

FPAC FACULTY SUBCOMMITTEE

PERSONNEL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Background/Grandfathering

Because of the important policy shifts in this document (specifically in regards to timelines), the issue of grandfathering was included in this section. Tenure-track faculty must declare their intent by the time the policies go into effect, and faculty applying for promotion would be covered under the new policy.

II. Rationale and Principles

The term “Fairness” was changed to “Equity” to better reflect the intent of the document, and the “Broad-Based Review” bullet-point was deleted because all of the issues raised were already covered in subsequent bullet-points (Equity, Non-Bias, and Appeal).

III. Relationship between University Policies and Unit Policies

We’ve added some language here that introduces the concept of department policy review by the University Personnel Committee.

V.A. Career Timelines

The original document had a break between years 4 & 6 during the tenure process; we have changed that to a break between years 3 & 5 to allow for more review near the end of the process and to make the candidate aware of any issues before they come up for continuing appointment.

V.B. Modified Timelines

In the original document, no language was included to address work/life balance issues for faculty on the tenure-track. This document contains a new section that addresses procedures for pausing the tenure clock for various reasons.

Faculty may also avail themselves of other options, such as modified duties and modified course offerings, procedures for which are being developed and will be available from Human Resources.

These options will be open to all faculty, not just those on the tenure-track, and may not affect the reappointment timeline. They may affect how faculty are evaluated, so mention of them is made in this document where appropriate.

V.C. Annual Timelines

The original draft set the due date for dossiers on September 1st. We changed this to October 1st to both allow the candidate to collect any documents that they’d need (including peer evaluations) and to lessen the burden on department personnel committees (which would otherwise be working on both dossiers and DSI simultaneously).

Tenure-track calendars for both the new policy and the old policy as well as a promotion calendar have been included in the document.

V.E. Evaluation Process

There was broad faculty consensus that the March 2009 Draft Policies were too prescriptive in defining the ability of departments to create their own personnel policies. This section has been completely rewritten in order to ensure departments broad autonomy in defining departmental review processes and standards.

At the same time, our review of departmental policies revealed that important elements of the review process are not clearly articulated by many departments. We have consequently identified a number of critical elements in the process and specified that departments must address them in departmental policies.

Most importantly, we have rejected the original Draft’s requirement for external representatives on personnel committees, but made requests for an external reviewer for tenure and promotion decisions optional for both departments and candidates. We hope that requests by candidates for an external reviewer will not be construed as questioning the judgment of DPCs, and that requests for external reviewers by DPCs will not be construed as indicating a perceived weakness in the candidate. External review plays a valuable role in assessment, particularly when the work in question does not fall within the areas of expertise of the members of the DPC.

FPAC FACULTY SUBCOMMITTEE

PERSONNEL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

V.F. University Personnel Committee

The single most contentious issue included in the March 2009 Draft Policies was the University Personnel Committee. Originally formulated as part of the continuing appointment and promotion process for all faculty, this was met with a large amount of resistance from a majority of both individual and departmental responses.

To counter their concerns, we decided to re-mold the concept of the UPC into a two-prong body responsible for both review of personnel policies at the departmental level and overseeing appeals from both applicants and departments.

V.G. Criteria

Language that suggested that collegiality is a legitimate criterion for evaluating faculty was deleted. The historical record of abuse and invitation for future misapplication were too striking to ignore.

“Section V.E.8. Expectations for promotion for faculty who assume significant positions within the University” was removed because rewarding faculty and staff for administrative work in lieu of scholarship may be inconsistent with BOT policies and places those faculty and staff members in ongoing conflict of interest situations.

Language that required evidence or proof of "continued progress" in the areas of evaluation was removed as well. Such evidence or proof would be either vacuous or redundant. Moreover, such language suggests the groundwork of a movement toward the unilateral imposition of post-tenure review.

Language was changed to reduce the emphasis on one specific philosophy of scholarship (i.e. Boyer). Instead, the subcommittee asserted department autonomy in deciding what criteria would be considered as scholarship. This was done in deference to the critical differences among academic units in terms of market conditions, operating conditions, and national self-image.

V.H. Department Policies

More emphasis was given here to the concept of the responsibility of each department to keep their policies up-to-date and readily available to their tenure-track faculty. It is our assertion that the lack of current policies at the department level is one of the most important issues this document can help to address.

V.I. Documentation

We felt that mentors should be mentioned (in V.I.2.f) to encourage departments to create mentoring programs for their own tenure-track faculty. The section on continuing growth was deleted because of our decision to promote three major sections within the dossier and not five (both mastery of subject matter and continuing growth are discussed as being inherent in all sections of the dossier).

Final Note

The process whereby these recommendations and pre-draft document were worked out and finalized began in the summer of 2009 with the creation of the FPAC Faculty Subcommittee with faculty and chairs from throughout the various disciplines on campus. Meetings commenced on August 24, 2009, after which the committee met every two weeks to discuss and deliberate each major issue raised during the Spring semester, and concluded on November 16, 2009 with the completion of the pre-draft document. An overview of the recommendations were distributed and discussed with the University Senate, the University Senate Executive Board, and the chairs of the Colleges of Arts & Humanities and Natural & Social Sciences as well as tenured and tenure-track faculty in separate forums. An immense amount of work has gone into revising what was given to us and creating that which did not yet exist, and it is the hope of this subcommittee that the process that follows our work goes as smoothly and as effectively as it has for us. I would personally and publicly like to thank the members of this subcommittee for their hard work and dedication to their fellow faculty: Ray Belliotti, Ann Carden, Michael Jabot, Adrienne McCormick, Samantha Kenney, Beez Schell, John Staples and Kim Tillery.

Sincerely,

Rob Deemer
FPAC Faculty Subcommittee Chair



State University of New York at Fredonia

POLICIES ON REAPPOINTMENT, CONTINUING/PERMANENT APPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION OF FACULTY AND UUP PROFESSIONAL STAFF

I. Background on These Policies

The policies in this document outline the rationales, definitions, procedures, and processes for personnel reviews of term (tenure-track) faculty¹ and United University Professions (UUP) professional staff at the State University of New York at Fredonia. In compliance with the *Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York* (2006) and the Agreement between the State of New York and United University Professions (July 2, 2007 – July 1, 2011), these policies define and clarify institutional standards and expectations at SUNY Fredonia.

They are based in part on the work of the Task Force on Personnel Policies², which was appointed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs in Spring 2007 as partial fulfillment of the Memorandum of Understanding between SUNY Fredonia and the State University of New York. This Task Force met throughout the 2007-08 academic year and submitted in May 2008 a report of findings and recommendations for tenure-track faculty and UUP professional staff. The recommendations of the 2002 Task Force on the Evaluation of Teaching³ were also adapted and included in these policies, which replace previous versions of personnel policies in the Campus Handbook and on the Human Resources website. The Academic Affairs Vice President's Council⁴ provided a draft of personnel policies in academic year 2008-09, building on these earlier documents. In academic year 2009-10, three subcommittees of the Faculty and Professional Affairs Committee (FPAC) were charged with developing recommendations for personnel policies to FPAC⁵, which then provided an initial Final Draft to the University Senate. The policies were discussed in the University Senate on _____ and _____ and approved in their current format on _____, to go into effect on September 1, 2010.

¹ Except where otherwise noted, the term "faculty" in this document includes department/school faculty and library faculty.

² Members of this Task Force who were approved by the University Senate (April 30, 2007) and served for all or part of 2007-08 were Richard Reddy and Maggie Bryan-Peterson (co--chairs); Nancy Hagedorn, Tom Loughlin, Larry Maheady, Averl Otis, Jodi Rzepka, Monica White, Kerrie Wilkes, and Julia Wilson.

³ Members of this Task Force who served in Spring 2002 were Jack Berkley and Joan Burke (co-chairs); Bob Booth, Roger Byrne, Bill Jungels, Barbara Mallette, Richard Reddy, Joe Straight, and Paul Schwartz.

⁴ Members of this administrative Council were Virginia Horvath (facilitator); David Ewing, Randy Gadikian, Christine Givner, Melinda Karnes, Kevin Kearns, John Kijinski, Karen Klose, Beez Schell, and Eric Skowronski.

⁵ Members of the FPAC Faculty Subcommittee were Rob Deemer (chair), Ray Belliotti, Ann Carden, Michael Jabot, Adrienne McCormick, Samantha Kenney, Beez Schell, John Staples, and Kim Tillery.

These new policies shall be followed by all new faculty hired for the 2010-11 academic year and thereafter. Faculty already on the tenure-track are "grandfathered" and may choose whether they want to be evaluated using the previous guidelines and timelines or those outlined in this policy. By September 1, 2010, faculty must make clear in a memo to their Chairs/Unit Directors whether they wish to follow the new timelines in these policies, or to follow their initial timelines for reappointment, continuing appointment and promotion. Tenured faculty seeking promotion to full professor shall follow the guidelines and timelines outlined in this policy.

II: Rationales and Principles for These Policies

These policies were developed with these rationales in mind:

- To clarify in a single document—approved after broad discussion—the expectations and policies for personnel reviews for term faculty and UUP professional staff;
- To clarify for term faculty and UUP professional staff the processes and policies for their reappointment, continuing/permanent appointment, and promotion, as well as the relationships among these forms of personnel review;
- To clarify for term faculty and UUP professional staff the ways SUNY Fredonia defines key terms related to faculty and professional performance and the criteria for evaluation;
- To clarify for term faculty and UUP professional staff the documentation needed for personnel reviews;
- To clarify for term faculty and UUP professionals the career timetable for personnel reviews and the annual/periodic reviews that lead to continuing appointment and permanent appointment;
- To clarify for academic departments⁶, library, and administrative units the processes and policies for conducting personnel reviews;
- To provide, where possible, institutional consistency in processes and policies so that each term faculty and UUP professional, regardless of department or unit, is afforded the same rights and opportunities for fair review;
- To provide a framework to guide the library, academic departments, and administrative units in reviewing and revising the personnel review policies in their department/unit handbooks.

These policies outline the way SUNY Fredonia rewards and retains its valued teacher-scholars and professionals, sustains excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service, and ensures the intellectual vitality of the university. These policies provide clear, equitable, and transparent processes so that individuals, departments, library, and colleges are aware of expectations and standards for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion.

These policies are intended to ensure these principles:

- **Equity:** the policies will be used to evaluate all individuals eligible for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion, regardless of department, unit, or college affiliation.
- **Transparency:** this policy and any subsequent revisions will be publicly available and reviewed by all new faculty and professional staff.

⁶ In this document, the term "department" refers to the local academic unit, which includes the School of Music as an academic unit. The School of Business is comparable to a college in its structure, with two departments reporting to a Dean.

- Non-bias: In all cases, reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion reviews and decisions will be made without regard to race, religion, gender, gender identity, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, national origin, personal relationships, and other forms of overt or covert discrimination. All evaluations will be based on objective information, evidence supplied by the candidate, and observations of peers.
- Ongoing contributions: It is assumed that those who are granted continuing appointment and promotion will continue to make substantial contributions to their profession, department, college, SUNY Fredonia, and the community.
- Appeal: All individuals have the right to appeal reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion decisions and to correct errors of fact in evaluation.

III: Relationship of These Policies with Unit Policies

It is campus policy that each academic department or administrative unit has written guidelines detailing local procedure for personnel reviews. These guidelines shall be distributed within the department or unit, available on the department or unit website, and available on the Human Resources website. They must also be on file in the appropriate supervisor or Dean's office as well as the office of the appropriate Vice President.

The personnel review policies of the library, academic departments and units, and administrative units should supplement the institutional policies in this document, providing specific details about how the general terms included here apply within a specific discipline and unit culture. Because each unit has a unique identity, goals, and values, these policies encourage flexibility in personnel review processes. However, to be consistent with institutional policies, department/unit handbooks and policies are likely to need some revision and updating to be consistent with this document; where conflicts exist between these institutional policies and current departmental/unit policies, the University Personnel Committee (see section V.F.) will review the discrepancies and make recommendations to the department and dean either for revisions to the departmental policy or for granting an exception to the university policy.

IV: The Goals of Personnel Review

SUNY Fredonia engages in careful, rigorous, and fair processes of personnel review so that term faculty and UUP professional staff have clear ideas of their roles and responsibilities, several opportunities to demonstrate the ways their contributions benefit their department, unit, library, and the campus, and several opportunities for feedback at multiple levels. Effective personnel review also ensures that term faculty who are granted continuing appointment (the SUNY term for *tenure*)⁷ and term UUP professionals who are granted permanent appointment meet the standards of their departments/units and show promise of continued effective contributions to the educational, scholarly/creative, community engagement, and operational missions of SUNY Fredonia. The continuing strength of academic programs and institutional effectiveness depends in large part on careful review of those entrusted with implementing the university mission.

⁷ The terms "continuing appointment" and "tenure" are used interchangeably throughout this document.

V: Review of Term (Tenure-Track) Department/School Faculty⁸

V.A. Career Timelines for Faculty Reviews

V.A.1. Regular timeline for reappointments leading to continuing appointment

Consistent with the *Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York* reappointment reviews for a ten-month term Assistant Professor occur according to this timeline:

<i>Year of service</i>	<i>Review for</i>
1 st	2 nd -year reappointment
2 nd	3 rd -and 4 th -year reappointment
3 rd	5 th - and 6 th -year reappointment
5 th	7 th -year reappointment
6 th	Continuing Appointment (takes effect at the start of 8 th year)

In the 2nd and 3rd year, departments reserve the right to reappoint candidates to a one-year term, instead of two years, as a means of providing further guidance to the candidate.

If a term faculty member is initially appointed by SUNY Fredonia as Associate Professor, this timeline for reviews is in effect:

<i>Year of service</i>	<i>Review for</i>
1 st	2 nd - and 3 rd -year reappointment
2 nd	Continuing Appointment (takes effect at the beginning of 4 th year)

V.A.2. Timeline based on Prior Service Credit

According to the *Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York*, term faculty may request up to three years of credit toward review for continuing appointment, based on prior service in a tenure-track position at another institution (see *Policies XI.B.3.d*). Within one month of the initial appointment, eligible term faculty may request Prior Service Credit by submitting a completed form (<http://www.fredonia.edu/humanresources/forms/servicecredit.pdf>) to the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Once eligibility is confirmed by the Human Resources office, the Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies faculty of approval of 1-3 years Prior Service Credit. As an example, with two years of Prior Service Credit, the regular timeline would be adjusted to reflect continuing appointment review in two fewer years:

<i>Year of service</i>	<i>Review for</i>
1 st	2 nd year reappointment
2 nd	3 rd and 4 th year reappointment
3 rd	5 th year reappointment
4 th	Continuing Appointment (takes effect at start of 6 th year)

⁸ This section of the policies clarifies review for term faculty in academic departments and the School of Music. Section VI focuses on review for term library faculty.

V.A.3. Regular timeline for promotion to Associate Professor

Normally review for continuing appointment and promotion to Associate Professor occurs at the same time, in the 6th year of appointment. Although continuing appointment is granted beginning with the 8th year of service, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is in effect at the beginning of the 7th year. In rare circumstances, continuing appointment may be granted without promotion.

V.A.4. Regular timeline for promotion to Professor

Review for promotion to Professor may occur 5 or more years after the rank of Associate Professor was attained. For example, if promotion to Associate Professor took effect on September 1, 2010, review for promotion to Professor could occur as early as September 1, 2015. If granted, promotion would take effect September 1 of the following year.

V.A.5. Early review for continuing appointment or promotion in rank

Only in exceptional cases will application for early continuing appointment or early promotion be considered. See the expectations for early continuing appointment and promotion in section V.G.6. In such cases, the review would normally occur no more than one full year early.

V.B. Modified Reappointment Timeline

The university recognizes the need for all tenure-track faculty members to balance the commitments of family and work. Special circumstances can cause substantial alterations to one's daily routine, thus creating a need to pause the tenure clock, fulfill a modified workload and/or a flexible schedule for a period of time.

Tenure-track faculty members have several options they may pursue when such circumstances arise. *The Policies of the Board of Trustees* and the UUP Agreement allow for faculty members to take unpaid leave under the terms of the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA). The following options provide alternatives to FMLA that would *not* require faculty members to take unpaid leave when issues arise that affect the balance of work and life commitments:

V.B.1. Pausing the Tenure Clock

V.B.1.a. When a faculty member is granted a pause in the tenure clock, that faculty member is not expected to be working on scholarly or creative activities, nor on performing service activities, during the period of time in which the tenure clock is paused. The faculty member is expected to maintain normal teaching responsibilities, unless he or she has also been granted a period of modified duties or unless other arrangements have been made.

V.B.1.b. Tenure-track faculty members have the option to request a pause of the tenure clock, either in conjunction with or separate from, a request for modified duties, modified course offerings, or leave granted pursuant to other provisions of the *Policies of the Board of Trustees*. Time off the tenure clock must be applied for and granted without regard to leave or modified duties status. The decision by the University to grant a pause of the tenure clock will be separate from any decision regarding proposed modified duties, modified course offerings, or grant of leave. Tenure-track faculty members may request that the tenure clock be paused for a period of time when any of the following

circumstances would seriously impair the faculty member's capacity to build the record of accomplishment he or she judges appropriate for professional satisfaction and tenure review:

- i. Physical or mental illness or other physical condition
- ii. Pregnancy, adoption or foster child placement
- iii. Substantial caregiver responsibility for someone with whom the tenure-track faculty member has an important relationship, including family and household, and including caregiver support for a partner who has given birth
- iv. Military service or obligations for self or partner
- v. Legal concerns, including but not limited to the settling of estates or the processing of divorce, custody deliberations or disputes, or civil suits or the defense of felony criminal charges
- vi. Pursuit of an advanced degree
- vii. Title F leaves or grant-related work

V.B.1.c. The above list of circumstances is not intended to be exhaustive, but instead is intended to be illustrative in nature. This policy recognizes that a variety of circumstances and conditions can occur that would make it beneficial to the faculty member and the University to pause the tenure clock temporarily. Pursuant to this policy, the University will agree to pause the tenure clock in semester or academic year increments; further, the University will grant a pause in the tenure clock for no more than two years, total, in the aggregate for any tenure-track faculty member.

V.B.1.d. Application for a pause of the tenure clock will be made by the individual faculty member to the Chair or Director of the academic unit and the Dean, using the Pausing the Tenure Clock⁹ form available from the Human Resources Office. The Dean will recommend to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

V.B.1.e. A pause of the tenure clock will not be counted against candidates when they resume the reappointment process. Candidates who are granted such requests are not expected to produce more work commensurate to the additional time that will accrue in their total time in appointment as a tenure-track faculty member. Candidates for continuing appointment will be evaluated on equal terms with candidates who had no need to pause the tenure clock.

V.B.1.f. *Individual academic units must include sections in their Department/Unit handbooks and personnel policies clarifying to individuals and personnel committees within those units the procedures to be followed in assuring that faculty who pause the tenure clock temporarily are not penalized for doing so.*

⁹ A draft of the Pausing the Tenure Clock form is not yet available, but models are being developed for HR.

V.B.1.g. Current practice under the Policies of the Board of Trustees allows two mechanisms for pausing the tenure clock: moving the individual from academic rank to qualified academic rank, with the assurance that movement back to academic rank is automatic after the period of time during which the tenure clock is paused; or decreasing the individual's status to part-time (e.g. 99%), with the assurance that movement back to full-time is automatic after the period of time during which the tenure clock is paused¹⁰. During a pause in the tenure clock, the faculty member is not reviewed. When the clock restarts, the faculty member picks up where he or she left off. Evidence of teaching effectiveness during the period of the paused tenure clock may be used in the subsequent reappointment dossiers, and any scholarly/creative activity that may have come to fruition during the period is likewise eligible for inclusion in subsequent dossiers. For example, something in the pipeline before the tenure clock was paused may appear in print during a pause in the tenure clock. Any such work counts for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion.

V.B.1.h. If the Department Chair or Unit Director does not support a request for a pause in the tenure clock, the reasons for denial shall be provided in writing within one week of such denial to the Dean. The Dean then recommends to the Vice President for Academic Affairs a decision on the specific request.

V.B.1.i. Candidates who are denied requests for a pause in the tenure clock by the Department Chair or Unit Director and the Dean may appeal to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

V.B.1.j. Candidates who are not being reappointed may not petition for a pause in their tenure clock.

V.B.2. Modified Duties and Modified Course Offerings

Faculty who need flexibility in balancing their work schedules while on the tenure-track may also apply for modified duties and modified course offerings. Procedures for these options are available from the Human Resources Office. Modified duties and modified course offerings do not affect the timeline for reappointment. These options include a full-time work equivalent and thus do not involve a reduction in pay.

V.B.3. Voluntary Reduction in Work Schedule (VRWS)¹¹

Under the VRWS program, an employee can defer a portion of earned income from the period it was actually earned to a period of time the employee would otherwise be on a scheduled unpaid leave. In other words, VRWS is a program that allows employees to voluntarily trade income for time off. This program can help with planned family care events such as birth, adoption, family members' surgery or other medical reasons. This can work in different ways. Faculty can take a pay reduction concurrently with time off, or take a pay reduction for a period of time while working and receive the withheld pay during a later period that would ordinarily be an unpaid leave. The latter allows an employee to spread out the financial burden. As the employee does not have to come off the payroll, this program also helps

¹⁰ It is preferred that faculty not be moved to qualified academic rank, but this would most likely require negotiation between UUP and the State.

¹¹ Labor Education and Resource Network. <<http://www.learnworkfamily.org/cases/uup.html>>.

avoid loss of health insurance that occurs for an unpaid leave beyond the 12 weeks covered by the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA)¹².

V.B.4. Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA)

For details on utilizing the Family and Medical Leave Act for unpaid leave, faculty should contact the Human Resources office. Such leave does not automatically lead to a pause in the tenure clock. Faculty should consult with Chairs or Directors and Deans on combining a pause in the tenure clock with FMLA leave.

V.C. Annual Timelines for Faculty Reviews for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion

Each July, the Vice President for Academic Affairs publishes the Academic Affairs calendar for the upcoming year. The calendar includes the following timelines for review of term faculty beyond the first year (for review of first-year faculty, see section V.D.).

V.C.1. Timeline for reviews in the second, third, and fifth years of appointment

- October 1: Candidate submits dossier to Department
- November 1: Department submits recommendation and dossier to Dean
- December 15: Dean submits recommendation and dossier to Vice President for Academic Affairs
- January 15: Deadline for letters of appeal to be delivered to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the University Personnel Committee
- February 10: Deadline for University Personnel Committee to give recommendations for appeals to the Vice President for Academic Affairs
- March 1: Vice President for Academic Affairs submits recommendation and dossier to President
- April 1: President notifies faculty of reappointment decision

Candidates receiving one-year appointments in the fall of their second and/or third years will resubmit their dossier in the spring and be considered for further reappointment using the following timeline:

- January 15: Candidate submits dossier to Department
- February 19: Department submits recommendation and dossier to Dean
- March 12: Dean submits recommendation and dossier to Vice President for Academic Affairs
- March 22: Deadline for letters of appeal to be delivered to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the University Personnel Committee
- April 2: Deadline for University Personnel Committee to give recommendations for appeals to the Vice President for Academic Affairs
- April 12: Vice President for Academic Affairs submits recommendation and dossier to President
- April 30: President notifies faculty of reappointment decision

¹² Confirmation is still needed on the procedures for this one from Human Resources, but the VRWS option was negotiated for in the 2007-2011 UUP Agreement.

V.C.2. Timeline for continuing appointment and promotion reviews

October 1:	Candidate submits dossier to Department
November 1:	Department submits recommendation and dossier to Dean
December 15:	Dean submits recommendation and dossier to Vice President for Academic Affairs
January 15:	Deadline for letters of appeals to be delivered to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the University Personnel Committee
February 10:	Deadline for University Personnel Committee to give recommendations for appeals to the Vice President for Academic Affairs
March 15:	Vice President for Academic Affairs submits recommendation and dossier to President
May 15:	President notifies faculty of promotion decision and submits continuing appointment recommendation to the Chancellor of the State University of New York
Summer:	Chancellor notifies faculty of continuing appointment decision

V.D. Process and Documentation for First-year Review

V.D.1. Process for first-year faculty (including faculty with or anticipating prior service credit)

V.D.1.a. By December 1, the first-year faculty member submits a 2-3 page Reappointment Statement and an updated *curriculum vitae* to the Department. The Reappointment Statement should address the following questions:

- What experiences, credentials, and scholarly/creative interests will be especially helpful as you define and continue in your role in your Department?
- What will you be doing in the next year to continue to develop as an instructor and advisor?
- What scholarly/creative activities are you planning for the next year? How do these activities fit into your goals for establishing a record of scholarship/creative activity that will lead to continuing appointment?
- In what service roles—such as committees, curriculum, and assessment—do you see yourself making the greatest contributions?

V.D.1.b. At the beginning of the following fall semester—the beginning of the second year of appointment—the faculty member begins to follow the timeline outlined in section V.C.1., submitting a full dossier to the Department. Because this dossier provides an overview of accomplishments in the first year, throughout the academic year the first-year faculty member should collect materials that show what is being done in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, service, and professional development.

V.D.1.c. Throughout the first academic year the candidate should look for opportunities to refine the plan set out in the Reappointment Statement. The candidate should meet with the Department Chair and her/his mentor to discuss a professional development plan, seek peer review of courses, and seek professional development opportunities on campus and in the discipline.

V.D.2. Process for Chairs and Departments

V.D.2.a. The Department should review the Reappointment Statement and submit a recommendation for second-year reappointment to the Dean by January 15. Reviewing a Reappointment Statement differs from reviewing a full dossier in that the questions shift from evaluating evidence to providing feedback on a new faculty member's plan for professional development. In the following fall there will be an opportunity to review the full dossier of activities and accomplishments in the current academic year, so there is no need to look at an incomplete body of evidence for the current Fall.

V.D.2.b. These are the questions that the Department might consider in reviewing the Reappointment Statement:

- How might the experiences, credentials, and scholarly/creative interests of this first-year faculty member be valuable to the department and campus?
- What comments and advice do you have about the first-year faculty member's plan for developing as an instructor and advisor?
- What comments and advice do you have about the first-year faculty member's plan for scholarship/creative activity?
- What mentors or resources would be valuable for this first-year faculty member to know about?

V.D.2.c. After departmental review, a first-year faculty member should meet with his or her Chair to discuss his/her professional development plans. This is an opportunity for conversation about the reappointment statement and elaboration of suggestions and advice that should be in the Chair's letter of recommendation.

V.E. Process for Evaluating Faculty for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion

V.E.1. Review by the Department.

Departmental Personnel Policies shall define the degree of involvement of faculty of all ranks in personnel review processes. It is desirable that the review of faculty for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion should involve input from multiple perspectives, including from tenure-track faculty.

V.E.1.a. Criteria for Department Policies. The process for eliciting input—including whether evaluations are written by individuals or discussed and then summarized by the Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC)—shall be clearly addressed in the policies. Policies shall clearly identify acceptable criteria appropriate to the department, expectations for documentation, and dossier content. Policies shall also address whether a meeting between the candidate and the DPC is required or optional before the committee's recommendation is made.

Individual academic units must include sections in their Department/Unit handbooks and personnel policies clarifying to individuals and to personnel committees within those units the procedures for evaluating faculty who are granted modified duties or modified course offerings, assuring that such procedures do not penalize faculty who pursue these workload options.

All written evaluations used at the department level become part of the review process and are forwarded to subsequent levels of review.

V.E.1.b. Departmental Personnel Committee. The structure, function and authority of the Departmental Personnel Committee shall be defined in the Departmental Personnel Policies. Included within these policies, the departments shall address: the eligibility of untenured faculty to serve on the DPC; the eligibility of DPC members of lower rank than the candidate under review to participate in the assessment of the candidate's application for reappointment/continuing appointment/promotion; the eligibility of the department Chair to be a member of the DPC.

In reviews for continuing appointment or promotion, either the candidate or the DPC may request that the opinion of an external reviewer be obtained, either from a different SUNY Fredonia department or unit, or from outside of SUNY Fredonia. In such a case the initiator of the request will make the request in writing to the Dean, who will consult with all affected parties in choosing the external reviewer.

If there are fewer than three faculty members eligible under the Departmental Personnel Policy to constitute a Departmental Personnel Committee, additional faculty from outside the department will be appointed by the Dean, in consultation with the Chair and faculty.

V.E.1.c. Chair's recommendation to the Dean. Departmental Personnel Policies shall define the relationship between the DPC's recommendation to the Chair and the Chair's recommendation to the Dean. Specifically, Departmental Personnel Policies shall address whether the Chair's recommendation to the Dean may differ from the DPC's recommendation to the Chair, and whether the Chair has the authority to issue a separate letter to the Dean when his/her recommendation differs from that of the DPC.

If Departmental Personnel Policy permits the Chair to submit to the Dean a recommendation that differs from that of the DPC, the candidate, the Dean, and the DPC must be provided with copies of both the Chair's recommendation to the Dean, and the DPC's recommendation to the Chair.

The DPC's recommendation to the Chair, and the Chair's recommendation to the Dean, are memorandums or letters identifying the faculty candidate by current rank and year of service. The letters provide clear recommendations for or against reappointment, continuing appointment, or promotion.

V.E.1.d. Appeal of departmental and/or Chair's recommendation. A candidate has the right to appeal the recommendation of the DPC to the Chair (where the Chair's recommendation is distinct from that of the DPC). A letter of appeal should be submitted at least one week before the Chair's deadline for recommending to the Dean. The candidate should send a copy of the appeal letter to the Department Personnel Committee Chair.

A candidate has the right to appeal the recommendation of the Chair to the Dean. A letter of appeal should be submitted at least one week before the Dean's deadline for recommending to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The candidate should send a copy of the appeal letter to the Department Chair and to the Department Personnel Committee.

V.E.2. Review by the Dean

The Dean's review of faculty for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion should be based on all materials submitted for that personnel review: the dossier, materials from the Personnel Committee, any written evaluations by individuals or groups within the department, recommendation from the Chair, and appeal letter (if one is submitted).

V.E.2.a. Dean's recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Dean's recommendation is a memorandum or letter, addressed to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, identifying the faculty candidate by current rank and year of service. The letter provides a clear recommendation for or against reappointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, based on the Dean's review of the materials in the dossier and evaluation materials submitted by the department. A copy of this recommendation is sent to the faculty candidate and to the Department Chair.

V.E.2.b. Appeal of Dean's recommendation. If the candidate wishes to correct an error or make a comment about the Dean's recommendation, he/she should write a letter of appeal to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the chair of the University Personnel Committee. This letter should be submitted according to the reappointment calendar at least one week before the Vice President's deadline for recommending to the President (see sections V.C.1 and V.C.2). The candidate should send a copy of the appeal letter to the Department Chair and to the Dean.

V.E.3. Review by the Vice President for Academic Affairs

The Vice President's review of faculty for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion is based on evaluation of the dossier and all materials submitted in previous levels of review.

V.E.3.a. Vice President's recommendation to the President of SUNY Fredonia. The Vice President's recommendation is a memorandum or letter addressed to the President, identifying the faculty candidate by current rank and year of service. The letter provides a clear recommendation for or against reappointment, continuing appointment, and/or promotion, based on the Vice President's review of the dossier and all submitted evaluations and recommendations. A copy of this recommendation is sent to the faculty candidate, Department Chair, Dean, and Director of Human Resources.

V.E.3.b. Appeal of the Vice President's recommendation. If the candidate wishes to correct an error or make a comment about the Vice President's recommendation, he/she should write a letter of appeal to the President. This letter should be submitted at least one week before the Vice President's deadline for notifying faculty or recommending to the Chancellor (see sections V.C.1 and V.C.2). The candidate should send a copy of the appeal letter to the Department Chair, Dean, and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

V.E.4. Review by the SUNY Fredonia President

The President's review of faculty for reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion is based on evaluation of the dossier and all materials submitted in previous levels of review. In the case of reappointment, the President notifies faculty of the campus decision to end the process for that academic year. For continuing appointment and promotion, the President sends a recommendation to

the Chancellor of the State University of New York and sends a copy to the faculty candidate, Department Chair, Dean, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Director of Human Resources.

V.E.5. Response from the Chancellor of the State University of New York

In the summer following the recommendation from the President of SUNY Fredonia, the Chancellor notifies the faculty candidate of his/her decision about continuing appointment and/or promotion.

V.F. University Personnel Committee

As was mentioned previously in Section II, two of the principles that these policies intend to ensure are the concepts of broad-based review and appeal, with the intention that the former would reduce the need for the latter. Both of these concepts are to be achieved through the creation of a University Personnel Committee (UPC).

V.F.1. University Personnel Committee

V.F.1.a. Selection of the University Personnel Committee. The UPC is elected from the faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or above at SUNY Fredonia under the same Standing Committee Election guidelines as outlined in the Fredonia University Senate Bylaws.

V.F.1.b. Composition of the University Personnel Committee. The Committee shall have a total of nine representatives: three from the College of Arts and Humanities, two from the College of Natural and Social Sciences, and one each from the College of Education, the School of Business, and Reed Library (at the rank of Librarian). An additional faculty member will be elected by the University Senate, and a non-voting liaison representative will be appointed by UUP.

V.F.1.c. Responsibilities of the University Personnel Committee. The UPC is responsible for reviewing departmental personnel policies in order to ensure consistent treatment of faculty applying for reappointment, continuing appointment and promotion and acting as an appeals body when circumstances in a reappointment, tenure or promotion procedure require such a review.

V.F.2. Review Process

Departmental Personnel Policies are the most important document in the tenure-track faculty member's reappointment and tenure process; each candidate must adhere to his or her own department's personnel policy in order to achieve continuing appointment and promotion, and University administration must interpret each candidate's application and dossier through the lens of the department's policy. Therefore, the need for departmental personnel policies to be clear, thorough and easily accessible is tantamount. To this end, the UPC is charged with periodically reviewing each department's personnel policies and, when necessary, making recommendations to the Dean that would support a consistent sense of process and procedure across campus while allowing each department the latitude to form its own policies meeting departmental needs.

V.F.2.a. Initial Review Process. In the first year after the UPC has been formed, collection and analysis of personnel policies from all departments at SUNY Fredonia will take place. The Initial Review will allow the UPC to gain an overall picture of the various policies from throughout the departments on campus and more accurately interpret each policy.

V.F.2.b. Ongoing Review Process. The UPC will review department personnel policies on a five-year rotation. This rotation will occur the year before each department's five-year review; departments that do not take part in five-year reviews will be scheduled on a recurring five-year schedule by the UPC. Each policy will be analyzed and interpreted in relation to the University Personnel Policy guidelines; while many guidelines are not mandatory and departments have a good amount of flexibility to form their own personnel policies, those policies cannot contradict the policies listed in the University Personnel Policies nor can academic units include additional criteria for reappointment, tenure or promotion beyond those listed in the University Personnel Policies. Once the UPC has examined the departmental policies, it will submit its findings, along with any recommendations, to the Dean and each department's Chair by January 15. This will allow for any discrepancies to be addressed and any changes to be made by the end of the school year.

V.F.3. Appeals Process

An applicant may decide to appeal the recommendation in a reappointment application by the Dean. Similarly, a department may decide to appeal the recommendation of the Dean in a reappointment application if it overturns the department's recommendation. In these cases, applicants or departments may file an appeal with the UPC.

V.F.3.a. Deadlines. Letters of Appeal must be filed with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Chair of the UPC by the deadline listed in the Reappointment Calendar (either January 15 or March 22, depending on which calendar the applicant is working under). The candidate should send a copy of the appeal letter to the Department Chair and the Dean. The UPC shall be required to submit its recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs by the deadline listed in the Reappointment Calendar (February 10 or April 2).

V.F.3.b. Appeals Letters. An appeal shall consist of a letter including a narrative of the process and a brief list of reasons for the appeal.

V.F.3.c. Appeals Process. When the committee convenes the appeals process, all materials, including dossier, letters of recommendation and letter of appeal shall be provided to the UPC. The UPC shall be free to interview any and all pertinent individuals and groups that might assist in the appeal investigation.

V.F.3.d. Recusals. When there is a member on the UPC from the same department as a faculty member under review, that committee member recuses him/herself from the discussion and evaluation of that faculty member.

V.G. Criteria for Evaluating Faculty

Faculty are evaluated based on the criteria outlined in the *Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York*. In addition, these policies identify specific interpretations of these criteria at

SUNY Fredonia, based on institutional mission, commitments, and priorities. Department policies shall provide further specificity for faculty.

V.G.1. Criteria for faculty of the State University of New York

V.G.1.a. Mastery of subject matter. The *Policies* define mastery of subject matter “as demonstrated by such things as advanced degrees, licenses, honors, awards and reputation in the subject matter field” (see *Policies* XII.A.4.a). Generally, mastery of subject matter is evaluated as a condition for hiring in a term position.

V.G.1.b. Effectiveness in teaching. The *Policies* define effectiveness in teaching “as demonstrated by such things as judgment of colleagues, development of teaching materials or new courses and student reaction, as determined from surveys, interviews and classroom observation” (see *Policies* XII.A.4.b).

V.G.1.c. Scholarly ability. The *Policies* define scholarly ability “as demonstrated by such things as success in developing and carrying out significant research work in the subject matter field, contribution to the arts, publications and reputation among colleagues” (see *Policies* XII.A.4.c).

V.G.1.d. Effectiveness of University service. The *Policies* define effectiveness of University service “as demonstrated by such things as college and University public service, committee work, administrative work and work with students or community in addition to formal teacher-student relationships” (see *Policies* XII.A.4.d).

V.G.1.e. Continuing growth. The *Policies* define continuing growth “as demonstrated by such things as reading, research or other activities to keep abreast of current developments in the academic employee’s fields and being able to handle successfully increased responsibility” (see *Policies* XII.A.4.e).

V.G.2. Criteria for faculty of SUNY Fredonia

The criteria for faculty review at SUNY Fredonia are based on those in the *Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York*, as well as the institutional interpretations, commitments, and priorities defined in the sections below. Faculty are evaluated primarily in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, with an understanding that continued mastery of subject matter and continuing growth occur in each of these areas. All areas are to be taken into consideration in all evaluations.

V.G.2.a. SUNY Fredonia statement on effectiveness in teaching. Teaching is the direct educational involvement with students inside and outside the classroom, in virtual learning environments, in advising, and in the activities that enhance learning. Strong teaching also involves scholarly inquiry about one’s practices, knowledge of the curriculum and student learning, attention to course design, and assessment of student learning outcomes. Aspects of teaching may include a variety of activities such as these:

- classroom/studio/laboratory/online instruction
- supervision of student research and creative activity

- academic advising
- supervision of independent study, clinical practice, service learning projects, field experiences, and internships
- course design, management, and organization
- professional development, which allows faculty to stay current in the discipline and in pedagogy
- curriculum development and review
- development of new modes of instruction such as the integration of technology in the classroom and online learning tools for instruction
- collaboration and contribution to the curriculum integrity of a program

Gathering and evaluating evidence of teaching effectiveness should be a routine part of a faculty member's approach to teaching. No single source of information is an adequate assessment of teaching and learning. These are some of the most typical sources of information about effective teaching and learning:

- peer review, which may be based on classroom/studio/laboratory/advising observation or review of teaching portfolios, graded student work, or other course artifacts
- critical narrative reflection on aspects of one's own teaching
- high academic standards in evaluation of student learning, examples of syllabi, and other instructional material, such as paper or project assignments
- curriculum integrity as evidenced by the alignment of course intended learning outcomes and course assessments across the program
- course evaluations completed by students
- quality of students' scholarly and creative work
- new course and curriculum development
- innovations in pedagogy
- participation in professional development activities related to pedagogy and instructional technology
- quality of undergraduate and graduate advising

V.G.2.b. SUNY Fredonia statement on scholarly ability. SUNY Fredonia departments shall define scholarship based upon Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York, the standards of their discipline, the requirements of their professional and certifying associations, the mission of the University, and their specific role in the University. Given the broad array of scholarly activities at SUNY Fredonia, departments are allowed to define scholarship broadly, and interdisciplinary approaches are valued. For the purposes of evaluation, a faculty member may demonstrate evidence of the scholarship of discovery, teaching, integration, application, and/or engagement.¹³

- The *scholarship of discovery* involves the investigation and search for new information, knowledge, theory, and artistic or creative design.

¹³ These categories stem from the research of Ernest L. Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990. See also R. Eugene Rice, *Making a Place for the New American Scholar*, Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1996; Charles E. Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene E. Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1997; and R. M. Diamond, *Aligning Faculty Rewards with Institutional Mission: Statements, Policies, and Guidelines*. Boston, Mass.: Anker, 1999.

- The *scholarship of teaching* includes those activities that expand the knowledge, skills, and abilities of others and make public these activities in order to inform a larger community of teachers. This involves strategies to transmit knowledge that engages, challenges, and actively involves students in order to enhance learning.
- The *scholarship of integration* involves creating connections across disciplines in order to expand and extend knowledge to a larger audience. This may include interdisciplinary connections between the arts, humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, and education.
- The *scholarship of application* involves using a scholar's expertise to help solve problems in and around the university community. Often times, the social issue and/or social institutions define the program for investigation. Such scholarship asks, "How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems? How can it be helpful to individuals as well as institutions?" (Boyer 1990:22). Boyer also notes that in the scholarship of application, scholars are not simply applying knowledge that was previously discovered. Rather, "new intellectual understandings can arise out of the very act of application...theory and practice vitally interact and one renews the other" (23).
- The *scholarship of engagement* means "connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems, to our children, to our schools, to our teachers, and to our cities"¹⁴ (Boyer, 1996). Engaged scholarship requires reciprocal and collaborative knowledge production. While it overlaps with the scholarship of application in addressing problem solving in communities, it differs in structure. Service-learning initiatives and community-based collaborative research are forms of engaged scholarship.

Over the course of an academic career, faculty may engage in activities across this broad mosaic. *Academic units may adopt each of these concepts of scholarship in the manner and to the extent appropriate for their disciplines. All academic units shall make clear in their personnel policies and procedures how they assess scholarly activities for purposes of reappointment, continuing appointment, and promotion. Faculty members are responsible for understanding their academic unit's definition of scholarly activities.*

High quality scholarship and creative activity may be evidenced in many ways. Activities may include but are not limited to the following:

Scholarship of discovery:

- artistic exhibitions, performances, and/or readings featuring original work or performances by the faculty member
- refereed publications (books/articles/chapters/essays/reviews)
- publication of creative writing
- musical compositions and recordings
- presentations at scholarly conferences
- organizing and chairing sessions at scholarly conferences
- serving as a respondent at professional conferences
- participation in professional development activities that focus on improving research productivity or quality
- publication of textbooks and other learning resources
- publication of software

¹⁴ Ernest Boyer. "The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Public Outreach* 1.1 (1996): 11-20.

- editorships
- publication in proceedings of scholarly meetings
- writing and funding of research grants
- organizing symposia and professional meetings
- grants, fellowships, awards, and residences recognizing scholarly research and/or creative activities

Scholarship of teaching:

- research-based collaboration with colleagues in the P-12 system
- publishing a textbook
- peer reviewed curriculum development
- improving the effectiveness of one's own teaching through peer review
- assessing effectiveness of new learning technologies through peer review
- facilitating student presentations outside of the University (documented by review)
- grant applications for developing and refining pedagogy
- developing educational resources to be used by other educators
- writing reviews of books and textbooks in area(s) of expertise
- presentation in written, oral or electronic form within appropriate venues

Scholarship of integration:

- examples listed under scholarship of discovery, but which pertain to interdisciplinary activities beyond the faculty member's primary area of expertise
- published interdisciplinary curricular materials
- grant applications for interdisciplinary endeavors
- lending research-based professional expertise to interdisciplinary organizations

Scholarship of application:

- presentation of applied research in external venues
- case studies
- outreach initiatives that rely on applied research
- consulting with industry or government or local business initiatives
- solving problems by communicating knowledge to the community

Scholarship of engagement:

- leading research-based collaborative community efforts to solve problems
- creating public information networks
- leading or participating in civic literacy initiatives
- chairing or sitting on a community-based task force that requires scholarly expertise
- grant applications for community efforts and initiatives

V.G.2.c. SUNY Fredonia statement on effectiveness of university service. Service is defined as those professional activities that aid the department, college, university, profession, or community. Beyond their individual roles in teaching and scholarship/creative activity, the faculty share responsibility for the academic mission of the university and therefore play significant roles in curriculum development, recruitment, assessment, faculty review, accreditation, academic initiatives, and governance. Such valuable efforts are recognized as important aspects of faculty performance.

Departmental, college, and university service may include many kinds of activities, such as these:

- participation on departmental/college/university committees, advisory boards, task forces, or councils (including hiring and personnel committees)
- participation in faculty meetings
- serving as faculty advisor for student organizations
- assisting with recruitment and orientation of new students
- reviewing internal grants and awards
- academic program development
- involvement in campus programming, such as planning special events, organizing workshops, hosting visiting writers/artists/scholars, etc.
- involvement in professional development activities, such as mentoring programs, learning communities, faculty enrichment, etc.

Faculty also lend their expertise to professional and community organizations. In some instances, collaboration with community partners may represent engaged scholarship; in other cases, volunteering one's expertise is valued service. Department guidelines may offer clear examples specific to the discipline.

Professional service activities may include these kinds of activities:

- serving as an officer in a professional organization
- leadership in campus initiatives
- reviewing grants for funding agencies
- refereeing papers or books for a journal or publisher
- refereeing conference papers

Professionally related community service activities—as opposed to the volunteerism that good citizens do—may include these kinds of responsibilities:

- speaking on professional or discipline-based topics to civic, public, business, or professional organizations
- serving in a professional capacity on boards of organizations
- working with colleagues in the P - 12 school system
- organizing or participating in public concerts, exhibitions, productions, readings
- working with groups that promote the understanding of one's discipline within the community
- serving as a consultant (paid or unpaid) to governmental or private groups in need of expert advising

All faculty are expected to contribute to the service workload of the department, college, and university. No amount of professional or public service excuses a faculty member from taking on the tasks that are essential to the academic enterprise.

V.G.3. Weighting of criteria

Teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service are all important components of a faculty member's professional role. Teaching is of utmost importance at SUNY Fredonia, and good teaching is expected of all faculty. A stellar research record or extraordinary involvement in service won't earn a mediocre teacher continuing appointment. Weighting of these criteria in the evaluation of faculty who pause the tenure clock for a period of time, or pursue modified duties/course offerings/a VRWS option for a period of time, should be commensurate with the particular responsibilities of the faculty member during that period of time. In other words, quality of teaching is still of utmost importance for these candidates, but they should not be penalized for a reduced quantity of courses in a given period of time. Department guidelines offer discipline-specific criteria for teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service.

V.G.4. Expectations for reappointment

These are the expectations for successful review for reappointment of term faculty:

- Evidence that the candidate is developing into a good teacher
- Evidence that the candidate is sufficiently engaged in and completing professional scholarship/creative activity and planning future scholarship/creative activity
- Evidence that the candidate is sufficiently engaged in appropriate department, university, community, and professional service
- Evidence that the candidate is satisfactorily progressing toward expectations for continuing appointment

V.G.5. Expectations for continuing appointment and promotion to Associate Professor

Continuing appointment and promotion are separate personnel recommendations but are normally granted together. These are the expectations for successful review for continuing appointment and promotion to the senior rank of Associate Professor:

- Evidence that the candidate is a very good teacher
- Evidence that the candidate has continued to be engaged in and completed scholarly/creative activities that have been peer reviewed, adjudicated, or otherwise recognized nationally or internationally by professionals in the discipline.
- Evidence that the candidate has engaged in significant departmental, university, and professional service

V.G.6. Expectations for early continuing appointment and/or promotion

Most faculty are reviewed for continuing appointment and promotion to Associate Professor in the sixth year of appointment (see the regular timeline in section V.A.1). Continuing appointment is granted based on sustained accomplishments across the years of review; it is not awarded as soon as one demonstrates a minimal threshold of achievements. Only cases in which teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service are all at exceptional levels—i.e., well beyond what would be expected for application for continuing appointment and/or promotion at the normal time—could be considered early. Candidates may apply for early continuing appointment and early promotion to Associate Professor only once. If denied early continuing appointment and/or promotion, the candidate may apply for the same under the regular reappointment schedule.

V.G.7. Expectations for promotion to Professor

These are the expectations for successful review for promotion to the most senior rank of Professor:

- Evidence that the candidate is a very good and innovative teacher
- Evidence that the candidate has continued to be engaged in professional scholarly/creative activity that have been peer reviewed, adjudicated, or otherwise recognized nationally or internationally by professionals in the discipline.
- Evidence that the candidate has continued to be engaged in significant departmental, university, and professional service, and has taken leadership roles in some of these service activities

V.H. Department Policies

V.H.1. Department guidelines and handbooks

Each department must publish and regularly review its own personnel review policies (see section V.F.2.b.) to supplement these university-level policies with discipline-specific interpretations and expectations for the evaluation of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. Departmental policies must be approved by the Dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Candidates appointed to term positions shall be given copies of the departmental personnel guidelines, these SUNY Fredonia policies, and the *Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York*. Additionally, candidates appointed to term positions shall be informed of the department or academic unit's mentoring process.

V.H.2. Relationship of department guidelines to SUNY and SUNY Fredonia Policies

The departmental policies may offer specific interpretations of terms, criteria, and departmental procedures, but they must be aligned with the policies of SUNY Fredonia and the *Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York*.

V.I. Documentation for Reappointment, Continuing Appointment, and Promotion¹⁵

Evaluation of term faculty is based primarily on review of the dossier submitted by each faculty member under review. Like all scholarly projects, dossier preparation requires reflection, gathering of appropriate evidence, good writing, and professionalism.

V.I.1. Electronic and print dossier formats

Although SUNY Fredonia may move to all-electronic format for dossiers in the future, the current practice is to submit print dossiers, generally in the form of a three-ring binder with pages divided into sections. Faculty who wish to submit materials electronically—on CD or website—may do so, provided that the department Personnel Committee has approved this format.

V.I.2. General principles of dossier preparation

V.I.2.a. Dossier for reappointment review. The dossier for reappointment review presents narratives and evidence of effectiveness in a particular review period. The dossier should include the accomplishments only of the review period, along with commentary about work in progress and planned work/goals. The dossier for reappointment review presents an argument that assists reviewers in answering the question, “How does this faculty member’s work demonstrate that he/she should be reappointed for another year?”

V.I.2.b. Dossier for continuing appointment and/or promotion review. The dossier for continuing appointment and/or promotion review presents narratives and evidence of effectiveness over the years from initial appointment (for continuing appointment and promotion to Associate Professor) or since the last promotion (for promotion to Professor). For continuing appointment, the dossier presents an argument that assists reviewers in answering the question, “How does this faculty member’s work across all areas demonstrate that continuing appointment is warranted?” For promotion, the dossier presents an argument that assists reviewers in answering the question, “How does this faculty member’s work demonstrate that he/she has met the requirements for promotion to a more senior academic rank?”

V.I.2.c. Audience of the dossier. Although review of the dossier begins in the department, some readers are from outside the discipline of the faculty candidate. Therefore, the dossier should be written as clearly and specifically as possible for a general academic audience.

V.I.2.d. Organization of the dossier. Each dossier may be presented in slightly different ways, based on the discipline, department guidelines, and faculty candidate’s own style and preferences. The outline in section V.G.3 offers general guidelines for organizing dossiers according to the criteria of the *Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York* and the broad view of scholarship/creative activity described in these SUNY Fredonia policies.

V.I.2.e. Format of the dossier. A well-prepared dossier shows respect for readers’ time by presenting materials in an organized, professional way. A print dossier should be compact, professional looking, and easy to navigate (room to turn pages, labeled sections, clear cross-reference).

¹⁵ Some of the concepts and language of this section have been adapted from materials that Virginia Horvath wrote for workshops at other institutions on documentation of faculty work.

Faculty candidates preparing dossiers should assume the same principles that guide their responses to student work or professional writing: stacks of raw data, poorly organized or written documents, or padded/misrepresented files are inappropriate.

V.I.2.f. Time. Preparing a professional dossier requires time for both thinking and assembling materials. Faculty candidates should start the process early and seek feedback and advice from colleagues and mentors.

V.I.3. Content of the dossier

Faculty should prepare the dossier according to this outline and submit all materials to the Department Chair by October 1. This outline and timeline do not apply for faculty in their first year of appointment (see section V.D.).

Information included in reappointment dossiers refers to only what was accomplished since the last review. Dossiers for continuing appointment and/or promotion review include information for all years of appointment at SUNY Fredonia (or for promotion to Professor, since the last promotion). Faculty who paused their tenure clock and are restarting it, or who pursued modified duties or modified course offerings during the period under review, shall clearly address these procedures and how they affect the sections on teaching effectiveness, scholarly/creative activities, and service in the pertinent sections of the dossier. While mastery of subject matter is supported by the *curriculum vitae*, it should also be apparent in the sections on teaching effectiveness and scholarly/creative activity in particular. Continuing growth should also be demonstrated in each of the three main areas for review, in the narratives as well as in materials submitted.

V.I.3.a. Cover Letter. A brief cover letter should be addressed to the Department Chair, summarizing what is most important about the record under review.

V.I.3.b. Section on mastery of subject matter. This section should include only an updated *curriculum vitae*, with any accomplishments, degrees, certificates, licenses, or awards attained in the review period highlighted.

V.I.3.c. Section on effectiveness in teaching. This section of the dossier provides a reflective narrative and evidence of effectiveness of teaching and learning.

- Narrative about teaching and learning, including reflection on advising, peer evaluation, and student course evaluation/feedback
- Courses taught in the review period, with enrollments
- Courses developed or significantly revised
- Summary of advising responsibilities and approach
- Peer evaluations of teaching and learning (at least two)
- Course evaluation results
- Publications, presentations, and grants related to teaching
- Teaching awards and recognitions
- Evidence of student engagement and learning
- Courses or workshops taken to improve teaching effectiveness
- Certificates or licenses attained
- Participation in professional development opportunities

- Other examples of scholarly teaching

V.I.3.d. Section on scholarly ability. This section of the dossier provides a reflective narrative and evidence of scholarship/creative activity, as described in these policies.

- Narrative about scholarship/creative activity, including reflection on progress toward goals and possible new lines of inquiry
- Publications
- Performances, exhibitions, or shows
- Grants
- Community engagement
- Musical compositions, recordings, conducting
- Scholarly presentations
- Collaborative work with students
- Participation in professional development opportunities
- Courses or workshops taken in scholarly field
- Professional conferences attended
- Other evidence of scholarship/creative activity
- Work in progress

V.I.3.e. Section on university service. This section of the dossier provides a reflective narrative and listing of professional service, as described in these policies.

- Narrative about service during the review period
- Service to the university
- Service to the department, school, or college
- Professional service to the community
- Service to the discipline
- Professional consulting, technical advising, or other service
- Other service activities

V.I.3.f. Appendices. Materials in the Appendices should provide clearly labeled evidence to support the sections of the dossier. The main part of the dossier should refer reviewers to support materials in the appendices. These are the kinds of materials that are typically included in appendices:

- Artifacts of teaching (sample syllabi, assignments, student work)
- Summaries of student feedback on courses (course evaluations, mid-term evaluations, classroom-based assessments)
- Copies of publications and presentations
- Materials that document performances, shows, exhibitions
- Grant proposals
- Reports or documents related to community engagement
- Reviews of publications/presentations/concerts/exhibitions
- Other support documents