following examples represent a sample of activities that would merit a rating of good during the period of evaluation. This list is not exhaustive, as other potential combinations of activities might also apply.

1. Significant service on an Honors College Committee, University committee, or ad-hoc committee.
2. Significant participation in student activities.
3. Service on a committee and participation in recruitment fairs.
4. Significant community service (i.e. Multiple lectures, meetings or other services).
5. Significant service to the profession (i.e. chair of panel and member of advisory board for a journal).

¹⁸“Exemplary” means service that is collegial and demonstrably highly effective, and sets an example for other faculty to follow.

¹⁹“Significant” means service that makes a definable contribution to the venue listed in terms of the stated goals and responsibilities, e.g. that an individual served on a sub-committee and wrote part of its report.

6. Other combinations of good College, University, and Professional service.

Rating: Satisfactory

A faculty member participates in the governance of the college through regular attendance and participation at faculty meetings and activities. In addition, a faculty member is expected to accept assignments to participate in regular College and University functions.

Rating: Unsatisfactory

This rating should be given to faculty members whose service does not meet any of the criteria listed above.

For Provost's Guidelines and Principles in please see Appendix A3.

ANNUAL APPRAISAL OF PROGRESS TOWARDS TENURE (AAPT)

Based on the candidate's record and the tenure criteria in this document, the candidate will be appraised on an annual basis and informed on whether they are making progress towards tenure. The AAPT will be included in the candidates tenure file.

**HONORS COLLEGE PROCEDURES FOR THIRD-YEAR REVIEW OF PROGRESS
TOWARD TENURE**

The Third-Year Review will be completed in the spring term of the faculty member's third year of employment.²⁰ Materials must be presented to the college Promotion and Tenure committee by the second Friday of February.

The candidate will assemble the Third-Year Review portfolio containing all of the materials required in the Honors College tenure portfolio. Letters of reference from outside of the Honors College are optional. The candidate's self-evaluation will contain a detailed section on research and/or creative activity. For research, candidates should describe their research agenda including published and unpublished work, grant proposals, and fellowships. For creative activity, candidates should include descriptions and reviews of exhibitions or performances, published work, and the status of current projects. The self-evaluation should state the significance of the faculty member's work as a

²⁰ The Third-Year Review will be done in the fall term of the second year of employment for those who are granted two years toward tenure at the time of hire and in the Spring term of the second year for those who are granted one year toward tenure at the time of hire.

contribution to one or more of the following areas: disciplinary research, interdisciplinary research, the Honors College curriculum, and professional development. For teaching, because two peer evaluations are required for the tenure portfolio, one peer evaluation of teaching will be included in the Third-Year Review portfolio.²¹ Candidates are expected to meet with the peer evaluator before the visit to discuss the course design and pedagogical strategies. The evaluation will be placed in the candidate's file. The candidate will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the peer evaluation.

In addition, the self-evaluation will detail the faculty member's teaching and service contributions to the Honors College. With regard to teaching, the self-evaluation should address student and peer teaching evaluations, new course preparation, thesis supervision, direction of independent studies, curriculum development, and other contributions to Honors College teaching. Given the nature of the Honors College, which demands extraordinary service from assistant professors, the service component may play a commensurately greater role in the self-evaluation, Honors College annual assignments, and evaluation of tenure and promotion.

(Revision of Sept. 28, 2007 follows in italics) The Honors College Promotion and Tenure Committee will evaluate the portfolio. The P & T Committee will select a TYR Committee as a subcommittee of its members²². The TYR Committee will include a Chair and at least two other individuals. The Chair should be selected by disciplinary proximity or special ability to judge the academic area of the Candidate²³. The TYR Committee will review the Candidate's file and its Chair will produce a report reflecting their consensus regarding the Candidate's progress toward promotion and tenure in the three areas of academic evaluation: teaching, scholarship, and service. Since the TYR is principally an evaluation of progress toward promotion and tenure, the cumulative progress will be paramount here, though annual performance may be considered secondarily. The report will make appropriate suggestions for improvement in any areas of concern. The report will also include an overall evaluation of the Candidate's progress toward tenure based on her/his performance in each of the three areas.

The TYR Chair and Committee will present their report to the full P & T Committee for comment. The TYR Chair will then revise the report, summarizing any dissenting views, and submit the final version simultaneously to the Candidate and Dean. The candidate will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the report. The Dean will compose a letter that will be made available to the Candidate and the P&T committee; the letter will be included in the TYR File. The Dean will then meet with the Candidate, the TYR Chair, and the P & T Chair to discuss the report and the Candidate's progress toward tenure, including any written or verbal response the Candidate wishes to make. The candidate will have a final opportunity to respond; the response will also be included in the File.

²¹ For the purposes of peer evaluation of teaching, "peer" is defined as an associate or tenured professor.

²² In consultation with the candidate this committee may invite tenured FAU faculty from outside the committee to assist in evaluating cases on an advisory basis (please see "The Tenure Process," p. 35).

²³ The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee may serve on the Third-Year Review Committee but not as the coordinator.

Deadlines for the Third-Year Review Process²⁴

- 1 Portfolio prepared for evaluation – 3rd Tuesday in February (September).
- 2 Committee Report to the P&T committee – 3rd Tuesday in March (October).
- 3 Committee Letter to the candidate and Dean – 1st Tuesday in April (November).
- 4 Candidate's Response — 2nd Tuesday in April (November).
- 5 Dean's letter – 3rd Tuesday in April (November).
- 6 Meeting of Candidate, P&T Chair, TYR Chair and Dean – 4th Tuesday in April (Nov.).
- 7 Candidate's Response – 1st Tuesday in May (December).

²⁴ At the beginning of each year the Promotion and Tenure Committee will publish the dates and circulate them to the faculty and administration.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE²⁵

Teaching and Academic Activities for Promotion and Tenure²⁶

The fundamental mission of the Honors College is to provide students with a quality education. Faculty take an active interest in teaching, both their own and that of others, as they work together formally (e. g. cohort groups, team teaching) and informally with their colleagues to create a culture with a high awareness of teaching. Candidates for promotion and tenure will be expected to achieve a rating of good or excellent in teaching. In addition the Honors College recognizes the importance of team teaching, the development of core curriculum and concentrations, the development of interdisciplinary, writing-intensive and writing-in-the-discipline courses, and the sustained work involved in mentoring seniors during their thesis year. For the purposes of Promotion and Tenure an evaluation of teaching includes student and peer teaching evaluations, as well as an evaluation of curriculum development and innovative pedagogy. Candidates will write a self-evaluation, stating which of the objectives have been met as well as efforts they have made to improve their teaching. Evaluation offers each faculty member the opportunity to show evidence of teaching commitment, enhancement, innovation, and effectiveness. Each faculty member should highlight the aspects of her/his teaching that best demonstrate these qualities. The existence of an evaluation system should not dampen faculty members' enthusiasm for and willingness to try innovative or challenging teaching methods that students may evaluate poorly. Neither should the use of evaluations contribute to a consumerist philosophy of education.²⁷

The evaluation of teaching will be both additive and cumulative, combining the information from annual evaluations over the entire period of evaluation, peer evaluations, self-assessment, and other information. Candidates will be expected to earn "good" or "excellent" ratings on most annual evaluations, or to show a pattern of improvement to "good" or "excellent" ratings over the period of evaluation. Candidates will also be expected to demonstrate a commitment to individual enhancement of teaching and to teaching at the Honors College (see the section on teaching in annual evaluation for the scale of ratings and lists of activities that constitute teaching enhancement and contributions to Honors College teaching.)

Candidates for tenure are required by the HC to have two peer evaluations in which the candidate invites a tenured faculty member to observe her/his teaching (one of which will have been done for the Third-Year Review). Candidates are expected to meet with the peer evaluator before the visit to

²⁵ The criteria that appear in this section are to be used for evaluation of promotion to Professor or Associate Professor and/or Tenure, unless otherwise stated. Criteria for Annual Review are to be found in the Annual Review section.

²⁶ Material in this section in part reiterates, and is intended to be consistent with, evaluative criteria stated under Instruction in the section entitled "Criteria for Annual Evaluation," above, though the period of evaluation here is that of the entire tenure-and-

promotion process.

²⁷ Please see footnote 8.

discuss the course design and pedagogical strategies. The evaluation will be placed in the candidate's file. The candidate will have an opportunity to respond in writing to the peer evaluation.

The committee will also take into account the quality and quantity of the indicators. For example, a faculty member who advises an unusually large number of senior theses, or whose students regularly produce theses of unusually high quality, will receive greater consideration for that part of his/her portfolio. In particular the committee should consider weighting the importance of evaluations for core and required courses differently from those for elective and concentration courses. This is to reflect the fact that in elective or concentration courses the student population would be a self-selected group. In particular the committee should acknowledge the potential difference between core and other courses.

Activities²⁸ and Indicators of excellence in teaching may include:

- Excellent student evaluations, particularly as indicated by the narrative component of evaluations.
- Teaching Awards.
- Excellent peer and/or supervisor evaluations.
- Innovative curriculum development.
- Innovative pedagogical approaches.
- Participation in team teaching.
- Supervision of independent study.
- Successful grant applications in support of curriculum and pedagogical development.

Activities and Indicators of good teaching may include:

- Good student evaluations, particularly as indicated by the narrative component of evaluations.
- Good peer and/or supervisor evaluations.
- Effective supervision of senior theses and participation on theses committees.

²⁸ Where activities are listed, mere participation is not sufficient; claims for an evaluation of excellent or good participation should include evidence supporting those claims.

- Core curriculum and concentration development.
- Participation in the writing program, i.e., teaching Gordon Rule classes, interdisciplinary writing seminars, etc.
- Teaching interdisciplinary courses.
- Participation in the Honors College Forum.
- Guest lecturing in another professor's class.

Activities and Indicators of satisfactory teaching may include:

- Satisfactory student evaluations, particularly as indicated by the narrative component of evaluations.
- Satisfactory peer and/or supervisor evaluations.
- Competent student advising.

The committee will also take into account the quality and quantity of the indicators. For example, a faculty member who advises an unusually large number of senior theses, or whose students regularly produce theses of unusually high quality, will receive greater consideration for that part of his/her portfolio. Similarly, as will be seen below, participation in an unusually large variety of "good" teaching activities can result in an excellent overall ranking. Conversely, a single indicator of excellence, with no other activity, is typically not enough for an overall ranking of excellent.

Some examples of an overall excellent ranking in teaching (over the entire period of evaluation) may include:

- Excellent teaching (student or peer) evaluations and innovative curriculum development.
- A pattern of distinguished teaching as indicated by awards or other forms of recognition.
- Good student evaluations, participation in team-teaching, supervision of senior theses, regular participation in the Honors College Forum, and a pattern of teaching writing-intensive classes.
- Good teaching evaluations, supervision of senior theses, supervision of independent study, and innovative pedagogical approaches.

- Excellent teaching evaluations, supervision of independent study, and a pattern of teaching writing-intensive classes.
- Good teaching evaluations, innovative curriculum development, and innovative pedagogical approaches.
- Good teaching evaluations and successful teaching grant applications.
- Excellent evaluations, competent student advising, and supervision of Honors' theses.

Examples of an overall good ranking in teaching (over the period of evaluation for promotion and tenure) may include:

- Excellent teaching evaluations with no other indicators of quality instruction.
- Supervision of senior theses, good teaching evaluations, and the teaching of interdisciplinary courses.
- Good evaluations, competent student advising and supervision of an Honors' thesis.
- Excellent teaching evaluations and participation in the Honors College Forum.
- Good teaching evaluations, guest lectures, and the teaching of interdisciplinary courses.
- A pattern of participation in the Honors College Forum, innovative curriculum development, supervision of independent study, and satisfactory teaching evaluations.

Examples of an overall satisfactory ranking in teaching (over the period of evaluation for promotion and tenure) may include:

- Good teaching evaluations.
- Satisfactory teaching evaluations and participating in Honors College Forum.
- Satisfactory teaching evaluations and competent student advising.

These examples are merely illustrative; other combinations are equally viable.

Criteria for Evaluation of Research, Scholarship and Other Creative Activity

Candidates for tenure must demonstrate that they are active and creative participants in the

scholarship or artistry of their chosen field. The successful candidate must demonstrate that he or she can develop new research/creative projects and bring them to successful conclusion. Given the

interdisciplinary nature of the Honors College, it is expected that interdisciplinary scholarship will be given the same weight in tenure considerations as discipline-bound scholarship. The Honors College recognizes that outstanding interdisciplinary scholarship may be published in various forms and venues.

The pattern of accomplishments that merits promotion will vary, but it will always include peer-evaluated work. The Florida Atlantic University Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure require a minimum of two outside letters evaluating the candidate's accomplishments in research/scholarship/creative activity. Candidates shall consult with the Associate Dean to create a list of referees in the candidate's area of research. The Associate Dean will contact the referees and request the review letters. The Associate Dean's letter should clearly state that the external evaluation is part of the candidate's research/creative activity record for promotion and tenure. Each letter of evaluation should be accompanied by the outside evaluator's curriculum vitae. A satisfactory evaluation requires letters of evaluation that attest to the quality and the significance of the candidate's research/creative activity.

In all categories the committee will take into account the quality of the venue of publication, presentation, or exhibition, as well as quantity of work.

The Honors College definition of "peer-reviewed" research includes all research reviewed by one or more reviewers. Individuals may also make a case that chapters in edited volumes, journal articles reviewed by editors, and creative work reviewed by exhibition or performance jurors represent "peer-reviewed" work. Details of the submission, editorial, and rejection processes must be included to make such a case.

Activities and Indicators used to evaluate excellent scholarly achievement include:

- The publication of scholarly work in peer-reviewed and regionally, nationally (or internationally) distributed journals, including traditional and electronic formats
- The publication of a scholarly book.
- Exhibition or performance of peer-reviewed creative work at the national or international level, or the curatorship of such an event.
- Editorship of a book accepted by contract for publication.
- Frequent citation of the candidate's work by other scholars.
- Pattern of success in obtaining significant extramural funding through grants, awards, or fellowships.

- Editorship of a journal.²⁹
- The publication of a peer reviewed chapter in edited collections.
- Awards and prizes received in competitions for research or creative activity.
- Patent awarded (Quality to be judged by the committee)

Activities and Indicators of good scholarly achievement include:

- The publication of a chapter in edited collections.
- The presentation of a paper at a professional or other conference.
- The publication of a textbook or other teaching-related publication.
- Successful grant application.
- Critical reviews and citations of the candidate's work.
- Awards, fellowships, and other academic honors.
- Service on the editorial boards of journals (please see note 18)
- Exhibition or performance of peer-reviewed creative work at the regional level, or the curatorship of such an event.
- Invited speeches or presentations to academic institutions or professional organizations.
- Research funded by public or non-profit agencies and the preparation of reports for those agencies.
- Evidence of research in progress including manuscripts, data sets, and grant proposals submitted.
- Patent awarded (Quality to be judged by the committee)

Activities and Indicators of satisfactory scholarly achievement include:

- Book and article reviews.
- Exhibition and performance reviews.
- Peer reviews for a journal, exhibition, or performance.
- Participation in workshops and courses to enhance professional knowledge.
- Evidence of research/creative work in progress including manuscripts, data sets, and grant proposals in preparation.
- Participation in exhibitions or performances at the local level.
- Patent awarded (Quality to be judged by the committee)

Examples of an **overall excellent rating** in scholarship (over the period of evaluation for promotion and tenure) may include:

²⁹ Due to disciplinary differences faculty members may make the case that editorial service may be counted either as scholarly activity or as service (but not as both).

- Authorship of a book and multiple presentations of papers at professional conferences.
- Participation in a solo, two-person, or three-person exhibition or performance on the national or international level.
- A pattern of publication in peer-reviewed journals
- A pattern of participation in solo, two-person, or three-person exhibitions or performances at the regional level.
- Publication of multiple scholarly works and service on editorial boards of journals.
- Editorship of a book and publication of chapters in edited volumes.

Examples of an **overall good rating** in scholarship (over the period of evaluation for promotion and tenure) may include:

- Publication of scholarly works and presentations of papers at professional conferences.
- Exhibition or performance of creative work at the regional level.
- Successful application for extramural grant and publication of scholarly work.
- Publication of articles with student(s) and presentation of papers at appropriate conferences.
- Publishing of chapters in edited collections and acting as a reviewer for journals and/or exhibitions and/or performances or creative work.
- Success in obtaining extramural funding through grants, awards, or fellowships, and conference presentations.

Examples of an **overall satisfactory rating** (over the period of evaluation for promotion and tenure) may include:

- Evidence of research in progress and publication of a chapter in an edited collection.
- Exhibition or performance of creative work in juried group shows at the local or regional levels
- Publication of an article and the organization of panels at professional conferences.

Examples of **unsatisfactory scholarly achievement** (over the period of evaluation for promotion and tenure) may include:

- A pattern of research and/or creative activity that does not include indicators of excellent, good, or satisfactory progress.
- No evidence of ongoing research/creative activity.

The preceding examples are merely illustrative; other combinations are equally viable.

The Role of Service in the Honors College and its Relevance to Promotion and Tenure

Given the nature of the Honors College, which demands an extraordinary amount of service from assistant professors,³⁰ the service component should play a significant role in both Honors College annual assignment and in evaluation of tenure and promotion³¹.

Service plays a fundamental role in the Honors College community. Teaching and scholarship are augmented by a range of responsibilities and activities orchestrated to enhance education: from lectures and events in the community to recruiting that takes place throughout the academic year to the full round of College and University committee work necessary to the functioning of the institution. The Honors College considers this range of service to be vital to the unique form and high quality of education in our community. Contributions of faculty in the area of service are therefore to be respected and weighted accordingly.

Examples of service activities fulfilling faculty responsibilities in this area appear below.

Service includes, but is not limited to, the following activities. Depending on the individual circumstances and Honors College annual assignment, some of these activities may count as teaching rather than service (such as HC Forum talks, guest lectures, etc.)

Activities and Indicators of Service may include:

- Service on an Honors College Committee
- Service on a search committee
- Participating in the national, regional or state honors community
 - attending NCHC conferences
 - attending SCHC conferences
 - attending FCHC conferences
- Service on a University committee

³⁰ See Provost's Principles for creating Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Section B.1.C

³¹ Because service often acts as a residual category in the percentage of time dedicated to it in the Annual Assignment, the time in the annual assignment may be significantly less than the actual amount of time that a candidate may spend on service. The committee and all evaluators should take this into consideration during a candidate's evaluation for promotion and tenure.

- Advising/assisting student organizations
- Participating in University governance
 - University Faculty Council
 - UFF
- Participating in recruitment activities
 - meeting with visiting students/parents/counselors
 - participating in recruitment fairs
 - participating in student orientation
 - participating in panels for visiting students/parents/counselors
- Organization of panels at professional conferences.
- Elected or appointed offices in professional associations.
- Involvement in community service
 - Other talks to the community
 - Teaching at local high schools
- Participating in media activities publicizing the Honors College and FAU
- Organizing an academic in the College
- Participating in Boca Departmental activities
 - organizing seminars

As in other areas the committee will take into account both the quality and quantity of activity in deciding the overall rating. For example, chairing a committee (or serving on a particularly labor-intensive committee) should be given more weight.

Examples of an overall excellent rating (over the period of evaluation) in service may include:

- Chairing an Honors College Committee, serving on another Honors College Committee, serving on an Honors College Search Committee, and regularly advising/assisting student organizations.
- Chairing an Honors College Search Committee, serving on multiple Honors College

Committees and participating in recruitment activities.

- Serving on multiple Honors College Committees, advising/assisting student organizations and organizing panels at professional conferences.
- Participating in the national honors community, serving on a University committee, significant participation in community service and organizing social events at the college.
- Serving on multiple Honors College Search Committees, organizing seminars at FAU, organizing panels at professional conferences and participating in recruitment activities.
- Leading a professional organization and participating in recruitment activities.

Examples of an overall good rating in service (over the period of evaluation) may include:

- Serving on multiple Honors College Search Committees and participating in recruitment activities.
- Chairing an Honors College Committee, advising student organizations and providing service to the community.
- Serving on an Honors College Committee, organizing panels at professional conferences and participating in the national honors community.
- Serving on a University Committee, chairing an Honors College Search Committee and serving on an Honors College Committee.

Examples of an overall satisfactory rating in service (over the period of evaluation) may include:

- Regular participation in faculty meetings and serving on an Honors College Committee.
- Regular participation in faculty meetings and serving on an Honors College Search Committee.

Overall Unsatisfactory rating:

- Failing to satisfy the criteria for a Satisfactory rating, as specified above.

The preceding examples are merely illustrative other combinations are equally viable.

UNIVERSITY TENURE AND PROMOTION PORTFOLIO PREPARATION³²

July 31, 2001

INTRODUCTION

The attached materials provide the outline and instructions for the preparation of tenure and promotion portfolios for 2001-02. All participating parties are encouraged to review Article 15 (Tenure), Article 14 (Promotion), Article 9.3(d), and Article 10 of the **BOR/UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (2001-2003)** to be certain of compliance. Please review also the **Guidelines and Procedure for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty** issued by the University Provost on 10/24/96 for information on the process to be used and the responsibilities of all parties.

It should be noted from Article 14.3 and 15.5 of the BOR/UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (2001-2003) that:

Prior to the consideration of the employee's promotion (or tenure), the employee shall have the right to review the contents of the promotion (or tenure) file and may attach a brief response to any material therein. **It shall be the responsibility of the employee to see that the file is complete.**

THE TENURE/PROMOTION PORTFOLIO

The candidate shall prepare two copies of the portfolio. Each should be bound in a single loose-leaf binder.

Materials are to be bound (loose-leaf style) in the order listed below, with indexed separations. If the college or department requires another kind of ordering please rearrange prior to submission to this office. Do not include material other than that requested. Label the spines of all binders with the applicant's name and college; on the same label, indicate the nature of the application (e.g., "tenure, promotion to Associate Professor). Do not put pages in plastic sleeves as this makes the folders too bulky.

Any packets delivered to Academic Affairs that fail to meet stated requirements will NOT be accepted for consideration.

³² This portfolio is updated yearly by the provost's office. It is the duty of the P& T committee to ensure that the Honors College Portfolio reflects the latest update from the provost's office. This can be found at <http://www.fau.edu/academic/provost/mem1pt.htm>

SUPPLEMENTARY PORTFOLIO

As a supplement to the portfolio, the candidate shall prepare a packet that includes examples of his or her accomplishments in scholarship, research and/or other creative activity. The label on the spine should have: the candidate's name; college; the nature of the application (e.g., "tenure and promotion to Associate Professor"). It should include a copy of his or her most significant books, journal articles, etc. When appropriate, the packet may include material that requires viewing or listening. If A/V equipment is necessary, please be sure to indicate this on the label on the spine of the supplementary portfolio. If possible, the material shall be placed in a loose-leaf binder. This binder may include plastic sleeves to hold material; it may also include envelopes to hold books or tapes. Candidates should make every effort to ensure that the material in this supplementary portfolio is bound securely. Only a single copy of this supplementary portfolio is requested.

Some candidates may choose to add additional sections on instruction and service/administration to their supplementary portfolio. These additional sections would provide documents relevant to sections three and five of the tenure/promotion portfolio. These additional sections would be necessary only for those with unusual assignments to instruction and/or service/administration or those whose cases for promotion/tenure rely heavily on their accomplishments in these areas.

THE ORDERING OF MATERIALS IN THE TENURE/PROMOTION PORTFOLIO

(Refer to following pages for explanation)

- 1 Current Vita
- 2 Annual Assignments
- 3 Instruction
- 4 Scholarship, research and/or other creative activity
- 5 Assigned service and/or administrative activity
- 6 Self-evaluation
- 7 Letters of recommendation
- 8 Chairperson's letter
- 9 Dean's letter
- 10 Department/Unit criteria
- 11 Annual Employee Performance Evaluations
- 12 Optional:
 - A. Tenure and/or Promotion Appraisals
 - B. Replies to any material in the portfolio
- 13 Tenure Recommendation Impact Form & Promotion Recommendation Report

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

Typically in the seventh year after tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, faculty will either undergo review of their contributions in teaching, service and scholarship during the five-year period, or apply for promotion to Professor. According to the Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty (issued by the University Provost and Chief Academic Officer, October 24, 1996), "Appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor is recognition of demonstrated achievement and distinction over the span of an individual's academic career in scholarship/creative activity in the appropriate discipline(s) and/or teaching and related instructional activity and/or service/administration. While distinction must be demonstrated in at least one dimension of the faculty role, the candidate must demonstrate commitment to and competency in the others. While the decision involves the candidate's entire career, the candidate's record shall demonstrate significant additional achievement beyond that demonstrated at the time of promotion to Associate Professor. Demonstrated merit, not years of service, shall be the primary factor in determining the case for promotion to Professor." Furthermore, "Faculty members eligible for promotion to Full Professor shall be apprised of their progress towards promotion at least every three years, but they may request more frequent appraisals. Faculty members' annual assignments must be considered in evaluating progress toward promotion and/or tenure." The Honors College will apply these guidelines, including relevant evaluative criteria. As the Provost's criteria for promotion to Professor indicate (see below), advancement to this rank is a mark of "academic maturity." It may be achieved via "multiple routes"³³ including all but potentially emphasizing one or more areas of the traditional evaluative triad: 1) research / scholarship / creative activity; 2) teaching/curriculum or program development; 3) service to the college/University/community, including work in administration. The variability in assignments of Associate Professors should be taken into account in determining a candidate's overall accomplishment. Evaluation of each of the three areas listed above will principally focus on the quality of accomplishment as indicated by external and internal reviews by individuals competent to judge the candidate's contributions. In keeping with its interdisciplinary curriculum, the Honors College will recognize scholarship and teaching contributing to traditional disciplinary as well as innovative interdisciplinary areas. Criteria for the evaluation of the triad will include those indicated in this document for promotion to Associate Professor, as well as further accomplishments contributing to the candidate's standing in appropriate academic communities. Review of an application for promotion to Professor will be conducted only by faculty who are Professors.

³³ See Appendix A2

APPRAISAL OF PROGRESS TOWARDS PROMOTION

Every three years after tenure Associate Professors will be evaluated for progress towards promotion. This appraisal will be done by a sub-committee of Full Professors of the HC Promotion and Tenure Committee and will be based on the annual evaluation files of the candidate. This process will occur in March and April on dates established by the HC Promotion and Tenure Committee. The committee will report in writing to the Dean on whether the candidate is making progress toward Promotion. This report will cover all three areas of faculty responsibility and the evaluation will be based on the criteria established in these guidelines.

THE TENURE PROCESS

Structure of the Promotion and Tenure Process

- With advice from the Associate Dean and the Faculty Advisor, the candidate will prepare a portfolio as described in the Provost's Guidelines.
- Candidates will consult with the Associate Dean to create a list of referees in the candidate's area of specialization.
- The Associate Dean will contact the referees and solicit the external review of the candidate's scholarship as described in the section on scholarship.
- The Candidate will also solicit at least two letters of recommendation from within the University.
- The Candidate will submit their materials for their portfolio to the Associate Dean.
- The Associate Dean will submit the entire Portfolio to the Honors' College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Role of Honors College P&T Committee

- There will be a standing Honors College P&T committee elected by the entire faculty from among the tenured faculty members.
- For each tenure case the HC Promotion and Tenure Committee may select a sub committee³⁴ from among the entire tenured faculty to evaluate the candidate. Wherever possible members of the candidate's Third year review committee should be included.
- In consultation with the candidate and the HC Promotion and Tenure Committee, this sub-committee may invite tenured FAU faculty from outside the college to assist in evaluating cases on an advisory basis.
- The sub-committee will receive and evaluate the portfolio and write a report to the HC Promotion and Tenure Committee. On receipt of the report the HC Promotion and Tenure Committee will make a recommendation via its chair to the entire tenured faculty of the college who will meet³⁵ and vote via a secret ballot.
- The Chair of the P&T committee will then write a letter to the Dean, summarizing the report, discussion and vote by the tenured faculty. This letter must make explicit reference to the Honors' College criteria for Promotion and Tenure.

³⁴ This is to ensure that appropriate tenured faculty are included in each candidates sub-committee. The HC P&T Committee should consider disciplinary proximity as well as maintaining a broad representation of the college.

³⁵ Copies of the candidates file should be made available two weeks before this meeting to the entire tenured faculty.

The Dean

The Dean will receive the materials from the standing committee and write a recommendation to be forwarded with the portfolio to the University-wide P&T Committee.

Honors College Representative on University P&T Committee

The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure committee will be the designated representative to the University-wide P &T Committee. An alternate representative, to serve in the absence of the chair of the P&T committee, may be elected by the tenured faculty of the Honors College.

Review

When needed, but at least within three years after these guidelines go into effect, the Honors College Promotion and Tenure committee will review these guidelines to determine whether they are meeting the needs of the college.

APPENDIX A1³⁶

EXPLANATION OF ITEMS LISTED IN PORTFOLIO SECTION

1. UP-TO-DATE VITA, with sequentially numbered pages. In that section of the vita devoted to Research and Other Creative Activity, please

- A. Provide complete citations

- B. Categorize as follows unless the nature of the scholarly activity requires additional categories:

Refereed Works

Books:

Authored
Chapters in Books
Edited

Journal Articles:

International
National
State
Local

Conference Papers: (indicate whether or not
refereed on basis of abstract or full paper and
if the paper resulted in publication)

Competitive Grants

Patents

Non-Refereed Works (categorize as above)

2. Copy of Annual Assignments

These should be included for the period under consideration. For promotion to Professor, they should cover the period from promotion to Associate Professor or years at FAU. For promotion to Associate Professor, they should cover the years as an Assistant Professor at FAU.

³⁶ It is the duty of the P& T committee to ensure that the Honors College Portfolio reflects the latest update from the provost's office. This can be found at <http://www.fau.edu/academic/provost/mem1pt.htm>

3. Instruction: classroom teaching, dissertation/thesis committees, senior projects, advising of student clubs; curriculum and course development; peer evaluation, if in place; professional development of teaching; other documentable contributions to the quality of instruction at the University or in the profession. Provide this information for the entire period under consideration for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure; applications for promotion to Professor should provide this information for the period since promotion to Associate Professor.

Provide the information in the following order. Include only the information as requested; if necessary, additional documentation can be provided in the supplementary portfolio. Mandatory categories are indicated with an asterisk*:

A. Teaching and/or advising awards. Explain the nature of the selection process.

B.*Quantitative data on teaching. At a minimum, for the years that the candidate has been employed in the SUS, this section must include the summary item (before Fall 1999, item 17; after Fall 1999, item 8) from the state-mandated form for the student evaluation of instruction. (For years prior to the implementation of this form (e.g. pre-1997), present the results of the evaluation form that was used. Be certain to explain the form that was used.) The results of other items may be included in the table, discussed in addenda to the table, or presented in other tabular form.

Candidates who have recently been appointed to the FAU faculty should present the results of student evaluations conducted at their prior place of employment.

If departmental/divisional or college instruments for student evaluation of instruction differ from those adopted by the University, they should be included if they are to be considered in the evaluation process.

Scores on evaluations should be compared to appropriate summary statistics. Departmental/divisional or college means may not be useful bases of comparison if courses vary widely in their sizes (e.g., seminars and mass lectures) and missions (e.g., advanced courses for major, courses in the lower-division core curriculum). If asked, chairs and deans should provide any data that are reasonable and necessary for purposes of comparison.

A. Sample table concerning teaching and evaluation*

Semester & Year	Title	Description	Number Enrolled	Require d Elective	Credit Hours	Campu s	Student Evaluation Results/ # Respondin g (Scale is from a low of 1 to a high of 5)	Department or College Mean	Other Means of Evaluatio n Including Peer if Available	Grad. Asst. Help
Fall 1995	Dance Appre c. TAP 1	DAN 3100 DAA 4560	30 20	E R	3 3	BOCA BOCA	4.2/28 4.0/20	4.0(Dept.)* * 4.0(Dept.)	YES*** NO	No No

* Insert additional columns as needed along with explanation of evaluation system.

** Explanation: each dept. has its own instrument

*** Describe evaluation, for example: outside expert brought in to observe three classes or peer evaluation of classes reported by letter in Section 6. Evaluated as excellent.

B. Sample table concerning chairing or being a member of thesis, dissertation, senior project, etc. committees:

THESIS COMMITTEES *

SEMESTER/YEAR	ROLE/NUMBER/TYPE	NOTES
Fall 1995	Chaired MFA's	One MFA graduated
Spring 1996	Served on 3 MFA's	
	Chaired 2 MFA's	One MFA graduated
	Served on 2 MFA's	One MFA graduated
DISSERTATION COMMITTEES		
Fall 1995	Served on 1 Ph.D.	Dept. of Ex. Science Coll. of Education

* MFA is a terminal performance degree requiring 3 years of study

- C. *Peer evaluation. This section should include peer evaluation as appropriate to the discipline, department/division, and college. Provide a brief explanation of the unit's procedures for peer review. If the unit has not adopted or has only recently adopted a system of peer evaluation, the candidates for 2001-02 may be unable to complete these sections. In forthcoming years, this section will be expected of all candidates and all units will be expected to develop some system of peer evaluation.
 - D. If necessary and appropriate according to the candidate's assignment and/or the relevant criteria for promotion and/or tenure, provide information on course or curricular development, professional development of teaching, and other instructional activity such as student clubs, etc. If this section is included, it should be limited to a two page (double-spaced) overview of such activities for the typical applicant for Associate Professor. Applicants for promotion to Professor may provide an overview of no more than five double-spaced pages. Additional documentation, if necessary, may be included in the supplementary portfolio.
 - E. Advising.
4. Scholarship, research and/or other creative activity.

This section is an annotated version of the parallel section of the candidate's vita. It should provide detailed information on each published or public work including, if appropriate to the discipline, presentations at conferences and symposia. This information should permit a colleague outside of the candidate's field to evaluate the candidate's accomplishments in his or her discipline(s). For all publications, the candidate should explain: the type of refereeing used (e.g., blind peer review; reviewed by an editorial board; solicited by the editor); the type of

journal or press (e.g., "The official publication of the National Association of Whatever"). For creative activities, the candidate should provide information on the significance of the venue or exhibition in which the work appeared. This information should be sufficiently detailed to permit an out-of-discipline colleague to evaluate the significance of the performance or other creative activity.

Complete information must be provided on all publications, including page numbers and publication dates. If any work has multiple authors, the candidate should explain his or her role (e.g., co-author, senior author). This is particularly important in those disciplines in which it is necessary to establish one's self as an independent scholar or researcher prior to tenure and/or promotion. If there is any question about the candidate's role, documentation of it should be provided.

Include critical reviews of your work, if they exist. (Candidates may attach a concise commentary to the review)

Include letters of acceptance for any forthcoming work.

5. Assigned service to institution, profession, community and public schools. This includes administrative assignments at the University. Include a table that provides an overview of these activities for each academic year under consideration; indicate which activities (if any) were supported by a reduced teaching assignment. Be sure to indicate your role in the activity (e.g., chair, member) and the approximate amount of time required by it (e.g., "three hours a week").

If the table is not self-explanatory, the candidate may include a brief (typically, no more than five double-spaced pages) narrative with additional information about service/administrative activities. This narrative should explain each activity, if it is not clear from the table. If possible, this narrative section should refer to evidence of the quality of the candidate's work. This is particularly important if service and/or administration was a significant part of the candidate's assignment. Additional documentation, if necessary, can be included in the supplementary portfolio.

6. A SELF EVALUATION of no more than eight double-spaced pages. This self-evaluation should use the candidate's accomplishments to explain how he or she has met the appropriate criteria for promotion and/or tenure. It should be written in terms easily understood by out-of-discipline colleagues. Reference should be made to the following areas:

- A. Instruction
- B. Scholarship, research and/or other creative activity
- C. Service and administrative work

D. Academic pursuits and accomplishments relevant to but not included in the above categories

7. LETTERS OF EVALUATION addressed to the Chairperson of the Department (who is to provide copies to the faculty member).
 - A. At a minimum, two current letters from referees outside this University chosen by the candidate in consultation with her/his chairperson. These should be letters from independent experts in the field who can evaluate the faculty member's work; letters from co-authors, dissertation advisors, and personal friends generally are not appropriate. The chair's letter should request a brief vita or summary of each referee's credentials; this should be appended to the letter from the outside evaluator, along with the candidate's brief explanation of why these persons are appropriate as evaluators of their work. A copy of the department chair's letter requesting external evaluations should be included in the portfolio. Such letters should clearly identify the purpose for which the external evaluation is being requested (e.g., "for promotion to Professor") and the nature of the evaluation requested ("review the publication record"). It is often useful to include a copy of the relevant criteria or to describe the candidate's assignment (e.g., "while teaching three courses a term").
 - B. At a minimum, two letters from colleagues within the University. While these letters may evaluate all aspects of the candidate's contributions, they should especially evaluate the quality of the candidate's service to the institution. Candidates are encouraged to include a brief statement of why these colleagues are appropriate as evaluators of their work. The most useful letters will be those from colleagues who have worked closely with the candidate or some committee or other institutional projects. Letters from junior colleagues in one's department/division are rarely appropriate.
 - C. Only letters solicited by the chairperson are to be included.
8. CHAIRPERSON'S LETTER, a copy of which is to be sent to the faculty member and is to include:
 - A.
 - (1) for tenure - the numerical results of the poll by secret ballot by the tenured members of the employee's department/division or unit.
 - (2) for promotion -the numerical vote, as well as an explanation of who had voting rights on the application and of how the voting was done.
 - B. In those instances where a candidate is under consideration for tenure, a statement is to be included as to the year of review (fourth, fifth, sixth, etc.). The amount of time granted as credit toward tenure because of service elsewhere, if any, should also be clearly stated. In such cases, the chair should be sure that the letter of offer contains a

written offer of time granted toward tenure.

- C. The Chairperson's recommendation (a clear statement of support or non-support).
- D. A detailed analysis and evaluation of the work of the faculty member. The record is to be evaluated in keeping with the appropriate approved criteria and written so as to be easily understood by out-of-discipline colleagues, and is to include consideration of annual assignments and performance evaluations regarding:
 - (1) teaching effectiveness
 - (a) consideration of effectiveness in imparting knowledge and skills and in stimulating students' critical thinking and/or creative abilities;
 - (b) clear explanation of the nature and meaning of student evaluations and a comparison of the candidate's scores to all other members of the department;
 - (c) explanation, description, and meaning of other tools used for evaluating teaching effectiveness.
 - (2) scholarship, research and other creative activity

- (a) published books, articles and papers; musical compositions; paintings, sculpture; works of performing art; papers presented at meetings of professional societies; and research and creative activity that has not yet resulted in publication, display, or performance.

- (b) an explanation and other appropriate information on the quality and/or ranking of publication and creative activity outlets.

- (3) service that is related to and furthers the mission of the University (if appropriate, please include a statement as to how the department views service for junior faculty).

- (4) other assigned University duties and responsibilities.

The Chairperson also has the responsibility, if requested, to assist the faculty member in obtaining copies of Annual Assignments, the Annual Employee Performance Evaluations, and tenure or promotion appraisals. The chair is responsible for providing the faculty member with a copy of the current promotion and tenure criteria.

- 9. DEAN'S LETTER OF EVALUATION. The record is to be evaluated in keeping with the approved criteria. The letter, a copy of which is to be sent to the faculty member, is to include:
 - A. The numerical vote of the college committee for tenure and promotion.
 - B. As an attachment, the signed written report of the college committee.
 - C. The Dean's recommendation (a clear statement of support or non-support).
 - D. A discussion of supporting evidence for the recommendation based on, but not limited to:
 - (1) teaching effectiveness
 - (2) research and other creative activity
 - (3) service that is related to and furthers the mission of the University (if appropriate, please include a statement as to how the college views service for junior faculty)

- (4) other assigned University duties and responsibilities.
10. A copy of the Department and/or Unit Promotion and/or Tenure Criteria as adopted by University according to Articles 14 and 15 of the UFF/BOR Agreement.
 11. Annual Employee Performance Evaluations for the period under consideration.
 12. OPTIONAL:
 - A. Tenure and/or Promotion Appraisals (If not included, they can be requested by the reviewer.)
 - B. Replies to any material in the portfolio
 13. Tenure Recommendation Impact Form (copy attached)
Promotion Recommendation Report (copy attached)

APPENDIX A2

The following criteria are provided by the Provost for 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, criteria for this promotion must be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the legitimate variations in faculty assignments and activity within the rank of Associate Professor."

Multiple routes to the rank of Professor are outlined in the Provost's criteria:

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/division, 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.

b. Recognizing Variability in Institutional Expectations of Associate Professors.

In creating 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 Professors.

Criteria for promotion to Professor must recognize that Associate Professors may have many different patterns of assignment, even within the same department/division. 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/administrative accomplishments, provided that he or she can also meet the relevant criteria for demonstrating continued competency in and commitment to research, scholarship and other creative activities in the discipline(s).

i. Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity

College or departmental/divisional 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/ division may also adopt criteria that include the faculty member's record of outside support in the form of grants and/or contracts. 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).

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, scholarship 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.

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, administrative work, 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.

d. Role of Annual Evaluations

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.

e. Appraisals of Progress Towards Promotion

At any time, as specified in the UFF/BOR Agreement (Article 14), faculty may request an appraisal of their progress toward promotion to Professor. To assist candidates for Professor in regularly assessing their progress towards promotion, all Associate Professors shall be apprised of their progress towards promotion every three years. All colleges shall establish written procedures for the evaluation of progress towards promotion to Professor."

APPENDIX A3

Relevant excerpts from the Provost's Guidelines and Principles appear below:

Provost's Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure: Annual Evaluation

Regular feedback, advice and assistance shall be a part of the process at annual or more frequent intervals. Annual performance evaluations must be conducted. They must be considered in the promotion and/or tenure process. The annual evaluations of untenured faculty must include a separate component that fairly appraises the faculty member's progress towards tenure and, if the candidate is an Assistant Professor, promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, an appointee to the rank of Assistant Professor shall receive, in the third year of his or her service, a formal review at both the department/division and college levels. Faculty members eligible for promotion to Full Professor shall be apprised of their progress towards promotion at least every three years, but they may request more frequent appraisals. Faculty members' annual assignments must be considered in evaluating progress toward promotion and/or tenure.

Provost's Principles for Creating Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Promotion (section 1, Promotion to Associate Professor):

a. Criteria Should Focus on Accomplishments. 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 departmental or divisional 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, scholarship 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.

1. Promotion to Professor:

d. Role of Annual Evaluations:

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.

APPENDIX A4

LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWER³⁷

Dear:

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate _____'s scholarly activity for inclusion in his/her portfolio for promotion and tenure at Florida Atlantic University.

Currently, _____ is an untenured Assistant Professor of _____ in Florida Atlantic University's new Wilkes Honors College. The mission of the Wilkes Honors College emphasizes interdisciplinary studies with a strong international and environmental focus.

Florida Atlantic University is classified as a Carnegie Doctoral/Research Intensive institution. The Wilkes Honors College is a unit dedicated to the undergraduate education of academically superior students, and provides the atmosphere of a small private liberal arts college within the context of a large public university. The responsibilities and activities of Wilkes Honors College faculty fall into the realms of teaching, scholarship, and service. The Wilkes Honors College considers *all three areas* to be very important with regard to promotion and tenure.

Enclosed are copies of _____'s publications along with a copy of the "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Florida Atlantic University Wilkes Honors College." In your evaluation of his/her scholarly production, we ask that you comment on the quality of his/her research and the contribution to the field of study.

The FAU Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure state that “promotion to the rank of Associate Professor means that the person will clearly demonstrate the commitment and ability to continue to be a scholar or artist, contributing to the relevant field(s) of knowledge through original work and quality teaching in the best traditions of the professorate. The candidate must demonstrate commitment to and ability in teaching and related instructional activity, as well as demonstrating the ability to contribute successfully and continuously to the scholarship or creative activity of the appropriate academic disciplines. Instructional activities shall be as rigorously evaluated as scholarship and creative activity. Although the typical Assistant Professor will have only a modest assignment to service, promotion to Associate Professor requires that the candidate have a record of responsible and conscientious participation

³⁷ Individual letters may be edited to reflect individual or disciplinary differences. Amendments will be made in consultation with Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Associate Dean.

in some service activities.” I should point out that since the Harriet L. Wilkes Honors College is new, all of our faculty are asked to do an extraordinary amount of service.

The FAU Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure state that tenure “is the recognition that the person so honored is an established member of the academic profession, possessing a terminal degree or qualification appropriate to the discipline, and having clearly demonstrated the commitment and ability to continue to be a scholar, contributing to the field of knowledge through original work and quality teaching in the best traditions of the professorate.” Your review will be an important and valued component that will assist us to determine whether the quality of _____'s scholarship is at a level sufficient to warrant promotion and tenure at Florida Atlantic University.

We will be forwarding _____'s promotion tenure portfolio to the Provost's office in the fall, so we would appreciate receiving your letter of evaluation by the end of August. I would like to point out that the Board of Education of the State of Florida requires that a faculty member under consideration for tenure be given a copy of all letters of evaluation; therefore your letter is not confidential. Please send an abbreviated copy of your CV to include in the tenure portfolio along with your letter.

We realize that it takes considerable effort to evaluate a candidate's scholarly record, and we would like to thank you for your time and consideration. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely,

Dr. Mark Tunick
Associate Dean and Professor

Enclosures

APPENDIX A5

LETTER TO INTERNAL REVIEWER³⁸

Dear:

Thank you for agreeing to evaluate _____'s Promotion and Tenure portfolio. Currently, _____ is an untenured Assistant Professor of _____ in the new Wilkes Honors College.

The Wilkes Honors College is a unit dedicated to the undergraduate education of academically superior students, and provides the atmosphere of a small private liberal arts college within the context of a large public university. The mission of the Wilkes Honors College emphasizes interdisciplinary studies with a strong international and environmental focus. The responsibilities and activities of Wilkes Honors College faculty fall into the realms of teaching, scholarship, and service. The Wilkes Honors College considers *all three areas* to be very important with regard to promotion and tenure.

Enclosed is _____'s promotion and tenure portfolio along with a copy of the "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Florida Atlantic University Wilkes Honors College." According to the Provost's Revised Tenure and Promotion Memorandum for 2001/2002, candidates for promotion and tenure must have, at a minimum, two letters of evaluation from within the university. As the Provost's

document states, " While these letters may evaluate all aspects of the candidate's contributions, they should especially evaluate the quality of the candidate's service to the institution."

In your evaluation of _____'s portfolio, we ask that you utilize the criteria specified in the "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Florida Atlantic University Wilkes Honors College." The FAU Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure state that "promotion to the rank of Associate Professor means that the person will clearly demonstrate the commitment and ability to continue to be a scholar or artist, contributing to the relevant field(s) of knowledge through original work and quality teaching in the best traditions of the professorate. The candidate must demonstrate commitment to and ability in teaching and related instructional activity, as well as demonstrating the ability to contribute successfully and continuously to the scholarship or creative activity of the appropriate academic disciplines. Instructional activities shall be as rigorously evaluated as scholarship and creative activity. Although the typical

³⁸ Individual letters may be edited to reflect individual or disciplinary differences. Amendments will be made in consultation with Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Associate Dean.

Assistant Professor will have only a modest assignment to service, promotion to Associate Professor requires that the candidate have a record of responsible and conscientious participation in some service activities." I should point out that since the Harriet L. Wilkes Honors College is new, all of our faculty are asked to do an extraordinary amount of service.

The FAU Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure state that tenure "is the recognition that the person so honored is an established member of the academic profession, possessing a terminal degree or qualification appropriate to the discipline, and having clearly demonstrated the commitment and ability to continue to be a scholar, contributing to the field of knowledge through original work and quality teaching in the best traditions of the professorate." Your review will be an important and valued component that will assist us to determine whether the quality of _____'s overall portfolio is at a level sufficient to warrant tenure at Florida Atlantic University.

We will be forwarding _____'s promotion and tenure portfolio to the Provost's office in the fall, so we would appreciate receiving your letter of evaluation by the end of August. I would like to point out that the Board of Education of the State of Florida requires that a faculty member under consideration for promotion and tenure be given a copy of all letters of evaluation; therefore your letter is not confidential. Please send an abbreviated copy of your CV to include in the promotion

portfolio along with your letter.

We realize that it takes considerable effort to evaluate a candidate's record, and we would like to thank you for your time and consideration. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely,

Dr. Mark Tunick
Associate Dean and Professor

Enclosures

APPENDIX A6

Provost's Annual Assignment Form³⁹

Annual Assignment for 2001-2002



Your annual assignment of responsibilities, including both instructional and non-instructional activities, is listed below. Instructional activities include scheduled courses, dissertation/thesis supervision, directed independent study, and other teaching-related activities. Non-instructional activities include student advising, research, public and professional service, university governance, and academic administration. Your evaluation will be based on your performance of these assigned responsibilities.

In accordance with Article 9 of the Board of Regents-United Faculty of Florida Collective

Bargaining Agreement and Florida Statute 240.245, assignments are expected to represent the equivalent of at least 12 credit hours of scheduled courses, making appropriate allowance for other instructional and non-instructional activities; you will subsequently be asked to complete an Activity Report estimating the division of your effort among various responsibilities.

When necessary in order to accommodate departmental, college or university needs, these assignments are subject to change with appropriate notice; any change will be discussed and specified in writing prior to the effective date of the change.

Summer Semester

Instructional Activities

Non-instructional Activities

³⁹ To be updated yearly from: <http://www.fau.edu/academic/provost/assign.htm>

Fall Semester

Instructional Activities

Non-instructional Activities

Spring Semester

Instructional Activities

Non-instructional Activities

Acknowledgement of the 2006-2007 Annual Assignment:

Faculty

Member: _____ Date: _____

Chairperson: _____ Date: _____

Dean: _____ Date: _____