

*DRAFT*  
*10-27-08*

## **Promotion and Tenure Working Group**

### **Executive Summary**

Over the last several years, several task forces and committees have been charged to address various aspects of MSU's promotion and tenure policies, procedures, criteria and standards. One of these groups, the University Promotion and Tenure Implementation Committee, presented its report and recommendations to Provost Dooley in January 2008 and which was reviewed by Faculty Senate during Spring 2008.

Three distinct areas were identified by the Implementation Committee as being most important for further development and general recommendations were provided by the Implementation Committee in the areas of:

- 1) Re-defining the terms associated with the evaluative levels of faculty performance as presently stated in Faculty Handbook language. Those present levels of performance are entitled "*effectiveness*", "*promise/potential for excellence*" and "*excellence*".
- 2) Explication of the external review process, including number and type of external reviewers, solicitation letter to reviewers, and expectations for content of external reviews.
- 3) Clarity in the nature of documentation associated with the presently-used term "*In-Depth Assessment of Teaching*", and identification of the respective roles of the candidate and reviewing entities in the assessment of teaching.

In Summer 2008, Provost Dooley charged a "working group" of Faculty Senate representatives, department heads and deans to further expand upon the work of the Implementation Committee with the specific charge to propose changes to the text of existing Faculty Handbook language, as well as recommendations for additional new text.

The consensus views of the 'working group' with respect to these three main areas of recommendations include the following:

- 1) The term "*promise/potential for excellence*" was judged to be too ambiguous and subject to mis-interpretation and is proposed to be eliminated. The term "*accomplishment*" is now a proposed defined level of faculty performance. Additionally, definitions for "*accomplishment*" and "*excellence*" with respect to faculty performance

in the categories of research/creative activity and teaching have been carefully worded to provide comparable language, where appropriate, for these two categories.

2) The major proposed changes regarding the external review process include a recommendation for a minimum of 5 external reviewers and that “*In the event that fewer than five letters are obtained, it is the responsibility of the primary review committee to explain, as part of their recommendation, why fewer than five letters were obtained.*”

The other proposed major change is that for candidates who are being reviewed for “*accomplishment*” or “*excellence*” in teaching, there **MUST** be external reviews of the teaching evidence. A sample solicitation letter to external reviewers, along with suggested documentation from the candidate’s dossier, has also been developed which is intended to minimize the present variability in external solicitation letters.

3) Key elements of the recommendations on the topic of teaching assessment include the specification of the required elements to be provided by the candidate in the ‘*Teaching*’ portion of the dossier. Those required elements will be more extensive for candidates who choose to be evaluated for “*accomplishment/excellence*” in the category of teaching.

Additionally, it is proposed to eliminate the presently-used term “*In-Depth Assessment of Teaching*”. Given that there is no comparable terminology for assessment of research/creative activity, it is the judgment of the group that the proposed changes in the required elements of the ‘*Teaching*’ portion of the dossier, as well as proposed changes in the external review process, obviate the need to use the term *In-Depth Assessment of Teaching*.

## **Recommendations for Faculty Handbook Changes**

### **602.00 Definitions**

#### **Proposed New Text**

*"Teaching"* is a form of scholarship that fosters critical and ethical thinking and problem solving. It develops creativity, improves communication skills and promotes citizenship and professional competency. It requires a command of one's subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments to promote student learning. It includes, but is not limited to, the following activities: class preparation; scheduled and unscheduled instruction in classes, seminars, and workshops, both on and off campus, informal meetings, help sessions, individual instruction and office hours; laboratory and studio or clinical-based teaching and training; pedagogical innovation – including the incorporation of new technologies and approaches to learning and assessment, course and curriculum design and development; development of teaching materials, documented study of curricular and pedagogical issues – and incorporation of this information into the classrooms, pedagogically-oriented research, contributions to professional societies and organizations that seek to improve teaching, thesis and professional project assistance and participation in the presentation and defense of theses and projects; grading and assessment of student work; academic and career advising of undergraduate and graduate students; supervision of student teachers, teaching and research assistants and professional interns; and, for library faculty, any tasks that contribute to the overall academic enterprise.

#### **Existing Text**

*"Teaching" fosters critical thinking, develops creativity, and promotes citizenship and professional competency. It includes all of the following activities: class preparation; scheduled and unscheduled instruction in classes, seminars, and workshops, both on and off campus, informal meetings, help sessions, individual instruction and office hours; laboratory and studio or clinical-based teaching and training; course and curriculum development; thesis and professional project assistance and participation in the presentation and defense of theses and projects; grading and assessment of student work; academic and career advising of undergraduate and graduate students; supervision of student teachers, teaching assistants and professional interns; and, for library faculty, any tasks that contribute to the overall academic enterprise.*

## 603.02 Philosophy

### Proposed New Text

A university is more than a collection of autonomous departments or individual faculty member striving for personal or professional satisfaction. To achieve and maintain excellence, Montana State University – Bozeman must act as a unified community of scholars linked by shared values that are consistent with the University's fundamental goals of teaching, research/creative activity, and service. Furthermore, though for the sake of convenience we traditionally speak of teaching, research/creative activity, and service as separate activities, it is recognized that there is inevitable and desirable overlap between these scholarly activities. In fact, Montana State University strongly encourages faculty to integrate, as appropriate to their individual assignments, these three fundamental activities throughout their career.

### Existing Text

*A university is more than a collection of autonomous departments or individual faculty striving for personal or professional satisfaction. To achieve and maintain excellence, Montana State University – Bozeman must act as a unified community of scholars linked by shared values that are consistent with the University's fundamental goals of teaching, research/creative activity, and service.*

(Note that the subsequent paragraphs on Teaching, Research and creative activity, and Outreach and public service are proposed to be eliminated)

## 603.04 Standards

### Proposed New Text

As defined below, sustained **effectiveness** in all areas of a faculty member's assignment is a University-wide requirement for retention, tenure and promotion. In addition, **accomplishment** is required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor rank; a **record of excellence** is required for promotion to Professor rank.

### Existing Text

*As defined below, sustained **effectiveness** in all areas of a faculty member's assignment is a University-wide requirement for retention, tenure and promotion. In addition the **promise of excellence** is required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor rank; a **record of excellence** is required for promotion to Professor rank.*

### **633.01 Effectiveness**

#### Proposed New Text

Faculty performance in the scholarship of teaching, research/creative activity, and service will be judged **effective** if it demonstrates competent execution of scholarly activities and products, in both quantity and quality.

#### Existing Text

*Faculty performance in teaching, research/creative activity, and service will be judged **effective** if it meets or exceeds the standards of the candidate's department and college.*

(Note that existing **Sec. 633.02 Excellence** is proposed to be replaced by new sections designated as **633.02 Accomplishment** and **633.03 Excellence**)

#### Proposed New Text

### **633.02 Accomplishment**

#### A. Accomplishment in Teaching

Faculty performance in the scholarship of teaching will be judged *accomplished* if it : 1) demonstrates meritorious execution of scholarly activities and products, in both quantity and quality; 2) receives recognition from peers and colleagues, as well as from current and former students/clientele, as having made positive contributions to the candidate's discipline or profession.

#### B. Accomplishment in Research/Creative Activity

Faculty performance in the scholarship of research/creative activity will be judged *accomplished* if it: 1) demonstrates meritorious execution of scholarly activities and products, in both quantity and quality; 2) receives recognition from peers and colleagues as having made positive contributions to the candidate's discipline or profession.

### **633.03 Excellence**

#### A. Excellence in Teaching

Faculty performance in the scholarship of teaching will be judged excellent if it: 1) demonstrates sustained superior execution of scholarly activities and products, in both quantity and quality; 2) receives national recognition from peers and colleagues, as well

as from current and former students/clientele, as having made significant, positive contributions to the candidate's discipline or profession.

**B. Excellence in Research/Creative Activity**

Faculty performance in the scholarship of research/creative activity will be judged excellent if it: 1) demonstrates sustained superior execution of scholarly activities and products, in both quantity and quality; 2) receives national recognition from peers and colleagues as having made significant, positive contributions to the candidate's discipline or profession.

Existing Text

**633.02 Excellence**

*A. Excellence in Teaching*

*Faculty performance in teaching will be judged **excellent** if it receives substantial recognition from peers and colleagues as well as current and former students.*

*B. Excellence in Research/Creative Activity*

*Faculty performance in research/creativity(sic) activity will be judged **excellent** if it receives substantial, international, or national recognition from peers and clients as having made a significant contribution to the body of knowledge and creativity germane to the candidate's discipline or profession.*

*C. Excellence in Service*

*Faculty performance in service will be judged **excellent** if it receives substantial recognition by colleagues and peers outside the University.*

(Note that **633.03 Demonstration of Effectiveness and Excellence** is proposed to be replaced by **633.04 Demonstration of Effectiveness, Accomplishment and Excellence**)

Proposed New Text

**633.04 Demonstration of Effectiveness, Accomplishment and Excellence**

???????????

Based on the definition of teaching in 602 and the Teaching Standards in 633, when a candidate's teaching performance is being evaluated, it is expected he or she will provide supporting evidence such as:

- Student products demonstrating their learning,
- Course syllabi demonstrating coverage of appropriate course content,
- Summary of student evaluations,
- Demonstrations of student success after graduation:
- Appropriate job placement of students after graduation
- Professional examination results of students
- Postgraduate education of students
- Innovative syllabi, class materials and assignments,
- New courses created and developed,
- New curricula created and developed,
- New options, minors, majors, and programs created and developed,
- Published pedagogical papers,
- Published professional papers,
- Published instructional materials,
- Demonstrations of integration across disciplines,
- Demonstrations of applied and practical applications,
- Demonstrations of integration of teaching with one’s own research,
- Evidence of stimulating and energizing learning environments,
- Evidence of teaching students the scientific method and process,
- Demonstrations of improved student problem solving and decision making skills.

Existing Text

**633.03 Demonstration of Effectiveness and Excellence**

??????????????

**813.03 Procedures for Obtaining External Peer Reviews**

Proposed New Text

Each department (or college) shall establish the specific procedures by which external peer reviews shall be conducted. When feasible, external peer reviews shall be obtained from five (5) external reviewers, at least 50% of whom shall be recommended by the primary review committee. In the event that fewer than five (5) letters are obtained, it is the responsibility of the primary review committee to explain, as part of their recommendation, why fewer letters were obtained. For cases in which the candidate is being reviewed for “*accomplishment*” or “*excellence*” in the scholarship of teaching, at least three (3) of the solicited external letters must include an evaluation of the

candidate's "effectiveness" in research/creative activity. These letters may be the same as those solicited for the evaluation of teaching or they may be in addition to these letters (i.e., if additional letters are necessary to assure that at least three (3) letters include an evaluation of research/creative activity).

The procedures for selecting external peer reviewers, soliciting letters, and documenting the external review process should be objective and transparent to review committee members at subsequent levels of administrative review. The following steps, typically carried out by the chair of the primary review committee, are intended to assure transparency: 1) solicit names of potential reviewers from the candidate; 2) solicit the names of potential reviewers from members of the primary (Departmental or College) P&T review committee; 3) select a list of names of potential reviewers with at least 50% of names coming from the primary review committee's list; 4) make initial contact (e.g., via e-mail) with potential reviewers in order to determine their willingness to provide a timely review letter (e.g., see sample solicitation email); 5) send a formal letter of solicitation containing essential elements and enclosures (e.g., see sample solicitation letter); 6) upon receipt of reviewer letters, complete the cover sheet for the external reviewer tab of candidates dossier (see cover sheet); 7) once all letters are received, insert the completed cover sheet, copies of solicitation letters and e-mails, and all reviewer letters into the dossier.

Note: University guidelines do not require external peer review letters for third-year (retention) reviews. However, college or department guidelines may require such an assessment.

### Existing Text

#### ***813.03 Procedures for Obtaining External Peer Reviews***

*Each department (or college) shall establish the specific procedures by which external peer reviews shall be conducted. When required, peer reviews shall be obtained from no fewer than three (3) external reviewers, the majority of whom shall be recommended by the primary review committee, the minority of whom shall be recommended by the candidate.*

*Note: University guidelines do not require external peer reviews for third-year (retention) reviews. However, college or department guidelines may require such an assessment.*

(Note that the proposed 3 sample items shown below (1. Sample Cover Sheet on External Letters; 2. Sample Solicitation E-Mail; and 3. Sample Solicitation Letter to External Evaluators) relate to the proposed new text for **Sec. 813.03**. These sample items may or may not be judged to be appropriate for direct inclusion in the Faculty Handbook. However, the intent is that these 3 sample items be codified in an appropriate document for use in formal review of faculty)

1. SAMPLE COVER SHEET ON EXTERNAL LETTERS\*

The chair of the primary review committee should include, along with this cover sheet, letters and e-mails used to solicit reviews and evaluation letters received from reviewers. All evaluation letters received must be reported here and included in the candidate's dossier. Five external review letters evaluating the candidate's scholarship in his or her selected area of achievement or excellence are required. If the candidate's selected area of achievement or excellence is the scholarship of teaching, at least three of these letters (or additional letters if needed) must also evaluate the effectiveness of candidate's research/creative activity. If fewer than five letters are received, the primary review committee must explain the reason(s) why in their letter of recommendation/transmittal.

A. Reviewers Suggested By Candidate (include only those who agreed to provide a review)

Reviewer's Last Name	Institution or Affiliation	Area of expertise	Relationship to candidate**	Solicitation Date	Reply Date
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					

B. Reviewers Suggested By Primary Review Committee (include only those who agreed to provide a review)

Reviewer's Last Name	Institution or Affiliation	Area of expertise	Relationship to candidate**	Solicitation Date	Reply Date
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					

\* Letters not solicited by the primary review committee or letters from within Montana State University are not considered within this category and should not be described here.

\*\* For each reviewer describe his or her relationship to candidate (e.g., none, dissertation advisor, former teacher, colleague, co-author, etc.).

## 2. SAMPLE INITIAL SOLICITATION EMAIL (OR OTHER INITIAL CONTACT) TO EXTERNAL EVALUATORS REQUESTING REVIEW OF CANDIDATES FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR

Dear Professor YYY,

I am writing to request your assistance. I am in charge of soliciting external reviews for faculty candidates applying for promotion and tenure in the (Department name) at Montana State University this year. My faculty colleague, (Name), is being considered for (tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Full Professor). I am hoping that you will agree to be an external reviewer of (his or her) scholarly record in (research or teaching).

For your convenience, I have attached an electronic copy of (name's) Curriculum Vitae and our departmental Criteria and Standards document. If you agree to provide this assistance, I will send a formal letter soliciting your review along with hard copy of the attached documents as well as a selection of (name's) (research products or his or her teaching portfolio).

To stay on the MSU schedule, I would need your review by (date).

Thank you for considering my request in this important matter. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Name  
Title  
Phone, FAX, email

Enclosures:  
(attach CV)  
(attach a copy of or link to the Departmental Role and Scope statement)

### 3. SAMPLE SOLICITATION LETTER TO EXTERNAL EVALUATORS REQUESTING REVIEW OF CANDIDATES FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE OR FULL PROFESSOR

(Note: This letter assumes prior contact with the evaluator and his/her tentative agreement to participate in the review (see sample solicitation email). Significant deviations from this sample letter must be approved by the Dean.)

Dear (name of reviewer):

Thank you for agreeing to provide an external review of (rank and name), who is a candidate for promotion to the rank of (Associate Professor or Professor) (with or without tenure), in the (name of Department) of the (name of College or School) at Montana State University, Bozeman, MT.

[Include here a short description of the candidate's assignment (i.e., teaching, research, and service percentages, administrative responsibilities, etc.)]

To assist the primary review committee and for subsequent levels of review, Montana State University requires that written evaluations be obtained from individuals outside of MSU who are qualified to evaluate the candidate's scholarship in (his or her) selected area of achievement or excellence. Prof. (name) has selected (research or teaching) as (his or her) area of (achievement or excellence). The enclosed Departmental Role and Scope document provides definitions and additional information on the departmental standards and criteria for (achievement and excellence) in (research or teaching).

On behalf to the primary (departmental or college) review committee, I am requesting that you provide a letter describing your assessment of the productivity, quality, significance, and impact on the discipline of Prof. (name)'s scholarship in (his or her) chosen area of (achievement or excellence). If you have knowledge and information regarding the candidate's qualifications in areas other than his or her (teaching or research), you are also encouraged to provide comments on (his or her) effectiveness in these areas. For additional information on MSU's expectations of candidates please consult the university's Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Standards online at: [http://www2.montana.edu/policy/faculty\\_handbook/fh600.html#600.00](http://www2.montana.edu/policy/faculty_handbook/fh600.html#600.00).

In addition to the Department's Role and Scope document, I am enclosing for your information a copy of Prof. (name)'s Vitae, (his or her) personal statement regarding progress in the chosen area of (achievement or excellence), and selected materials

representing (his or her) scholarly productions in (teaching or research). Please let me know if you need additional materials in order to conduct your review.

Please return your review, on department or business letterhead, directly to me. Since deliberations by the departmental review committee must be concluded by (date), I will need your review by (date). If you are unable to reply by that date, please let me know as soon as possible. Your letter will remain confidential but will become a part of the candidate's dossier. In the event of a negative evaluation, however, the candidate may file a grievance, in which case a redacted version of your letter will become available to the candidate

The MSU promotion and tenure process also requires that we include in the candidate's dossier a copy of each external reviewer's vitae and a short statement describing each reviewer's relationship to the candidate. You may include such a statement either separately or as part of your review. Finally, once your review is completed, please destroy or return any of the personal documentation regarding the candidate.

On behalf of MSU let me express in advance our appreciation for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Name

Title

Phone, FAX, email

Enclosures:

(attach candidate's CV.)

(attach samples of the candidate's scholarly work, selected by the candidate)

(attach a copy of the Departmental Role and Scope statement)

(attach candidate's Personal Statement, provided or not at the candidate's discretion)

Candidate's Name \_\_\_\_\_

## **811.00 Mandatory Procedures at All Levels of Review**

### Proposed New Text/Existing Text

(The only proposed changes in Sec. 811.00 are to eliminate item E. and the subsequent note as shown below.)

In conducting the review, each review committee and reviewing administrator shall consider the following:

- A. the dossier submitted by the candidate and the recommendations of each preceding level of review,
- B. the University criteria and standards described above,
- C. the previously approved role and scope, criteria and standards document of the department and college,
- D. the letter of hire and any subsequent faculty role statements, including any differential staffing/differential assignment, and
- E. in cases of review for promotion and tenure, the in-depth assessment of teaching, and*

*Note: University's guidelines do not require an in-depth assessment of teaching for third-year (retention) reviews. However, college or department guidelines may require such an assessment.*

- E. in cases of review for promotion and tenure, the written evaluations of external and internal peer reviewers,

Note: University guidelines do not require external peer reviews for third-year (retention) reviews. However, college or department guidelines may require such an assessment.

Each review committee or reviewing administrator may request further documentation from the candidate and solicit and obtain additional materials deemed necessary to make a thorough and substantive review of the candidate's qualifications.

No materials except required documentation specified in the role, scope, criteria, standards and procedures of the department and college may be added to or deleted from

a candidate's dossier without notice to the candidate and an opportunity for the candidate to respond (See [471.05](#), [471.06](#), and [812.03](#)) and notice to any preceding review committees and reviewing administrators and an opportunity to respond. (See [811.01](#).)

Each review committee and reviewing administrator shall determine, to the best of its ability, whether a candidate's preceding reviews have been conducted in substantial compliance with the procedures set forth by the department, college and this Handbook.

## **812.00 Responsibility of the Candidate to Submit Dossier**

### Proposed New Text

The candidate is responsible for preparing the dossier and making her or his case for retention, tenure, promotion, or favorable special review. Candidates shall submit to the primary review committee or primary administrative reviewer, a dossier, which shall include:

- A. A curriculum vitae listing all teaching, research/creative activities and outreach/public service activities.
- B. A narrative self-evaluation or personal statement,
- C. Documentation of role, assignments, and performance including the letter of hire, any subsequent role statements or reassignments, and annual reviews and ratings, and all the letters conveying MSU-Bozeman administrators' and committees' recommendations from the most recent formal review (if such a review has occurred within the past 7 years).
- D. Information as to performance and accomplishments in teaching, research/creative activity, outreach/public service, and professional development, appropriate to the assignment.

If appropriate to the assignment, the dossier shall include a section for research/creative activity and a section for teaching. The section representing the candidate's selected area of accomplishment or excellence shall necessarily be more comprehensive than the other area.

If research/creative activity **is** selected as the candidate's area of accomplishment or excellence, the research section must contain a set of articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence that, in the candidate's judgment, represents his or her best efforts to advance the discipline or profession. A subset of these materials, to be determined at the discretion of the candidate, shall be sent to external peer reviewers.

If research/creative activity is **not** selected as the candidate's area of accomplishment or excellence, the research section must still contain a set of articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence that, in the candidate's judgment, represents his or her best

efforts to advance the discipline or profession. A subset of these materials, to be determined at the discretion of the candidate, shall be sent to external peer reviewers

If teaching **is** selected as the candidate's area of excellence, the teaching section must contain a portfolio of the candidate's scholarly activities and products that, in the candidate's judgment, represents his or her best efforts in the scholarship of teaching.

Required elements for this portfolio include:

**1. Statement** – A brief statement in which the candidate expands on the Personal Statement, describing her/his approach to teaching and learning. A candidate should specifically address his or her philosophy of teaching, how he or she gauges the level of student learning, and the logic which underlies his or her approach to the classroom and student learning. The candidate should include a statement detailing his or her approach to student advising.

**2. Course List** – A list of courses taught during the review period, number of credits and/or contact hours for each course, and number of students per course.

**3. Student Evaluation of Faculty** – A summary of numerical averages, organized by semester in reverse chronological order, for student evaluations. The candidate will supply a brief narrative offering his or her interpretation of the results, bringing any extraordinary or unusual circumstances to the attention of readers.

For two different courses taught by the candidate at MSU during the review period, the candidate will supply an entire set of narrative evaluations.

**4. Course Materials** – For four different courses taught by the candidate at MSU during the review period. The candidate will supply the course syllabus listing course goals, sample student assignments, representative examples of examinations, and other relevant course materials that support the candidate's description.

**5. Classroom Observations** - Observations of at least three different courses since the last review. These Observations will be arranged by the candidate. Copies of the observers' reports will be provided to the candidate and his/her Department Head.

**6. Student Letters** - Ten or more signed letters of evaluation from former and current students. At least half of the letters must be solicited by the primary review committee.

Other teaching products and activities that the candidate might choose to include are:

evidence about the following activities: class preparation; scheduled and unscheduled instruction in classes, seminars, and workshops, both on and off campus, informal meetings, help sessions, individual instruction and office hours; laboratory and studio or clinical-based teaching and training; pedagogical innovation—including the

incorporation of new technologies and approaches to learning and assessment, course and curriculum design and development; development of teaching materials, documented study of curricular and pedagogical issues—and incorporation of this information into the classrooms, pedagogically oriented research, contributions to professional societies and organizations that seek to improve teaching, thesis and professional project assistance and participation in the presentation and defense of theses and projects; grading and assessment of student work; academic and career advising of undergraduate and graduate students; supervision of student teachers, teaching and research assistants and professional interns; and, for library faculty, any tasks that contribute to the overall academic enterprise.

A subset of these materials, to be determined at the discretion of the candidate, shall be sent to external reviewers

If teaching is **not** selected as the candidate's area of accomplishment or excellence, the teaching section must contain a portfolio of the candidate's scholarly activities and products that, in the candidate's judgment, represents his or her best efforts in the scholarship of teaching.

Required elements of this portfolio include:

**1. Statement** – A brief statement in which the candidate expands on the Personal Statement, describing her/his approach to teaching and learning. A candidate should specifically address his or her philosophy of teaching, how he or she gauges the level of student learning, and the logic which underlies his or her approach to the classroom and student learning. The candidate should include a statement detailing his or her approach to student advising.

**2. Course List** – A list of courses taught during the review period, number of credits and/or contact hours for each course, and number of students per course.

**3. Student Evaluation of Faculty** – A summary of numerical averages, organized by semester in reverse chronological order, for student evaluations. The candidate will supply a brief narrative offering his or her interpretation of the results, bringing any extraordinary or unusual circumstances to the attention of readers.

**4. Course Materials** – For two different courses taught by the candidate at MSU during the review period. The candidate will supply the course syllabus listing course goals, sample student assignments, representative examples of examinations, and other relevant course materials that support the candidate's description.

Unless specified otherwise by department or college procedures, this set of materials is **not** required to be sent to external peer reviewers.

The candidate may also provide supporting documentation separate from the dossier. During the review period, this supporting documentation shall be retained by the college dean and transmitted to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee upon request.

The "Cover Sheet--Candidate's Dossier," available from the office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, shall be used as the cover page of the dossier.

### **Comments/Rationale for Proposed Faculty Handbook Changes**

As above, we've added numerical organization to clarify the relationship between the two required parts. We cleaned up the "significant/significantly" error from the previous version. And we added a comma after "significant."

We also removed the "and" from the "and/or" statement in the teaching definition, so that input from former students is now required.

Finally, we also discussed the issue of whether this definition represents a "lowering of the bar," by altering the definition from the existing required: "substantial, international, or national recognition" (whether one treats the initial comma as a substantive one or not). We decided that taken as a whole, this definition doesn't "lower the bar;" also, that it preserves the desired parallelism between the requirements for teaching and research/creative activity; and that it also preserves beneficial "flexibility" in how the various disciplines will apply and interpret this standard, while still offering some clarity and specificity.

- 3) Make sure that the preliminary language in the Handbook section mentions "Integration." Note: rather than putting the word "integration" into the definitions, we felt it instead it should be mentioned as desirable, as "counting," in the preliminary section somewhere. (We did not specify where yet).
- 4) Make sure that the Boyer language referring to the "scholarship of teaching" is included in the preliminary section, making clear that this includes both teaching itself, as well as publications about teaching, etc.
- 5) In the expectations section (603.03), or Preamble (603) add language specifying that individuals' assignments (as per letter of hire, as modified, etc) are taken into account. What we're trying to get at here especially is if an individual's assignment is 10% teaching, and 90% research, that person probably couldn't go up in Teaching; though given the quantitative aspects of research, one could still go up in Research on a 10% assignment, if that person has still cranked out the articles.
- 6) Leave the series of A B C D elements as proposed in the "Standards for Retention, etc sections, specifying effectiveness, promise of continuing effectiveness....

Note: We discussed removing the “promise” portions altogether, but decided that it was necessary for the tenure decision, and a defensible element in the Full decision. So to keep these all parallel, we decided to keep them all in, after a discussion of possibly removing D for Full, and B for Retention. (Got that?)

7) Remove the Definition of “Excellence in Service” altogether.

Note: Excellence in service has no substantive meaning in our process of choosing Accomplishment in either Teacher or Research/Creative Activity for tenure; and being Excellent in one or the other for Full. Providing a definition of Excellence for Service probably was originally included to maintain parallelism, but serves no purpose.