

MISSOURI WESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY

Governance Advisory Council Report 2005-2006

May 31, 2006

Volume 32, No: 3

GOVERNANCE ADVISORY COUNCIL

April 7, 2006

Members Present: Dr. James Scanlon, Dr. Jeanne Daffron, Ron Olinger, Dan Nicoson, Dr. Martin Johnson, Dr. Brenda Blessing, Dr. Phil Mullins, Dr. Cindy Heider, Dr. Chris Shove, Mark Linder, Julie Fiedler, Barbara Davis

Others Present: Beth Wheeler, Dr. Jeanie Crain, Dr. Kathleen Andrews, Dr. Ann Thorne

Update reports were given by President Scanlon and Vice Presidents Olinger, Nicoson and Daffron.

GAC #7 – Changes in Faculty Professional Leave Policy

Source of Proposal: Faculty Senate

Purpose of Proposal: Policy Revision

Current Policy or Procedure: Missouri Western State University Policy Guide, pages 48-50

Proposed Policy or Procedure:

O. SABBATICAL LEAVE

The purpose of sabbatical leave is for the professional development of the employee and for increased effectiveness of the individual to the institution and higher education. Sabbatical leave is open to any full-time ~~employee, except Instructors (March 1996)~~ **tenure track/tenured faculty** who: (a) will have served ~~five~~ **six** years **at Missouri Western State University in a tenure track/tenured position**; (b) has submitted detailed plans for the period of sabbatical leave in advance for the approval of appropriate authorities; (c) has a proper and satisfactory record of performance ~~as a teacher or administrator, as a counselor, and as a citizen in the~~

University community. (November 2000). **For faculty who apply for tenure and sabbatical during the same year, any sabbatical leave awarded will be contingent upon receiving tenure.**

Leaves should seldom be for more than one academic year plus contiguous summers. **Normally, faculty who receive sabbatical leave should serve at least five years full time (or ten years half time) before their next sabbatical. However, faculty with special circumstances may be considered.** A faculty member may have the option of one academic year at one-half salary or one-half of an academic year at 100% salary. Sick leave does not accumulate. An administrative or professional member may have the option of one full year at one-half salary or one-half year at three-fourths salary. If funds are available, grants for support during the summer months will be offered. **Time spent on sabbatical will be counted towards tenure, promotion, or faculty awards.** Leaves for a period of one year will not interfere with scheduled salary increases. Group insurance will be continued by the University.

The individual is obliged to return to teaching or administering at MWSU for at least two years or remit all salary paid while on leave plus fringe benefits paid. Additionally, during the first semester upon his or her return, the awardee is obligated to file a report on how the original aims of the sabbatical request were fulfilled. The report is to be sent to the appropriate supervisor/supervisors and vice president. Each faculty awardee is also required to provide a copy of the leave report to the Faculty Senate ~~and to the member of her or his department.~~

Application Procedures for Faculty. A faculty applicant for sabbatical leave must submit one copy of the leave proposal to the department Chairperson by September 1. The Chairperson shall submit the proposal and the chair's recommendation to the appropriate Dean of the College and the chair of the Professional Leave Committee by September 15. The Dean of the College will submit his or her recommendation to the chair of the Professional Leave Committee by October 1.

Approval Procedures for Faculty. In considering proposals for sabbatical leave, the Professional Leave Committee requires the candidate to provide the following specific items: (a) name, educational status, and present academic rank; (b) eligibility (years in service at MWSU); (c) type and length of leave being requested; (d) outline of proposed course of study or professional activity to be undertaken during leave; (e) certification of acceptance in above program (recommendation is contingent on acceptance or validity of program); (f) major goal to be achieved as a result of leave; (g) justification for leave; (h) benefit to be accrued to the department and/or institution; (i) departmental arrangements to cover leave; (j) a brief resume/vita which shows evidence of the candidate's professional development and overall performance at MWSU; (k) other pertinent information an applicant may wish to submit (i.e. student evaluations, testimonials, previous academic record, etc.). **In addition, any faculty member who was granted a sabbatical prior to the current application should provide a copy of the leave report from any previous sabbatical.** The proposal will provide sufficient detail concerning the product and process of the proposed leave and will be limited to fifteen (15) pages, exclusive of the candidate's resume/vita **and any previous leave reports.**

All candidates for leave will be interviewed by the Professional Leave Committee. The committee Chairperson will make the necessary arrangements to schedule same.

The Professional Leave Committee will base its decision to recommend or not recommend the request on the following criteria: (a) merit of the scholarly and/or other professional development of proposed activity; (b) benefit of project to students, department and/or institution; (c) merit of candidate's overall performance at MWSU. After considering all leave requests the Professional Leave Committee will determine, via secret ballot, which candidates will be recommended for leave and a priority ranking of these candidates will be established. Final committee recommendations with a ranking of candidates and the rationale for the rankings will be forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs and the Faculty Senate for consideration by October 25. The committee will also forward to the Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs copies of the proposals and recommendations from the chairs and Deans of the College. The committee will forward to each applicant and the appropriate Dean of the College and chair the committee's recommendation and rationale (the rankings will not be included) by October 25. The Faculty Senate will review the committee's recommendations, including the rationale for its rankings, at its meetings in the first week of November, and may forward any comments which it may have concerning the committee's decision to the Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs no later than five (5) days after the Senate meeting at which the committee submits its recommendations. The rankings of candidates shall not be included in the minutes of the meeting at which the committee's recommendations are reviewed, but the names of the candidates approved by the Senate for sabbatical leave shall be reported, in alphabetical order, along with a description of their projects and departmental affiliation. The Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs will forward his/her recommendations to each applicant and the appropriate Dean of the College and chair when the recommendations are sent to the President. (June 2001)

GAC Summary: It was discussed and approved to remove all revision dates except the most recent. In the second paragraph, the following sentence should be struck: "An administrative or professional member may have the option of one full year at one-half salary or one-half year at three-fourths salary." In the third paragraph, "or administering" should be struck from the first sentence.

Administrator and Exempt Staff sabbatical information should be noted in another location of the Policy Guide.

With these changes, this proposal will be forwarded to the President for his approval.

Presidential Action: The President signed this proposal on May 21, 2006.

GAC #8 – Revision of Faculty Evaluation Policy and Procedures

Source of Proposal: Faculty Senate

Purpose of Proposal: Policy Revision

Current Policy or Procedure: Missouri Western State University Policy Guide, pages 64-90, Section Two, VII. Faculty Evaluation

Proposed Policy or Procedure:

VII. FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The evaluation of a faculty member is a continuous process that involves the accumulation of relevant data and information that permits intelligent judgments concerning a faculty member's performance. Evaluation procedures are used in the annual review, in the mid-term review, in the tenure review, in promotion reviews, and in special reviews such as those for Board of Governors Distinguished Professor awards and grants for professional leave and sabbatical. At the heart of an effective evaluation system lies the requirement that a faculty member diligently seek self-improvement and that evaluators responsibly interpret results and carefully support comments and recommendations.

A. AREAS OF FACULTY EVALUATION

Faculty performance is evaluated in three areas: teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity. The discussion below provides a general orientation to institutional expectations for performance in each area. A list of artifacts that may be used to demonstrate performance in these areas is located in Section E.

1. Teaching

One of the primary responsibilities of a faculty member at Western involves effective teaching and student interaction through classroom activities, campus involvement, and advising. Successful student learning is the primary goal of effective teaching.

Effective teaching may include, but is not limited to

- Presentation of subject matter in a carefully organized, clear, logical, and competent manner in class presentations, syllabi, teaching resource guides, web materials, posted notes, and other teaching materials
- Creative, challenging, and competent student learning evaluation measures such as examinations, quizzes, writing assignments, and other assignments appropriate for the subject matter
- Appropriate rigor in the assignment of student grades for specific assignments and courses
- Purposeful reflection on practice and student response (qualitative and quantitative) as a means to continued improvement of teaching

- Development of a new course, course preparation, or course component, special pedagogical practices, and/or special tutorial/individualized work
- Performance of duties allied to instruction such as curriculum development, advising, and/or counseling
- Participation in programs that promote instructional development in the discipline
- Sponsorship of student learning opportunities beyond the classroom that are relevant to the discipline such as a film program, a class trip, a campus event, or some similar co-curricular opportunity
- Participation in campus initiatives related to teaching such as learning communities, honors programs, and applied learning
- Meeting teaching requirements established by the department and institution
- Maintaining respect for students

2. Service

Professional service is a faculty responsibility and an opportunity. Through professional service, a faculty member contributes knowledge, skills, and expertise to activities designed to benefit students, the institution, the discipline/profession, and the community. Faculty members will typically provide service in several of the areas listed below.

a. Students

Service to students includes activities that go beyond the usual teaching expectations of a faculty member. Service to students may include, but is not limited to

- Serving as a faculty advisor to a student organization
- Providing guidance for a student project not associated with the faculty member's assigned workload
- Providing an out-of-class seminar to students on academic and student affairs topics
- Providing professional advising and mentoring activities such as sponsorship of independent student work

b. Institution

Institutional Service may include, but is not limited to

- Providing leadership for a committee or an academic unit
- Serving as an elected member of Faculty Senate or as an active member of a Faculty Senate, institutional, or departmental committee
- Representing the institution on a community project or in a partnership project

c. Discipline/Profession

Service to the academic discipline or profession involves faculty activities that focus on disciplinary goals or on enhancing the work of professional organizations. Evidence of service to the discipline or profession may include, but is not limited to

- Participating in accreditation activities
- Editing a professional journal or serving as a peer reviewer or juror
- Organizing a professional conference or a conference panel or event
- Serving as an elected officer of a professional society
- Participating in the work of a professional association

d. Community

Service to the community includes activities that contribute to the public good. As citizens, faculty members are encouraged to participate in non-profit organizations that benefit the community. Faculty members have the ability to serve the community through their expertise as educators, scholars, fine or performing artists, administrators, or practitioners. Community service may include, but is not limited

- Giving public presentations or performances
- Participating in economic or community development activities
- Serving as a board member for a community non-profit organization
- Serving as a consultant or evaluating programs, policies or personnel for agencies
- Publishing written or video work in non-academic media outlets

3. Scholarship/Creative Activity

Activities fulfilling faculty responsibility for scholarship include not only scientific research and humanistic scholarship but also creative expression in the arts. Faculty must be engaged in on-going scholarship/creative activity in order to be current and competent in their areas of instruction. Active participation in the ongoing conversation of scholarly/professional communities is expected of all faculty at the postsecondary level.

Scholarly and Creative activities can be divided into four categories. **Scholarship of Discovery** includes basic research or creative expression. **Scholarship of Integration** reviews and/or integrates prior research. **Scholarship of Application** applies current knowledge and innovations to important practices. **Scholarship of Teaching** focuses on the nature and improvement of teaching (Boyer, 1990).

The following criteria, although not exhaustive, help to delineate an activity as scholarly/creative (Diamond, 2002)

- The activity, both process and product (or result), is reviewed and judged to be meritorious and significant by one's peers. (A necessary element for all scholarly activity)
- The activity or work requires a high level of discipline-related expertise
- The activity or work is conducted in a scholarly manner with clear goals, adequate preparation, and appropriate methodology
- The activity or work and its results are appropriately and effectively documented and disseminated. (This reporting should include a reflective critique that addresses the significance of the work, the process that was used, and what was learned)
- The activity or work has significance beyond the individual context. (It breaks new ground or is innovative and can be replicated or elaborated)

References

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Diamond, R.M. (2002). Defining scholarship for the twenty-first century. In K.J. Zahorski (ed.), *Scholarship in the postmodern era: New venues, new values, new visions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

B. THE DEPARTMENT EVALUATION FILE

An evaluation file for each faculty member will be kept in the office of the department chairperson. Access to this file is guaranteed only to the individual faculty member, department chair, dean, and provost/vice-president for academic and student affairs unless the individual faculty member gives prior written approval. In addition to maintaining files and discharging other assigned responsibilities in the evaluation process, department chairpersons are responsible for making faculty members aware, through department meetings and bulletins, of each individual's responsibility in connection with material to be included in the evaluation file.

1. Evaluation Materials to be Included in the Department File

a. Annual Summaries of Teaching

Updated annual summaries of regular teaching assignments and other specific assigned responsibilities should be included. The template below provides an example of a concise way teaching data can be presented.

| COURSE NAME TYPE (Major, GS) | NUMBER OF STUDENTS | GRADE DISTRIBUTION | Student Evaluation Course mean |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| ENG 108 GS | 19 | A=5; B=5; C=3; D=1; F=1; W=4 | 2.34 ± 0.78 |

b. Summaries of Student Evaluations of Faculty

A tabulated summary of student evaluations of faculty will be included in the department file. This summary contains the institutionally generated evaluation data.

c. Annual Self-evaluation

Each faculty member should submit to his/her chair an annual self-evaluation using the Self Evaluation Form no later than January 22. The self-evaluation should document the faculty member's performance in each of the following areas: teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity (see VII A. "Areas of Faculty Evaluation"). The department chair will include a copy of the self-evaluation in the department evaluation file.

d. Annual Chairperson/Dean Evaluation

Each faculty member will be formally evaluated by the department chairperson (or, in the case of a department chairperson, the appropriate college dean) annually utilizing the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form. The evaluation period will encompass the full calendar year. The form will serve as the faculty member's written evaluation and will be utilized as the basis for the annual review interview. The department chair will place a copy of the completed Annual Faculty Evaluation Form in the faculty member's department evaluation file when the form is returned from the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.

The chairperson will complete the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form, sign it, and discuss the evaluation with the faculty member early in the spring semester. Each

faculty member will read, sign, and receive a copy of his or her Annual Faculty Evaluation Form during the meeting with the chairperson.

The faculty member has the right to attach a statement to the form if he or she so desires, before it is forwarded to the appropriate dean. Normally, the chairperson submits the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form and faculty member's Self-Evaluation Form to the school dean by February 15. However, each faculty member will have the opportunity to discuss the chairperson's recommendation, sign, and offer any written rebuttals before the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form is submitted to the dean.

The dean will normally submit the review/evaluation package to the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs by February 25. The Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs will complete the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form by the first Friday in April, and a copy will be returned to the faculty member.

The Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs will also submit the review/evaluation recommendations to the President who will make recommendations to the Board of Governors for final disposition. When the President's recommendation differs from the recommendation of the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, the faculty member will be notified. If the faculty member believes there are grounds for a grievance, procedures in the *Policy Guide* should be followed.

- Evaluation Code on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form

The S, M, U evaluation code is defined as follows:

| | |
|-----|--|
| S - | performance satisfactory |
| M - | performance marginal, need for significant improvement |
| U - | performance unacceptable |

The "S" evaluation will be utilized with the great majority of faculty members across campus. It indicates performance, which ranges from acceptable to superior.

The "M" evaluation denotes marginal performance and indicates the need for significant improvement. Such an evaluation shall be explained by the Department Chairperson on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form.

The "U" evaluation indicates that the faculty member is performing in a poor and unacceptable manner. This evaluation shall be explained on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form.

When the "U" evaluation is considered serious enough to jeopardize future employment, the Early Warning Provision (below) will be initiated.

- Early Warning Provision for Faculty

The purpose of the following provision is to make sure that a faculty member with serious shortcomings is made aware of them so that the opportunity for improvement is available.

Faculty members who have been employed full-time at Missouri Western State University for more than two years shall not fail to receive a reappointment recommendation by the administration because of an unsatisfactory evaluation in teaching, service or scholarship/creative activity unless they have been advised of their shortcomings. The formal early warning shall be issued by the department chairperson, or, in the case of chairperson, by the appropriate dean, in writing on the FACULTY REAPPOINTMENT FORM and incorporated within the formal evaluation process.

A faculty member placed on early warning must demonstrate at the next annual evaluation to the satisfaction of the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, in consultation with the department chair and dean, that the shortcomings have been remedied and are not likely to reoccur. Failing to do so will result in the termination of a non-tenured faculty member effective at the end of that spring semester, or in the case of a tenured faculty member, will result in a terminal contract for the following academic year.

C. TENURE

1. General Tenure Philosophy

Tenure, as a status in higher education, is a means to protect the independent inquiry and the openness of academic discourse of faculty as teacher-scholars. Integral with this freedom of inquiry and openness of discourse are a set of interdependent professional responsibilities, including fidelity and integrity with professional standards and ethical codes of conduct; relevance and context of subject matter in teaching; habitual scholarly engagement with one's field; and collegial decorum in the free exchange of ideas in debate and other forums. In sum, "the freedom to pursue ideas, to raise inconvenient questions, to create an agenda of inquiry that builds on one's imagination and curiosity must be maintained as essential to the work of professoriate...the *quid pro quo* for this autonomy is accountability" (Rice, 1996, p. 27).

Faculty accountability is determined by systematic evaluation of their teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activity. Faculty evaluation, whether annual or periodic (i.e., event specific related to tenure, promotion, awards, etc.), should begin with self-evaluation and include multiple levels of peer review. This peer review (i.e., departmental, institutional, community, by scholarly/creative peers outside the institution) will be audited by academic administrators to assess the reliability of its results and to minimize any role "faculty rivalries, jealousies and prejudices sometimes play" in peer review (Byrne, 1997, p.12).

The primacy of professional peer review in faculty evaluation and the professional assessment of academic administrators are designed to determine which tenure-track, probationary faculty have earned tenure status through high-quality teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activity. The Board of Governors grants tenure to faculty whose high-

quality performance in these three domains has been documented through peer review. Although some faculty may be hired with tenure or credit toward tenure (identified on the contract), most faculty are awarded tenure only after a tenure review in the sixth year of service. The elements of the tenure review process are specified below (VII E & F).

Tenure, as granted by the Board of Governors at Missouri Western State University, is designed to protect academic freedom and to insure due process for the termination of a teaching contract. Tenure, as recognized by MWSU, is not designed to protect an incompetent instructor. Tenure assures the tenured faculty member automatic reappointment with the following conditions and exceptions.

- Tenured faculty are subject to the Early Warning Provision (VII. D)
- The services of a faculty member may be terminated immediately for gross immorality or disloyalty to the government of the United States, admitted or proved
- A tenured person denied reappointment shall have the right to a hearing before the Grievance Committee if requested in writing to the chairperson of that committee within thirty (30) days after notification. (See Appendix H, Grievance Procedure for Faculty)

If the faculty member is not granted tenure in the tenure review, he or she will receive a one-year terminal contract in the following year.

References:

Byrne, J. B (1997). Academic freedom without tenure? New Pathways Working Paper, no. 5. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Rice, R. E. (1996) Making a place for the New American Scholar. New Pathways Working Paper, no. 1. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

2. Tenure Processes

a. Determining Eligibility

Faculty members hired on a tenure-track position commencing after July 1, 2005 are required to have a tenure review in the sixth year. That tenure review coincides with a promotion review. If a candidate is recommended for tenure but is not promoted, he or she is not barred from re-applying for promotion in subsequent years. Tenure status, or the timeframe for a tenure review, will appear on the contract. Should a faculty member wish to negotiate an earlier tenure review, the faculty member, department chairperson, dean, and the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs must approve any change in the tenure review date in writing. This agreement will be documented in the faculty member's personnel file. Degree status is not a tenure criterion unless contractually stipulated.

b. Delaying Tenure Review

Missouri Western State University strives to provide a supportive environment in

which faculty can model lifelong scholarship and engaged citizenship. To aid tenure-track faculty striving to balance such professional demands with personal lives, MWSU recognizes that in some instances, it may be in both the faculty member's and the institution's interest to temporarily stop the tenure clock. Faculty may request to stop the tenure clock for a period of time either in conjunction with or separate from reassignment or leave. Time off the tenure clock may be appropriate for faculty without reassignment of duties or time on leave. Faculty may continue to teach a full load of courses for full pay and benefits with the understanding that the year for tenure review has been pushed back for the duration of the clock stoppage. Faculty may request for the tenure clock to be stopped for a period of time when any of the following circumstances would seriously impair the faculty member's capacity to build a record of accomplishment he or she judges appropriate for professional satisfaction and tenure review:

- Physical or mental illness or other physical condition
- Pregnancy, adoption, foster child placement
- Substantial caregiver responsibility for someone with whom one has an important relationship, including family and household
- Military service or obligations
- Legal concerns (settling estates, divorce, custody deliberations or disputes, civil suits, felony charges)

This list is not exhaustive—rather, the clock may be stopped for a variety of circumstances and conditions that would make it beneficial to the faculty member and the university to adjust the pace and timing of tenure service. The purpose of stopping the tenure clock is not to avoid or delay a difficult tenure decision.

Stopping the tenure clock implies the sequence of events related to tenure should simply be pushed back. Time off the clock before the third-year review should also push back the timing of the third-year review. Those in evaluative roles at both the third-year and tenure review time points will take care to insure that expectations for faculty members taking time off the clock are not ratcheted up to account for the clock stoppage.

Requests for stopping the clock that are granted will typically be for one academic year. Normally, only one stopping of the tenure clock may be granted to each faculty member unless warranted by extraordinary circumstances.

To make a request to stop the tenure clock, the faculty member should submit his/her request in writing to his/her department chair prior to the start of the academic year in question. If a request is submitted after the start of the academic year, it will be reviewed for that year or could be considered for the following academic year. Within two weeks, the department chair will have responded to the request in writing by making a recommendation to the college dean. In turn, the dean will review the request and respond in writing within two weeks with a recommendation to the Provost. The Provost has the final authority to approve or deny such requests and should do so in writing to the candidate within two weeks of receiving the dean's recommendation. In order to evaluate the request, additional documentation, such as medical information, may be required. Such information

will be treated as confidential in accordance with HIPAA Guidelines.

c. Levels of Peer Review in the Tenure Process

Chairperson Evaluations & Responsibilities: Annual evaluation interviews by the department chairperson of those on tenure track should address issues related to work toward tenure. Candidates for tenure must have a mid-term review in the third year (of a six year probationary period) that mirrors the tenure application process up to the level of college dean. For faculty who have negotiated an earlier tenure review through credit towards tenure at the time of hire, the mid-term review should occur at the midpoint of their anticipated probationary period. The chairperson is responsible for initiating this review. The review should document a prospective tenure candidate's strengths as well as areas in which additional work should be focused in subsequent years. This documentation should appear on the candidate's annual evaluation form, or as an attachment to it.

Departmental Review Committee: Academic departments must have a review committee that provides a recommendation to the department chairperson on tenure and promotion decisions. The departmental chairperson provides his or her review to the dean but must include the recommendation from the departmental committee. The departmental chairperson is responsible for appointing the departmental committee after consultation with tenure candidates. The committee should be small and members should be tenured colleagues in the same (or allied) disciplines. The departmental committee should also be involved in the mid-term review process to assure that mid-term review and tenure/promotion processes are aligned.

External Peer Reviewers: The department chairperson and the candidate must confer and agree upon at least two and no more than three scholars/artists outside the institution from whom input on a candidate's scholarly/creative work can be solicited for confidential tenure reviews; A tenure packet must include at least one confidential external review. Candidates are expected to provide the chairperson a brief disclosure statement identifying any knowledge they have of proposed external peer reviewers. The department chairperson will contact the external reviewers and ask for a confidential review focusing on representative materials selected by the candidate. The confidential review or reviews should be sent directly to the department chairperson and will be available to others involved in tenure decisions. All submitted confidential peer reviews are added to the tenure package by the chairperson and removed by the Provost and VPASA before materials are returned. A standardized instruction sheet for outside review letters is included in the *Policy Guide*. In addition to specially solicited confidential external reviews, candidates may also submit scholarly/creative materials that already reflect external peer review.

Additional review letters (if any) appraising teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity can also be solicited by the candidate; these too should be sent directly to the department chairperson. The quality of the peer evaluation of

scholarship/creative activity and not the number of such evaluations is what is important in the decision-making process. All peer review materials received by the department chairperson should become part of the package examined by the departmental review committee and others in the chain of review. A standardized instruction sheet for outside review letters is included in the *Policy Guide*.

D. FACULTY PROMOTION: ELIGIBILITY AND PERFORMANCE GUIDELINES

Faculty who are hired at the rank of Instructor will be immediately promoted to Assistant Professor upon verification of the terminal degree in their respective field. (The academic contract salary of the faculty member will be adjusted to reflect the new rank beginning the month following the verification from the faculty member's university/college documenting completion of all requirements for the terminal degree. The educational advancement salary increase will be determined prior to promotion adjustment monies). This promotion will have no bearing on the tenure track status of the faculty member.

Promotion above the level of Assistant Professor is for the purpose of recognizing achievement in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity. Experience, time in rank and preparation minima are not sufficient justification for promotion. Promotion is not automatic, nor will it be regulated by a quota system. Promotions will be contingent upon availability of funds.

As with the tenure application, faculty accountability is determined by systematic evaluation of teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activity. Faculty evaluation, whether annual or periodic, should begin with self-evaluation and include multiple levels of peer review. The elements of the promotion process are specified below (VII E & F).

1. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor Requirements for promotion consideration

Normally, a minimum of six years of full-time university teaching experience at the rank of assistant professor* at MWSU is required for promotion to this rank.** However, less time may be required if arrangements have been made at the time of the first tenure track contract among the candidate, chair, college dean, and provost. Application for promotion to Associate Professor normally occurs in the sixth year of service at the same time that application for tenure is made. The tenure package doubles as a promotion package, although judgments about tenure and promotion remain separate at each level. For promotion consideration, the candidate must

- Have the appropriate terminal degree in which the faculty member holds the appointment, or
- Have at least the MA+30 educational level status with four additional years of full-time university experience at the rank of assistant professor at MWSU, or
- Have eight additional years of full-time university experience at the rank of assistant professor at MWSU, or
- Have made exceptional contributions to the university or the profession. Exceptional performance must be documented in detail by the candidate and addressed and evaluated by the chair and dean.

*Absence from the position without pay will not be included as time toward promotion. Two years of half-time college teaching experience will be considered as one year of full-time teaching experience.

**Faculty employed by MWSU before July 1, 2005, are eligible to apply for Associate in the fifth contract year providing that they have also applied for tenure in the same cycle. Faculty employed by MWSU before July 1, 2005 who already have tenure but have not been promoted to the rank of Associate can apply for promotion at any time. Faculty hired with credit toward tenure are eligible to apply for promotion to Associate in the year in which they have a tenure review.

Performance levels required for promotion to Associate Professor

The assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor must be able to document consistently strong teaching effectiveness. Teaching quality will be compared with other MWSU faculty. Active, constructive service in departmental, institutional, and/or community is expected. The candidate must demonstrate that he or she has kept current with advances in areas of expertise and teaching duties and has shown a continuous significant growth in scholarship/creative activity.

2. Promotion to Professor Requirements for promotion consideration

A minimum of five years of full-time experience at the rank of associate professor at MWSU is required for promotion to this rank.** Application for promotion can be made during the fifth year of service at the rank of associate professor. The appropriate terminal degree in the discipline in which the faculty member holds the appointment is normally required for promotion to the rank of professor. However, the faculty member who does not have the appropriate terminal degree but who has consistently demonstrated outstanding teaching, and who has made exceptional contributions in service to both the institution and discipline/profession, and community, may request consideration for promotion to the rank of professor based upon these contributions. Exceptional performance in teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity must be documented in detail by the candidate and addressed and evaluated by the chair and dean. The terminal degree must not be a limiting factor for the candidate being considered on the basis of exceptional performance.

** Absence from the position without pay will not be included as time toward promotion. Two years of half-time college teaching experience will be considered as one year of full-time teaching experience.

Performance levels required for promotion to Professor

The associate professor seeking promotion to professor must be able to document quality performance in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity. The faculty member's performance in one area might be outstanding and compensate for a solid but not outstanding performance in another area. Teaching

will be compared with other MWSU faculty. High-quality participation in departmental service is required on a regular basis. Evidence of active leadership in departmental and institutional service is expected. In the area of scholarship/creative activity, the faculty member seeking promotion to professor must document a pattern of consistent significant growth since the last promotion. Significant professional service to students, institution, discipline/profession or community must be documented.

The promotion candidate must authorize release of his or her personnel file in the office of the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs for use by appropriate committee members, it being understood that the confidentiality of such file is to be protected and its contents to be used solely for the purpose of making promotion recommendations.

E. PROMOTION/TENURE EVALUATION PACKAGE

The candidate for promotion and/or tenure will be reviewed according to the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship/creative activity. Candidates should study the discussion of VII. A. Areas of Faculty Evaluation in which the institution's general expectations for teaching, service and scholarship/creative activity are outlined. The candidate should also consult with his or her department regarding the most suitable material to include in his or her evaluation packet. It is ultimately the candidate's responsibility to show that he or she is qualified to be promoted/tenured; the candidate should include all relevant information in the promotion package.

1. Preparation of Evaluation Package

- a. The information should be well organized and include a table of contents.
- b. Where possible, qualitative and quantitative comparisons should be made which will demonstrate the candidate's performance in relation to other departmental and MWSU faculty.
- c. Data presented should be analyzed, explained, and contextualized in terms of teaching, service, and scholarly/creative activity.
- d. Materials must be confined to one three-ring notebook NOT to exceed two inches in thickness. All materials must be easily available without having to remove them from the notebook. A second notebook will be submitted containing ALL student evaluations received during the rating period, or for the most recent five years.
- e. Annual faculty self-evaluation forms, Annual Faculty Evaluation Form, midterm evaluations, and chairperson annual evaluation forms must be included for each year of evaluation period.
- f. The candidate must authorize release of materials in his or her personnel faculty file in the office of the Provost/Vice-President for Academic and Student Affairs for use by appropriate committee members. It should be understood that the confidentiality of such file is to be protected and its contents to be used solely for the purpose of making tenure and/or promotion recommendations.

2. Areas Evaluated

a. Teaching

Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to the following:

- A narrative explaining the instructor's development as a teacher and his or her application of pedagogical theory
- Syllabi, teaching resource guides, web materials, posted notes, and other teaching materials
- Creative, challenging, and competent student learning evaluation measures such as examinations, quizzes, writing assignments, and other assignments appropriate for the subject matter
- Copies of graded material that shows appropriate rigor and engagement in the assessment of student work
- New course preparation or course component, special pedagogical practices, and/or special tutorial/individualized work
- Curriculum development
- Records of advising, and/or counseling
- Peer evaluations from colleagues
- Letters of support from students
- Evidence of student learning opportunities beyond the classroom that are relevant to the discipline such as a film program, a class trip, a campus event, or some similar co-curricular opportunity
- Documentation showing participation in campus initiatives related to teaching such as learning communities, honors programs, and applied learning
- Documentation showing respect for students.

b. Service

i Students

Evidence of service to students may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Examples of student projects not associated with the faculty member's assigned workload
- Notes, slides, and or programs for out-of-class seminars to students on academic and student affairs topics
- Documentation of academic advising (including number of advisees) and mentoring activities such as sponsorship of independent student work.

ii Institution

Evidence of institutional service may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Documentation showing leadership provided for a committee or an academic unit, such as reports, memos, and so forth
- Documentation showing membership on Faculty Senate or active membership on a Faculty Senate, institutional, or departmental committee, such as bills proposed, assignments completed and so forth

- Documentation of representation of the institution on a community project or in a partnership project.

iii Discipline/Profession

Evidence of service to the discipline or profession may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Documentation of accreditation activities
- Documentation of professional journal editorship or serving as a peer reviewer or juror
- Documentation of professional conference, panel, or event organization
- Documentation showing elected office in a professional society
- Documentation showing other work in a professional association.

iv Community

Evidence of community service relevant to one's discipline may include, but is not limited to the following:

- Program from presentations or performances open to the public
- Documentation from economic or community development activities
- Documentation showing service as a board member for a community non-profit organization
- Documentation showing program consultation
- Documentation showing work with area literacy groups
- Written or video work in non-academic media outlets.

c. Scholarship/Creative Activity

All scholarship/creative activity **MUST** be accompanied by, or show evidence of, some form of peer review.

i Scholarship of Discovery includes basic research or creative expression.

Examples include, but are not limited to the following:

- A published article, monograph, or book that advances understanding (Such artifacts have been reviewed by peers in the publication process)
- Original research presented in an academic paper or other academic venue (Such artifacts have been judged by peers in the review process as worthy of public discussion)
- Artifacts such as poems, paintings, theatrical productions (or other works of original expression) that have been reviewed in a jury process
- A successful grant application for basic research/ scholarly/ creative activity.

ii Scholarship of Integration includes scholarly work that reviews and/or integrates prior research. Examples include, but are not limited to the following:

- A published article or textbook or a juried presentation that summarizes or synthesizes earlier scholarly work and/or crosses disciplinary boundaries. (Such artifacts have been reviewed by peers in the publication process)
- A published book or software review or a review article. (Such artifacts have been invited/ authorized by or selected by peers for publication)

- Presentations selected for a scholarly/professional meeting which present a critique or frame a position (paper) in a scholarly/professional debate
 - Published bibliographies
 - Artifacts that are published or presented that provide critical analysis of scholarly projects, artistic exhibits or performances, or museum exhibits
 - Successful grant applications for projects that integrate already existing scholarly resources.
- iii **Scholarship of Application** includes scholarly work that applies current knowledge and innovations to important practices. Examples include, but are not limited to the following:
- artistic exhibits or performances, or museum exhibits
 - Publications or juried presentations that focus on applications or practical problems in the field
 - Activities to acquire or maintain certification for disciplinary specialties (process should be described)
 - Consulting (peer reviewed)
 - Successful grant applications for projects that focus on application problems.
- iv. **Scholarship of Teaching** includes scholarship that focuses on the nature and improvement of teaching. Examples include, but are not limited to the following:
- Publications or juried presentations that focus on issues of pedagogy or any aspect of the instructional mission of the institution
 - Written studies or reviews (that include a peer review element), which focus on assessment
 - Successful grant applications for projects that focus on practical problems linked to any dimension of instruction.

References

Boyer, E.L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Diamond, R.M. (2002). Defining scholarship for the twenty-first century. In K.J. Zahorski (ed.), *Scholarship in the postmodern era: New venues, new values, new visions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

F. PROMOTION/TENURE TIMETABLE

1. Initiation of Procedure

Promotion and tenure recommendations originate in the department. Both the departmental review committee and the chairperson produce an evaluation in a tenure review. Material prepared for a tenure review serves also as a promotion package for the rank of Associate Professor. Both the departmental committee and the chairperson provide a promotion recommendation as well as a tenure recommendation.

Promotion to the rank of Professor utilizes the same basic procedure outlined for the tenure

review/ Associate Professor promotion. That is, a candidate's package is reviewed first by a departmental committee and then by the chairperson. Each produces a promotion recommendation.

2. Preparation and Routing of Materials: Candidate and Chairperson

By October 15, the candidate for promotion/tenure presents his/her evaluation package to the department chairperson.

The departmental committee will provide a copy of the committee evaluation/recommendation and the supporting rationale to the faculty candidate by December 1, the final date by which to give the recommendation to the chairperson. The candidate may respond to the recommendation by the committee by submitting a written response to the department chairperson by 4:30 p.m. no later than the third working day after December 1. At the candidate's request, this written response will become a permanent part of the evaluation package.

By December 1, departmental committee must return the candidate's evaluation package to the department chairperson. The chairperson has the responsibility of evaluating the evidence presented by the faculty member as well as any other material available, placing these materials into a department perspective, and making evaluative judgments in the three areas. By January 7, the chairperson will submit his or her recommendations and the rationale for these recommendations to the dean. The chairperson will provide a copy of the recommendation and the supporting rationale to the faculty candidate at the time the recommendation is submitted to the dean. A copy of the recommendation must be delivered to the faculty candidate's office or mailbox by January 7. The candidate may respond to the chairperson's recommendation. Such response will be submitted in written form to the dean by 4:30 p.m. of the third working day after January 7. At the candidate's request, this written response will become a permanent part of the evaluation package.

3. Review and Recommendation: Dean

By February 1, the dean will review the materials submitted by the chairperson along with any response by the candidate and will make a recommendation on promotion/tenure, with rationale, to the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs along with the candidate's evaluation package. A copy of the recommendation and rationale will be sent to the Promotion/Tenure Committee. The dean will provide a copy of the recommendation and supporting rationale to the candidate at the same time the recommendation is submitted to the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs. This recommendation must be delivered to the faculty candidate's office or mailbox by February 1. If the candidate wishes to respond to the dean's recommendation, he or she must do so in writing to the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs by 4:30 p.m. of the third working day after February 1. At the candidate's request, this written response will become a permanent part of the evaluation package.

4. Review and Recommendation: Promotion & Tenure Committee

The Faculty Promotion/Tenure Committee will, after February 3, have access to all evaluation materials submitted to the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student

Affairs. Using these materials, the Faculty Promotion/Tenure committee will review the recommendations of the department chairperson and the dean along with any responses submitted by the candidate. By April 4, the Promotion/Tenure Committee's recommendation with supporting rationale, attached to the evaluation materials, will be submitted to the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs. The recommendation will consist of a yes or no vote by the committee, accompanied by a list of strengths and weaknesses of the candidate and the rationale. The Chairman of the Promotion/Tenure Committee will provide a copy of the recommendation and supporting rationale to the candidate at the same time the recommendation is submitted to the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs. This recommendation must be delivered to the faculty candidate's office or mailbox by April 4. If the candidate wishes to respond to the committee's recommendation, he or she must do so in writing to the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs by 4:30 p.m. of the third working day after April 4. At the candidate's request, this written response will become a permanent part of the evaluation package.

The candidate has the option of appearing before the subcommittee reviewing his or her evaluation package to briefly discuss materials documented in the evaluation package. Applicants will not have the option of appearing before the entire Promotion/Tenure Committee. No new materials may be introduced. To exercise this option, the candidate must notify the Promotion/Tenure Committee chairperson in writing by February 3. The Promotion/Tenure Committee chairperson will contact the subcommittee members who must arrange to meet with the candidate prior to any full committee discussion and/or voting on this candidate.

5. Review and Recommendation: Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.

By May 5, the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs will review all promotion/tenure recommendations and any candidate's responses and make recommendations with rationale to the President. Should the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs and the Promotion/Tenure Committee fail to agree on a promotion/tenure recommendation, the Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs will attempt to resolve the disagreement before making a recommendation to the President. The Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs will provide a copy of the recommendation and supporting rationale to the candidate at the same time the recommendation is submitted to the President. This recommendation must be delivered to the faculty candidate's office or mailbox by May 5. If the candidate wishes to respond to the committee's recommendation, he or she must do so in writing to the President by 4:30 p.m. of the third working day after May 5. At the candidate's request, this written response will become a permanent part of the evaluation package.

NOTE: During the promotion/tenure cycle, if the university is officially closed on the date materials or responses are due, those items may be submitted on the next official university business day.

6. President's Recommendation and Board's Approval

The President's recommendation will be placed before the Board of Governors for final

disposition. Promotion granted by the Board will be effective with the next year's contract and will include the following salary adjustments, which shall be in effect through AY2005-2006 (at which they shall be reviewed), for full-time faculty members:

| | |
|---------------------|---------|
| Assistant Professor | \$2,000 |
| Associate Professor | \$3,500 |
| Professor | \$5,000 |

SUMMARY OF PROMOTION/TENURE TIMETABLE

| FROM | TO | DATE |
|---|---|------------|
| Candidate | Department Chairperson | October 15 |
| Department Chairperson | Department Committee | October 17 |
| Department Committee | Department Chairperson | December 1 |
| Chairperson | Dean | January 7 |
| Dean | Provost / Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs | February 1 |
| Provost / Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs | Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee | February 3 |
| Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee | Provost / Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs | April 4 |
| Provost / Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs | President | May 5 |
| President | Board of Governors | |

[Procedural forms for this policy are attached to these minutes.]

GAC Summary: It was recommended that the wording of the Evaluation Code on the

Annual Faculty Evaluation Form be revised. Also, under Section E.2., the areas evaluated should be in the following order: teaching, scholarship/creative activities, and service. This should be changed on the Evaluation Form as well.

The wording of the Evaluation Code will be taken back to Faculty Senate and brought back at a future meeting.

Presidential Action: The President signed this proposal on May 21, 2006.

GAC #9 – Academic Honesty Policy

Source of Proposal: Faculty Senate

Purpose of Proposal: New Policy

Current Policy or Procedure: None

Proposed Policy or Procedure:

Academic Honesty Policy and Due Process

Academic honesty is required in all academic endeavors. Violations of academic honesty include any instance of plagiarism, cheating, seeking credit for another's work, falsifying documents or academic records, or any other fraudulent classroom activity.

Violations of academic honesty may result in a failing grade on the assignment, failure in the course, or expulsion from school. When a student's grade has been affected, violations of academic honesty will be reported to the Provost or the designated representative.

Violations of Academic Honesty

Violations of academic honesty include, but are not limited to, the following activities:

1. Copying another person's work and claiming it as your own;
2. Using the work of a group of students when the assignment requires individual work;
3. Looking at or attempting to look at an examination before it is administered;
4. Using materials during an examination that are not permitted;
5. Allowing another student to take your exam for you;
6. Intentionally impeding the academic work of others;
7. Using any electronic device to transmit portions of questions or answers on an examination to other students;
8. Using any electronic device to improperly store information for an exam;
9. Knowingly furnishing false information to the University or its representatives.
10. Assisting other students in any of the acts listed above.

Definition of Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a specific kind of academic dishonesty in which you take another's ideas or words and claim them as your own. When you draw on someone else's work, you must indicate the source of that material, whether you are repeating another's words, argument or thought. Even if you paraphrase another's work and are not using the exact wording, you are still required to indicate the source of the material. This material must be clearly identified with appropriate citations. If you do not do that, you have plagiarized those materials. Any time you copy and paste any writing that is not your own for an assignment, you must use quotation marks and give the source of that material. If you cut and paste without noting what you have done, you will be guilty of plagiarism. Even if the writing is your own, if it has been used for a previous assignment that should be indicated.

Student Due Process Procedure

A student accused of academic dishonesty will first meet with the faculty member who made the allegation of academic dishonesty. If the faculty member decides academic dishonesty occurred, consequences could include giving the student a zero on the assignment, asking the student to rewrite the assignment, or failing the student in the course. If the student's grade is affected, the faculty member must file a MWSU Academic Honesty Violation Report. If the student disagrees with the faculty member's decision, the student may submit a written appeal of that decision within ten days to the department chairperson and request a meeting with the department chair. In the event there is no assigned chairperson, the request should be made to the college dean. The chairperson's decision shall be provided in writing to the student and faculty member within ten days. Should the student or faculty member disagree with the chairperson's decision, a written appeal may be made within ten days to the Provost or designated representative to present the case to the Academic Honesty Committee. The Committee will base its decision on the written statements and evidence submitted by the student and the faculty member. The Committee's decision, which must be made within 30 days, is final. If it is determined that no violation of academic honesty has occurred, the student's alleged violation will be removed from his or her record.

Any student who has been found guilty of violating the academic honesty policy a second time will be reported by the Provost to the Dean of Student Development for disciplinary action.

[Procedural forms for this policy are attached to these minutes.]

GAC Summary: This proposal will be forwarded to the President.

Presidential Action: Dr. Scanlon signed this proposal on May 21, 2006.

GAC #10 – Academic Honesty Policy

Source of Proposal: Faculty Senate

Purpose of Proposal: New Policy

Current Policy or Procedure: None

Proposed Policy or Procedure:

This Faculty Senate passed a Bylaw change that establishes the Academic Honesty Committee to implement the Academic Honesty Policy spelled out in GAC Academic Honesty Policy 1. The addition (below) to the 2005-2006 *Policy Guide* should be included in Appendix L Bylaws of the Faculty Senate under III. F. Purposes, Membership and Duties of Standing Committees as a new item, number 11, currently on page 260.

11. Academic Honesty Committee

Purpose: This committee serves as the final review board for violations of the Academic Honesty Policy.

Membership: The committee shall be composed of one member from each college and three additional members from the faculty at large. The committee shall elect a chairperson whose responsibility it is to receive documents, convene the committee and sign documents on behalf of the committee.

Duties: The committee will act as the final review board for students who have been accused of violating the Academic Honesty Policy. The committee will base its decision on the written statements and evidence submitted by the student and the faculty member. The committee's decision, which must be made within 30 days, is final. If it is determined that no violation of academic honesty has occurred, the committee will recommend to the Provost that the student's alleged violation be removed from his or her record.

GAC Summary: This proposal will be forwarded to the President for his approval.

Presidential Action: Dr. Scanlon signed this proposal on May 21, 2006.

GAC #11 – Academic Honesty Policy

Source of Proposal: Faculty Senate

Purpose of Proposal: New Policy

Current Policy or Procedure: None

Proposed Policy or Procedure:

This Faculty Senate has proposed a new academic honesty policy (GAC Academic Honesty Policy 1) and has passed a Bylaw change that establishes the Academic Honesty Committee to implement the Academic Honesty Policy (Academic Honesty Policy 2). The Faculty Senate also passed and is sending to GAC the following recommendation:

Recommend that the Student Handbook be revised so that the current (2005-2006) Academic Honesty Policy and Due Process sections (page 9) be deleted and replaced by the new Academic Honesty Policy and Due Process provisions.

GAC Summary: This proposal will be forwarded to the President for his approval.

Presidential Action: Dr. Scanlon signed this proposal on May 21, 2006.

GAC #12 – Four New Graduate Programs

Source of Proposal: Faculty Senate ad hoc Graduate Studies Committee

Purpose of Proposal: New Policy/Procedure

Current Policy or Procedure: None

Proposed Policy or Procedure: The Graduate Studies Committee is forwarding four graduate curriculum proposals for consideration. Program start dates are expected to be Fall 2007 for the three MAS programs. The certificate in Teaching of Writing is to begin July 2006. Please contact the Office of Academic and Student Affairs for details regarding the proposals.

GAC Summary: This proposal will be forwarded to the President for his approval.

Presidential Action: Dr. Scanlon signed this proposal on May 21, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennie McDonald
Secretary