RANK AND STATUS POLICY

With additional expectations specified by the College of Life Sciences (highlighted in red)

7 April 2015

Approved by Academic Vice President's Council 20 May 2015

With additional expectations specified by the Department of Plant and Wildlife Sciences (highlighted in blue)

22 September 2016

Approved by College Deans 29 August 2017

Executive Summary

This policy governs the hiring, retention, granting of continuing faculty status, and rank advancement of faculty. It specifies the steps to be taken in hiring to fill faculty vacancies, including obtaining appropriate clearances. It establishes standards of performance in all three areas of faculty responsibility, citizenship, teaching, and scholarship, and criteria by which faculty performance is to be evaluated. The policy also establishes the procedures to be followed in evaluating faculty in the initial (third-year) review, the final (sixth- or seventh-year) review, and for rank advancement, along with the timetable for the scheduled reviews. The policy also specifies the responsibilities of faculty members for preparing materials to be used as the basis of evaluation in the reviews, as well as the responsibilities of department rank and status committees, department chairs, department faculty, college rank and status committees, deans, and the university council on rank and status. It also establishes the timetable for mandatory reviews. In its treatment of this process, the policy also deals with issues of confidentiality, the adding of materials to the file, procedures for delaying continuing status reviews, and support for the mission of the university. The policy also establishes the process of appeal of rank and status decisions available to faculty members. Attached as appendices to the policy are checklists to be used in making sure all relevant materials are placed in the faculty members' files, and sample letters for use by chairs in soliciting external reviews of the faculty members' work.

---

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview. This policy describes the university's standards and procedures for hiring faculty and for granting candidacy for continuing faculty status, continuing faculty status, and rank advancement. Continuing faculty status is defined at the university as "an automatically renewed appointment." The automatic renewal is accomplished by the issuance of a contract for the next academic year unless the faculty member is terminated for cause. A faculty member's rejection of a contract has the effect of indicating a withdrawal from the university and a relinquishment of continuing faculty status. Such an action ends the employment relationship with the university.

1.2 Individual Responsibility. Fundamental to the purpose of this policy is the understanding that the individual bears the burden of becoming familiar with the university's, college's

and department's policies, procedures, and standards for review, and for presenting persuasive evidence to the university, college and department that he or she is appropriately qualified for hiring or for receiving candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. While the university is not obligated to hire or to grant candidacy, continuing faculty status or rank advancement to any individual, the university, college and department agrees to provide a fair review process as described in this policy.

1.3 Changes. These standards and procedures may be changed from time to time, and such changes apply to all faculty members in the college regardless of when they were hired or the standards and procedures that then prevailed.

1.4 Exceptions. The academic vice president may approve exceptions to this policy to accommodate particular needs. In the college, the dean must approve in writing exceptions to this policy prior to submission to the academic vice president.

1.5 College and Department Policies. Colleges and departments are encouraged to create their own rank and status policies and to review and update them periodically to reflect current expectations, department, college, and university needs, and disciplinary standards. College and department rank and status policies must be approved by the dean and the academic vice president. College and department rank and status policies may not contradict or waive any requirement of this policy or apply a lower standard. If there is a conflict between a college or department policy and this policy, this policy governs. The rank and status policy of the College of Life Sciences is incorporated herein with additional expectations or points of clarification specific to the college highlighted in red. In no instance does the college policy apply a lower standard than the university standards described in this document.

The expectation of the college is that departments will provide strong justification and positive endorsements for faculty who have met or exceeded department criteria for rank and/or status. This includes providing any necessary context for the faculty member's assignment and making appropriate reference to the department's rank and status document. Departments should only submit files to the college when there is a strong likelihood that the faculty member will successfully pass reviews at both the college and university levels. Departments should also be prepared to make a negative decision on a file when a faculty member does not meet department criteria and does not have a strong likelihood of successfully passing reviews at the college and university levels.

1.6 Nondiscrimination. The standards and procedures in this policy will be applied without illegal discrimination on the basis of gender, race, color, national origin, age, veteran status, or disability. Because of the university's religious mission, in hiring decisions strong preference is given to members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

2 Appointment of Faculty Members

2.1 Appointments. Faculty members are appointed by the university president as authorized by

the Board of Trustees. Faculty appointments are for one year, except that some visiting appointments are for one semester. Faculty appointments on a continuing faculty status track are renewable at the university's discretion for additional one-year terms until continuing faculty status is granted. Continuing faculty status is awarded at the discretion of the university president with the aid of recommendations generated from the procedures found in this policy. The appointments of faculty with continuing faculty status are automatically renewed each year unless they are terminated for adequate cause (see Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy).

2.2 Vacancies. The associate academic vice president for faculty authorizes the filling of a vacancy. When a vacancy occurs, the department chair and dean should submit memos justifying the filling of the vacancy accompanied by a Faculty Position Vacancy Form.

2.3 Search Committee. To fill a continuing faculty status track position, the department chair will refer the matter to a search committee composed of at least three faculty members. Departments are encouraged to begin the search process early in the academic year preceding the vacancy.

2.4 Identifying Candidates. The department should make a vigorous effort to identify the most qualified candidates for a faculty position. This effort may include tracking potential candidates, recruiting at conferences, and advertising broadly in professional publications, on the university's website, in BYU Magazine, in the Church News, etc.

2.5 Clearance to Interview. Following an appropriate search period, the department search committee will recommend which candidates to invite to campus for interviews. Invitations to campus for interviews must be approved by the department chair, the dean, the associate academic vice president for faculty, and the Church Commissioner of Education. Clearance to interview must precede any express or implied invitation to interview. The associate academic vice president for faculty will pay for visits of up to two candidates for each approved position vacancy, but the department may interview additional candidates at the department's expense, provided proper clearance to interview is obtained. Departments are encouraged to interview at least two candidates for each position.

2.6 Interviews. Generally, candidates invited to campus should make a formal presentation to the faculty and teach a class or make some other presentation in which they interact with students. During the visit, all available department faculty should have the opportunity to meet individually or in small groups with the candidate. The candidate will also interview with the department chair, the dean, the associate academic vice president for faculty, and a General Authority.

2.7 Hiring Decision. After the interviews, and following open discussion in a meeting of the department committee of the whole, department faculty who have continuing faculty status and faculty who are in continuing faculty status track positions will vote by secret ballot on which candidate, if any, should be offered a position. To be hired, candidates must be approved by at least a majority of voting faculty, and approved by the department chair, the dean, the academic vice president, the president, and the Board of Trustees.

2.8 Offers. All offers must be in writing, with the terms and conditions specified in detail. All offer letters are drafted by the department chair but must be approved by the dean and the associate academic vice president for faculty before they are sent. Those participating in the hiring process must not make or imply any commitments regarding employment terms, including rank or salary, before the offer letter is approved. Deans or chairs may discuss academic rank, possible schedules for the rank and status review process, and salary ranges with candidates, but must not make commitments in addition to those approved in the offer letter. An offer letter is binding on the university only if it is approved by the associate academic vice president for faculty, the academic vice president, or the president, and only if the approvals required in section 2.7 have been obtained.

2.9 Initial Rank. Appointment as an assistant professor in a continuing faculty status track requires the completion of a terminal or other degree appropriate to the candidate's discipline and position, or equivalent professional experience or training. (See 5.1.D, 6.6.1.C.) If the candidate does not meet this standard, the appointment will be at the rank of instructor. The instructor's offer letter will specify the conditions that need to be met to become eligible for a continuing faculty status track appointment and the rank of assistant professor, and a fixed term within which the person must become eligible for such an appointment. When the instructor has met the conditions described in the offer letter, the dean should notify the associate academic vice president for faculty, who will authorize moving the person to a continuing faculty status track and granting immediate rank advancement to assistant professor. Appointment as an instructor is intended to be a limited appointment and may not be extended beyond a reasonable time.

2.10 Starting the Timetable for Continuing Faculty Status. Time spent as an instructor does not count toward the time required for continuing faculty status. The timetable for the continuing faculty status process begins with the start of the fall semester following the granting of a continuing faculty status track appointment and the rank of assistant professor. The timetable for faculty hired midyear also begins the following fall semester.

2.11 Moving Visiting and Other Faculty to a Continuing Faculty Status Track. To move a visiting, temporary, part-time, or adjunct faculty member to a continuing faculty status track, the procedures for hiring continuing faculty status track faculty, specified in this policy must be followed. Upon the recommendation of the dean, the university may count the period of the visiting or temporary appointment toward continuing faculty status if the appointment was at a professorial rank, and if all requirements specified in section 2.9 were satisfied at the time of hiring into the visiting or temporary appointment. The offer letter for the continuing faculty status track appointment will specify the timetable for the continuing faculty status process.

2.12 Credit for Previous Work. The university may count time as a visiting or temporary faculty member at BYU, or as a faculty member at another university or college or in comparable professional work toward initial rank, rank advancement, or continuing faculty status. In such cases, the final review for continuing faculty status may be held in the faculty member's third year at BYU or at such other time as is agreed upon in writing. The timetable for the continuing faculty status process must be determined at the time of hiring, approved by the dean and the associate academic vice president for faculty, and specified

in the offer letter. The offer letter may also specify the schedule of review for rank advancement as approved by the associate academic vice president for faculty.
During initial rank, rank advancement, or continuing faculty status evaluations, faculty members will be expected to demonstrate leadership in developing a research program while at BYU. Examples of leadership in research include role as principal investigator in research proposals (candidates should detail their leadership role in the case that many principal investigators are listed for a research proposal), scholarly publication from an established research program that continues to develop at BYU, initiation of promising research activities at BYU, or taking the lead in collaborative research projects
Leadership in publications from work initiated at BYU or from an established and ongoing research program that is continuing to actively develop at BYU is critical.

2.13 Appointments with Continuing Faculty Status. In very unusual cases, the university may appoint a faculty member with continuing faculty status. This action must be approved by the department chair (after appropriate consultation with department faculty), the dean, and the academic vice president. The academic vice president will consult with the appropriate Faculty Council on Rank and Status before granting approval.

3 Expectations of Faculty Members

3.1 General Expectations

3.1.1 Faculty Standards. Brigham Young University is a private university with unique goals and aspirations that arise from the mission of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. A faculty member's responsibility is to engage in high quality citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and to make affirmative contributions to the university mission. Faculty should provide students an education that is spiritually strengthening, intellectually enlarging, character building, and leading to lifelong learning and service. (See The Aims of a BYU Education.) It is a condition of employment that faculty members observe the behavior standards of the university, including the Church Educational System Honor Code, and refrain from behavior or expression that seriously and adversely affects the university mission or the Church. Faculty who are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints also accept as a condition of employment the standards of conduct consistent with qualifying for temple privileges. They are expected to live lives reflecting a love of God, a commitment to keeping his commandments, and loyalty to the Church. They are expected to be role models to students of people who are proficient in their discipline and faithful in the Church. All faculty are expected to be role models for a life that combines the quest for intellectual rigor with spiritual values and personal integrity. They are expected to engage in continuing faculty development, and to maintain high levels of performance throughout the course of their careers.

3.1.2 Faculty Development Plan. New faculty should meet with their department chair during their first year to develop a faculty development plan for the period of employment through their final continuing faculty status review. The faculty development plan should describe the faculty member's proposed activities in the areas of citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty). The faculty

development plan should include a statement of:

A. The faculty member's self-assessment of his or her strengths, skills, competencies, interests, opportunities, and areas in which the faculty member wishes to develop.

B. The faculty member's professional goals in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and the plan to accomplish these goals.

C. The relationship between individual goals and department and university aspirations and needs.

D. Resources needed to accomplish the professional goals, including budgetary support, equipment, time, etc.

E. The faculty member's activities and accomplishments so far in achieving the goals.

F. The faculty member's comments, if desired, on measures used to assess success in his or her professorial or professional responsibilities and in accomplishing the goals set forth in the plan.

Faculty are encouraged to use the Faculty Center's resources in developing the plan. Faculty members should update and review the plan with the department chair in their annual interviews. Parts of the faculty development plan may form the basis for the personal statement which the faculty member produces for the file at the time of the third-year and final continuing faculty reviews (Appendices A and B). The faculty development plan is a planning tool, and does not constitute a commitment that the university will employ the faculty member for the period covered by the plan or that the faculty member will receive continuing faculty status if the goals in the plan are met. Retention of faculty depends on the overall quality of their performance and on the university's evolving needs. Continuing faculty status reviews are performed at the department, college, and university levels, and continuing faculty status is granted only by the university president.

3.1.3 Effectiveness in All Areas of Responsibility. Faculty are expected to perform high quality work in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty). Failure by faculty with continuing status to maintain acceptable performance constitutes adequate cause for termination. (See 2.1 and Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy) Faculty members have different strengths. However, the performance of faculty must be above acceptable minimum standards in all areas of responsibility. Most professorial faculty early in their careers should have a balance of teaching and scholarship, with lighter committee and other administrative assignments. The allocation of time in these three areas may vary among faculty or over a faculty member's career, depending on changes in assignments due to legitimate university and department needs. Reviewers in the rank and status process will exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing heavier responsibilities in one area against lighter responsibilities and performance in another. In this regard, reviews performed at the college level will rely heavily on context provided primarily in the department chair's letter but also from the

letter submitted by the department's rank and status committee. The Department of Plant and Wildlife Sciences is strongly committed to teaching undergraduate students. Faculty members are expected to balance teaching and research and to use research as a teaching tool to mentor undergraduates and to advise graduate students.

3.1.4 Annual Performance Reviews and Interviews. Continuing performance evaluations will be carried out for all faculty. The department chair, dean or designee, will conduct an annual performance review of, and an annual stewardship interview with, each faculty member in the department, including faculty with continuing faculty status. These interviews are the primary vehicle for tracking and encouraging continuing faculty development, and through which the performance of faculty with continuing faculty status is monitored, and through which performance expectations are communicated. These interviews should identify performance problems early, implement progressive steps to help a faculty member be successful in all areas of professorial responsibility, and create a record of discussions about performance problems and attempts made to remedy them. Departments are encouraged to have a department committee assist in conducting the annual performance reviews. In the annual interview the chair and the faculty member will review performance and develop goals and strategies for development and improvement. A written summary of the department chair's evaluations should be given to the faculty member and a copy placed in his or her department personnel file. A copy of the letter will be sent to the dean. In addition to serving as a regular, systematic process for reviewing faculty members' past performance, the annual stewardship interview process should also contain a prospective, developmental component. It is the primary opportunity for department chairs to monitor and help encourage continuous faculty development. Faculty development needs and opportunities should be discussed in each annual interview, regardless of a faculty member's past performance. Faculty should include in the materials submitted for the annual review a statement of plans for faculty development. The interview should include discussion of time and other resource implications of the development plans. All faculty members are expected to engage in continuous development and improvement in scholarship and teaching. Department chairs should encourage efforts and support opportunities for faculty development.

3.1.5 Academic Freedom. Occasionally, evaluation of faculty for rank and status may involve issues of academic freedom. In such cases, BYU's principles of academic freedom should be respected. These issues, however, will be reviewed within the faculty rank and status process rather than under university procedures governing faculty discipline or academic freedom grievances. (See Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy; Faculty Grievance Policy) Note that the faculty rank and status process considers academic freedom issues under a different standard than would apply in a disciplinary or academic freedom grievance proceeding. This is because disciplinary and academic freedom grievance proceedings are concerned with whether a faculty member has engaged in conduct or expression that seriously and adversely affects the university mission or the Church. A faculty rank and status review, on the other hand, focuses not merely on the presence or absence of harm, but on the "quality of the faculty member's overall affirmative contribution to the University. (See Procedures for Termination and Academic Freedom Grievances Policy, footnote 3.) Thus, the faculty rank and status process applies a higher standard for citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service,

for professional faculty) than would apply in a disciplinary or academic freedom grievance proceeding. For instance, assessments of teaching quality in a faculty rank and status review consider not just whether a teacher is incompetent or has harmed students or the university mission, but--far beyond the absence of harm--whether the teaching is affirmatively of high quality. The same approach applies to issues of citizenship and scholarship.

3.1.6 Annual Performance Reviews for Faculty with Continuing Status. All faculty are expected to perform at acceptable levels in all areas of their responsibility, citizenship, teaching, and scholarship, or professional service. (See 3.1.2) The standard for judging acceptable performance will depend in part on particular assignments and expectations formulated during the annual review process. Such assignments and expectations may vary over the course of a faculty member's career. If, in the annual performance interview, a faculty member's performance is evaluated as below acceptable levels it is the faculty member who bears the responsibility for achieving and maintaining acceptable performance. The department chair should take steps to see that reasonable efforts and resources are expended to assist the faculty member's efforts toward development and the maintenance of acceptable levels of performance. These efforts along with the chairs' evaluations should be documented on an ongoing basis. Development opportunities and activities should also be discussed in each annual interview. Generally, three consecutive annual reviews in which the faculty member's performance is judged to be below acceptable standards constitute adequate cause for termination of the faculty member's employment. Furthermore, a recurrent pattern of negative performance reviews over a period of years, even if they do not occur in consecutive years, may also constitute adequate cause for termination. These provisions do not mean that the university must wait three years or more before terminating a faculty member's employment. In some situations, immediate termination may be appropriate. In other situations, termination may be appropriate if the faculty member does not correct the problem within a reasonable period of time (see 2.1 and Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy).

3.1.7 Unacceptable Performance by Faculty with Continuing Status – First Year. Following an annual evaluation in which a faculty member's performance is judged to be unacceptable in any area, the faculty member and the chair will work together to produce a written improvement plan specifying in detail expectations and performance standards to be met, a reasonable time frame in which to meet the expectations and standards, criteria against which performance will be evaluated, methods by which satisfactory performance will be assessed, and specific efforts and resources that will be committed by the faculty member and by the department to the process. A copy of this plan will be included in the faculty member's file along with the department chair's written summary evaluation. These documents will be reviewed as part of the next year's annual evaluation. The chair will notify the dean of the results of the evaluation and the improvement plan. The dean should evaluate the thoroughness and reasonableness of the evaluation and improvement plan, and may suggest modifications to the conclusions of the annual review or the plan for improvement as well as next steps to be carried out in the development process.

3.1.8 Unacceptable Performance by Faculty with Continuing Status – Second Year. If, after following the procedures outlined in section 3.1.7, the next (a second) annual review also

results in a judgment that the faculty member's performance, including the implementation of the improvement plan, is below acceptable levels, the chair will inform the dean, who will review the case and conduct a performance evaluation. The dean may enlist the participation of the College Rank and Status Committee in the evaluation. The faculty member may also request a performance review by the College Rank and Status Committee. The dean, the department chair, and the faculty member will meet to review the evaluation and the improvement plan, develop a strategy for addressing the below standard performance, and take steps determined by the dean to be necessary so that the faculty member has reasonable resources available to allow opportunity to achieve an acceptable level of performance. The dean will write a summary evaluation, provide a copy for the faculty member, and place a copy in the faculty member's file.

3.1.9 Unacceptable Performance by Faculty with Continuing Status – Third Year. Following the procedures specified in Sections 3.1.7 and 3.1.8, in the event of a negative performance evaluation in the following year's (a third) annual performance review by the chair, the file containing the record of the last three annual performance reviews will be sent to the Academic Vice President. The Academic Vice President, the dean, and the department chair will meet to discuss the performance record of the faculty member, along with the efforts expended toward improvement by the faculty member and the support provided by the department and college. The dean, in consultation with the department chair, will make a recommendation to the Academic Vice President as to whether the faculty member's appointment should be terminated for adequate cause (failure to maintain acceptable standards of performance) at the end of the current contract period. The Academic Vice President will consider the recommendation and decide whether to terminate the faculty member's employment, or propose other remedies.

3.1.10 Appeal of the Academic Vice President's decision to not renew the faculty member's appointment for adequate cause is governed by the Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy.

3.2 Citizenship

3.2.1 The Citizenship Standard. As a university owned by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Brigham Young University expects all faculty to adhere to the highest standards of personal behavior and to exemplify honor and integrity. Faculty who are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints should be loyal to the Church, and all faculty should support the university mission and work to further the principles stated in the Mission of Brigham Young University and The Aims of a BYU Education. Faculty should observe university policies. They should willingly serve on committees and in other department, college, and university assignments. They should mentor, encourage, advise, and collaborate with colleagues. Although professionalism requires rigorous review and critique, faculty should always interact with colleagues, students, and others with civility and respect. They should promote collegiality and harmony in their departments. They should not denigrate other faculty or students or engage in disruption, manipulation, or contention. They should not abuse the moral climate of discourse on the campus. Faculty should be involved in the discipline by serving as referees of scholarship and by providing service and leadership in professional associations. They are encouraged to use their

professional expertise to give service to the community and the Church. They should actively participate in the life of the university community by attending department, college, and university meetings. While most professorial faculty early in their careers will have lighter committee and other administrative assignments (see 3.1.3), the college views failure in the citizenship standard for any faculty member as adequate justification to not recommend continuing faculty status, even if performance in teaching and scholarship is satisfactory. This includes failure to interact with other faculty members in a collegial, civil or respectful manner (see 3.2.2 below). The department will work with newer faculty members to avoid overloading them with course preparations or citizenship responsibilities.

3.2.2 Assessment of Citizenship. The following citizenship criteria will be used in the assessment of all faculty members:

A. For faculty who are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, loyalty to the Church.
B. Support for and affirmative contributions to the university mission and The Aims of a BYU Education.
C. Behavior reflecting honor, integrity, collegiality, civility, respect, concern for others, adherence to the university Church Educational System Honor Code, and observance of university policies. Department rank and status documents should include expectations for attendance at meetings, responsiveness to communication, and the quality of interpersonal interactions. The department chair's letter should report on outcomes related to these expectations including input given at annual stewardship interviews.

Plant and Wildlife faculty members are expected to consistently attend meetings on time; fulfill committee assignments, be available and communicative in a timely manner, engage in department issues and work, use university resources appropriately, and treat everyone with respect and kindness.

Although a faculty member may participate in only a portion of the following and other citizenship activities, evaluation of citizenship should consider the following evidence:

D. Participation in activities that strengthen the university, including administrative service, committee service, assignments in the Jerusalem Center and Study Abroad, and the teaching of General Education, Honors, Religious Education, and interdisciplinary courses.
E. Active participation in the intellectual life of the department, college, and university.
F. Willing participation in citizenship, leadership, and governance activities in the department, college, and the university, including service in rank and status reviews, curriculum review and development, hiring processes, student advising, etc.
G. Collaboration with colleagues in citizenship, teaching, or scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty).
H. Mentoring colleagues.
I. Service to the profession, including holding offices and committee assignments in professional associations, organizing professional meetings and panels, editing journals and newsletters, serving on editorial boards, and serving as referees of scholarship. Such service may include, but should extend beyond, strictly local and regional venues over a

faculty member's career.

J. Employment of professional expertise in service to the community and the Church.

K. Attendance at department and college meetings, devotionals, forums, convocations, etc.

L. Collaborative participation in international and service-learning activities and other activities that enhance BYU's approved outreach efforts.

3.2.3 Review Letters of Citizenship Activities. Department chairs and department review committees may solicit review letters evaluating a faculty member's citizenship activities from those who have closely observed these activities. Review letters should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the service.

3.3 Teaching

3.3.1 The Teaching Standard. The high quality education of students is, and should be, the most important activity of Brigham Young University faculty. Good university teachers are themselves eager learners who imbue their teaching with the excitement of learning. They care about their students. They are enthusiastic about sharing their knowledge with students and helping them learn. They have high standards, set clear expectations, and hold students to high levels of academic performance. They are well prepared and well organized, and they make good use of class time. They prepare well-designed syllabi, course materials, assignments, and examinations. They provide helpful evaluations of student work in a timely manner. They are consistently available to help students at least during reasonable designated consultation hours outside class. They are always engaged in the process of improving their teaching. They master the content of their courses and stay current with the literature and techniques of their disciplines. They are mentors and role models to students. They provide an education that is spiritually strengthening, intellectually enlarging, character building, and leading to lifelong learning and service. (See The Aims of a BYU Education.)

"The Teaching Standard" which is primarily addressed in 3.3.1 describes teaching that meets university expectations. Plant and Wildlife faculty members are expected to consistently receive high course and instructor ratings, accept a proportionate share of the department teaching load, take positive actions in response to teaching concerns raised by consistent student comments or teaching assessments; and support learning outcomes and assessment.

3.3.2 Assessment of Teaching. In assessing a faculty member's overall performance, evaluators should be sensitive to teaching loads, the number of preparations required, extra time spent working with students individually, and similar factors. Within the Department, faculty members with research appointments should approximate an even teaching-research time allocation (50-50), with some of the time for both research and teaching reduced by citizenship work. The number of preparations generally equals the number of different courses taught by a faculty member and represents a maximum not to be exceeded in a two-year period. The standard for the Department is no more than 12 contact hours (semester credits per 12 months) or four preparations over two years. In this regard, reviews performed at the college level will rely heavily on context provided primarily in the department chair's letter but also from the letter submitted by the department's rank

and status committee. The department chair's letter should indicate how teaching loads have been assigned and balanced with research and citizenship loads. This letter should also provide context for the relative difficulty in teaching certain courses within the department. Although faculty may participate in only a portion of these and other teaching activities, evaluation of teaching should consider evidence such as:

A. Description of teaching activities and quality, including:

1. List of courses taught by semester, with enrollment numbers.
2. New courses developed.
3. Supervision of independent study and research
4. Supervision of academic internships and service-learning experiences.
5. Supervision of graduate students as a committee chair or member.
6. Supervision of laboratory or field-based learning experiences.
7. Courses that require time-intensive or other unusual commitments.
8. Average number of office hours per week and other means of contact with students.
9. How written student comments are analyzed and incorporated into teaching improvements.

The faculty member will assemble a summary table of teaching that includes the following: courses taught by semester, enrollment numbers, student credit hours per course, instructor and course ratings per course (including response rates), and average GPAs per course (See Appendices A & B).

All members of the graduate faculty must have a terminal degree in their discipline or a doctoral degree in their area of expertise. The department expects each faculty member to maintain a rigorous graduate program. Graduate faculty must be committed and available to advise graduate students throughout their program of study. Consistent ongoing advisement of graduate students is expected, as evidenced by student presentations at professional and national meetings, and publication of student work in refereed journals.

B. Student evaluations, including:

1. University student evaluation forms and students written comments.
2. Written or oral comments solicited by the department review committee from a representative sample of students.

C. Peer evaluations. Peer evaluation is as important for teaching as it is for scholarship. The department review committee will obtain at least two substantive confidential peer evaluations of teaching from BYU faculty members qualified to make evaluations of the faculty member's approach to pedagogy, teaching activities and materials. The college recommends that two substantive peer evaluations of teaching be included in the third year file and that two additional evaluations be included in the sixth year file for four evaluations. Two additional recent peer evaluations should be included in files for rank advancement to Professor. The college also recommends that courses taught by the faculty member considered main or core teaching preparations be included in the four evaluations. The college encourages departments to use the peer review of teaching tools (i.e. narrative

and rating forms for both course design and classroom instruction) located on the university's department chair /administrator website. Peer reviews of teaching should be substantive in nature and assess: the faculty member's preparation and capacity to teach the designated course(s); course design and materials; classroom instruction; and student mentoring or consultation related to the course. Cursory peer reviews of teaching presented in the form of brief letters will not be considered. Evaluations may be completed by one faculty member or a group of faculty members (i.e. committee) as determined by the department chair or department protocol. While these evaluations are considered confidential to help ensure objectivity, department chairs should regularly provide teaching recommendations to faculty from the resources listed above (3.3.2).

The faculty member will assemble a teaching portfolio containing syllabi, textbooks, handouts, multimedia materials, assignments, learning exercises, examinations, and other course materials. The peer evaluations should concentrate on a review of the teaching portfolio, but should also include classroom visits. Ideally, the classroom visits should be conducted over several semesters prior to the faculty member's third- and sixth-year reviews. Peer evaluations might best assess such areas as:

1. Whether the course reflects the current state of the discipline.
2. The faculty member's mastery of the course content.
3. The course objectives, including whether the course meets the objectives of the curriculum of which it is a part.
4. The course organization.
5. The methods used to foster and measure learning.
6. The materials in the teaching portfolio (syllabi, textbooks, handouts, multimedia materials, assignments, learning exercises, examinations, and other course materials).

The department Rank and Status Committee chair will work with the department chair to assign peer-evaluators of teaching at least 2 teaching semesters before candidates for CFS or promotion are required to submit their materials.

Candidates should make their own assessment of both peer and student comments and indicate in the personal statement on teaching what steps they have taken to improve teaching and remedy concerns.

7. The faculty member's general concern for and interest in teaching.
8. The overall quality of teaching.

Other examples of meaningful peer evaluation of teaching might include reports from graduate schools or employers regarding students' performance, and professional invitations based on a faculty member's reputation as a teacher.

D. Description of steps taken to evaluate and improve teaching, including:

1. Staying current in one's discipline.
2. Performing self-evaluations of teaching.
3. Studying teaching techniques.
4. Obtaining assistance from the Faculty Center.

5. Presenting at, or attending seminars, workshops, and conferences on teaching.
6. Involving students or peers in improvement efforts.
7. Appropriately implementing instructional innovations, including technology.
8. Participating in course or curriculum development.
9. Writing textbooks, supplements, or other instructional materials.
10. Receiving grants aimed at improving teaching.
11. Taking professional development leaves to improve teaching.
12. Engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

E. Other evidence of quality teaching, such as:

1. Teaching awards and honors received.
2. The quality of text materials used.
3. Information about the faculty member's availability to students.
4. Effectiveness in implementing innovative teaching methods, including technology.
5. Effectiveness in mentoring students.
6. Other evidence of positive impact on students, including working with students in mentored learning environments.

F. Products of high quality teaching and mentoring, including:

1. Evidence of student achievement.
2. Student scores on standardized test when appropriate.
3. Student papers and examinations that evidence learning.
4. Students' scholarly or creative works.

Undergraduate student mentoring involves a significant commitment of faculty time; as well as personnel, financial, and laboratory resources. Mentored students must have access to faculty such that: a professional relationship is developed, creativity through the scientific process is experienced, and the student has sufficient responsibility over time to result in co-authorship in a professional presentation or peer-reviewed publication. Because mentoring requires a large commitment of time and expertise for one-on-one teaching, seeking funds to support mentored students, and presentation and publication of results, a faculty member will receive credit toward his/her responsibility in teaching and scholarly activity for each student mentored. (see also 3.4.4.2 H)

5. Honors and masters theses and Ph.D. dissertations supervised.
6. Successful academic internship and service-learning programs.
7. Student placement in graduate school or meaningful employment.

G. Example of course materials, such as:

1. Course materials prepared for students, including syllabi, textbooks, handouts, multimedia materials, assignments, learning exercises, examinations, and other course materials
2. Materials developed for on-campus, online, or distance education courses.

3.4 Scholarship

3.4.1 Purpose of Scholarship. The highest purpose of scholarly and creative work (collectively referred to in this policy as scholarship) is to serve God and humanity. Scholarship should contribute to the university mission. It should achieve one or more of the following objectives: improving the education of the minds and spirits of students, contributing to the expansion of truth throughout the world, facilitating the solution of pressing world problems, and enhancing the quality of people's lives. Scholarship extends the university's influence and reputation, which benefits our students, serves our local and worldwide communities, and makes friends for the university and the Church. Scholarship should infuse and inspire the faculty member's teaching both directly and indirectly. It must not interfere with or detract from teaching, but support and strengthen it. University faculty members must be learners in order to be teachers worthy of the name. They must be intellectually alive and current in their disciplines, not only through participating in the substantive developments of the discipline, but also through constantly honing the skills and tools of scholarship used in the discipline. In most disciplines this means that faculty will bring to their work the rigor of writing, subject the work to the criticism of scholarly peers, and share their insights with colleagues and students. A scholar is characterized by devotion to discovering and learning, by rigor and thoroughness in that learning, and by the determination to profess what is learned.

3.4.2 Forms of Scholarship. Because of diversity among the academic disciplines and because of the variety of intellectual tasks with which faculty are concerned, a faculty member's scholarship may take different forms, so long as the work is of high quality. Scholarship in the college generally falls along a continuum between basic and applied research. Basic research aims at obtaining greater fundamental knowledge without thought of a practical end goal. Applied research aims at practical application of knowledge toward a specific goal or solving a problem. While these two types of research are valued equally, they are assessed differently within departments based on discipline-specific standards for quality. Faculty members generally focus their work in no more than three areas and become experts in those fields. Scholarship includes, among other things, the discovery of new knowledge and original insights that add to the world's body of knowledge and understanding; the application of existing knowledge to the solution of practical problems; the integration of existing knowledge through interdisciplinary work; studying and improving the presentation of existing knowledge; and aesthetic or intellectual expression reflecting achievement in creative or performing arts.

3.4.3 The Scholarship Standard. Professorial faculty (and professional faculty whose responsibilities include scholarship) are expected to demonstrate consistent productivity of high quality scholarship over their entire careers. The scholar's record shows a growing body of works that have stood the test of exposure to and evaluation by other scholars in the discipline. Each discipline has its own scholarly traditions and its own channels for communication among scholars, and therefore each department should establish criteria for defining and evaluating scholarship within its discipline. A faculty member's scholarship should then be measured against those criteria. Both quality and quantity are relevant in assessing a faculty member's scholarly record. It should be recognized that one truly exceptional scholarly or creative work may be more important than several others. It should also be recognized that a faculty member may choose to work in an area in which progress is exceptionally difficult and in which results submitted for peer review are

necessarily few and infrequent. In this regard, reviews performed at the college level will rely heavily on context provided primarily in the department chair's letter but also from the letter submitted by the department's rank and status committee. While the expected type and quantity of scholarship vary by discipline, subject area, and the fraction of a faculty member's assignment devoted to scholarship, the expected level of quality must always be high.

3.4.4 Assessment of Scholarship

3.4.4.1 Criteria. Within the context of the various disciplines, the following criteria are relevant in evaluating scholarship:

A. Scholarship should be consistent with disciplinary norms and department, college, and university missions. Reviews performed at the college level do not compare disciplines or departments but rather the merit of scholarship within a discipline.
B. It should contribute to a faculty member's overall effectiveness as a teacher.
C. It should be of high quality and contain some element of originality, either in the form of new knowledge, new understanding, fresh insight, or unique skill or interpretation.
D. It should be subject to peer review in any of several appropriate ways on this campus and elsewhere, for the purpose of verifying the nature and quality of its contribution by those competent to judge it. In some departments and colleges, a variety of situations may make on-campus reviews of scholarship the most appropriate means of evaluation. A decision by a department or college to regularly use on-campus reviews as a primary method of peer review must be approved by the dean and the academic vice president.
E. The reputation and selectivity of scholarly presses and journals are relevant in evaluating the quality and impact of scholarship. Generally, faculty members are encouraged to publish in nationally and internationally recognized peer-reviewed scholarly presses and journals in the discipline. The further removed that scholarship is from this format, the greater the responsibility of the faculty member and the department to provide for a critical evaluation that verifies the quality of the work. More specifically, the college relies on department rank and status documents to contextualize and clarify discipline-specific issues of both quantity and quality, particularly with respect to the quality and strength of journals (i.e., tiered listings, other rankings, impact factors within disciplines, narrative descriptions, etc.). In the absence of clear standards described in department rank and status documents, the college rank and status committee may seek additional information or clarification from department chairs and/or department rank and status committees to assess the quality of scholarship.
F. Generally, publications count in the rank and status process when they are accepted for publication. This includes papers published as *epubs* ahead of print. Additional publications may not be considered after the department faculty vote has been taken, except as outlined in Section 7.5.

G. The same criteria that apply in evaluating scholarship published in paper formats (quality, peer review, publisher's reputation and selectivity, etc.) also apply to scholarship published in electronic formats.
H. Generally, course materials that are used primarily inside the university and that are not disseminated in the wider discipline count in the category of teaching rather than in the category of scholarship.

3.4.4.2 Evidence of Scholarship. Evidence of scholarship includes but is not limited to the following, so long as the above criteria are satisfied. Evidence should emphasize work performed at BYU and since the last rank advancement. The whole body of a scholar's work is also important because it provides evidence of a wider impact of the research.

A. Refereed scholarly publications, including books, articles, refereed conference proceedings, etc. During the third and sixth year reviews, and reviews for advancement in rank, emphasis is on primary publication—peer reviewed first publication in readily available sources of original research, in a form that allows others to repeat experiments and test conclusions. Such sources are usually printed journals, but may include open-access journals. Other sources (i.e. books, articles, refereed conference proceedings, etc.) that fail to meet the criteria of primary publication are of much lesser value. Peer review is defined as having at least two outside anonymous prepublication reviewers in addition to any review by editors. Senior-author journal articles are expected, but collaborative publications are also valued. Including students as co-authors, as appropriate, provides evidence of mentoring quality. Senior author refers to the author who directed the research, without whose contribution the research would not have happened. Because of various practices among disciplines and journals, this is often, but not always, the first author listed. Objective evidence of journal quality and publication impact should be included (when available) in the annotated bibliography (See Appendices A & B).

Work that is published in anonymously peer-reviewed and recognized reputable journals is given highest recognition and is expected to be the majority of output of all faculty members. Some well-respected professional journals now publish names of reviewers of a manuscript after acceptance for publication. This is still considered anonymous peer review. Faculty members are expected to publish as a 3-year sliding average 1 to 2 peer-reviewed publications per year. For advancement to professor, an average of at least 2 publications per year in refereed journals is highly recommended. Given the emphasis of mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, co-authorship with students is a high priority.

Senior authorship and secondary authorship after a mentored undergraduate or an advised graduate student are considered of equal value. The senior author of a publication is decided by co-authors and is usually the person who leads out in developing and implementing the research idea, conducts or supervises data analysis, initiates the manuscript draft, and revises the manuscript during the review process. Candidates under review should specify how senior authorship

is indicated in their profession, if not by the usual convention as the first-listed author. As with professional presentations, co-authorship with students is highly valued. Multiple-authorship is considered of value, and evidence of a mix of authorships including major responsibility in cooperative research should be apparent over time.

B. Other scholarly publications, including books, textbooks, monographs, book chapters, abstracts, translations which contribute to a body of knowledge or reflect significant scholarly activity and expertise, etc. Anonymously peer-reviewed synthesis and other work published as book chapters, books, or in proceedings of symposia will be considered of similar value, but must be in addition to journal publications. Work that is peer-reviewed or peer-edited, but not anonymously, such as may appear in reports or symposia proceedings is also valued, but these works will not be considered as rigorous as those above, and must supplement, not replace, anonymous peer review.

C. Technical reports and similar publications that present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research, and which contribute to the professional literature, the advancement of professional practice, or the improvement of professional education. Non-reviewed works are recognized as valuable for disseminating information in some fields. These works are not considered as rigorous as those that are peer-reviewed and will be considered as supplementary.

D. Peer-reviewed or juried creative works, such as paintings, public performances, exhibits, published poetry, and published essays.

E. Other creative works.

F. Grants for research or creative work, when resulting from a competitive process of peer review. Grants may evidence the quality of the prior body of work upon which the research proposal is based. Proposals which received high ratings but no funding may also be considered. Success in most research areas requires substantial funding, including funding from outside sources. There is not a specific requirement for outside funding. The real measure of research success is publication 3.4.4.2.A. Unfunded proposals show effort.

G. Intellectual property developed, such as software or patents. Patents are also recognized as refereed publications, as is the release of a certifiable variety or brand of commercially acceptable plant or organism.

H. Presentations at professional meetings and conferences. Although presentations are evidence of scholarly activity, they should be developed into publications. Including student co-authors, as appropriate, provides evidence of mentoring quality. All faculty members with research time are expected to regularly present their on-going and completed work at professional meetings. Invited presentations at professional meetings will be recognized as having the greatest value. Invited professional research seminars and professional meetings are considered a high honor. Co-authorship with students is highly valued and is recognized as a major indicator of appropriate mentoring. Presentations at other than professional meetings are considered of value, but are viewed as supplemental to those at professional meetings.

Faculty members are expected to consistently seek research funding; advise and mentor graduate and undergraduate students; submit well organized and thorough faculty profile information and promotion portfolios; and increase teaching load as appropriate when decreasing scholarly productivity.

I. Awards or other recognition for scholarship.

4 Continuing Faculty Status Reviews

4.1 Initial and Final Reviews. The first six years of service after appointment in a continuing faculty status track until continuing faculty status is granted are a probationary period during which a faculty member's performance is reviewed annually by the department chair. New faculty members should receive mentoring during this probationary period. To receive continuing faculty status, faculty members must pass two formal university reviews. During the winter semester of their third year, an initial review will occur to assess their progress and to decide whether to advance them to candidacy for continuing faculty status. If the candidate continues to meet expectations during the probationary period, a final continuing faculty status review will occur beginning fall semester of their sixth year. An exception to this six-year schedule of reviews may be granted to an individual college based on considerations unique to the nature of the disciplines represented in the college. Colleges may petition to extend the probationary period to seven years for all faculty within the college. Permission to extend the probationary period must be requested in writing by the dean, and can be granted only in writing by the academic vice president. It is expected that the decision to extend the probationary period to seven years will reflect the individual nature of the disciplines and the best interests of the colleges and the university. Faculty members in colleges that have adopted a seven-year schedule for continuing status reviews may, at their sole discretion, elect to undergo a final continuing status review in their sixth year of service. Each faculty member must declare in writing to the department chair his or her intention whether to undergo a final review in their sixth or seventh year by April 1 of his or her fifth year. The same criteria of evaluation will apply for a sixth- as for a seventh-year review. If a faculty member elects to undergo a final continuing status review in the sixth year, and if that review is negative, or if the faculty member withdraws at any point during the review process, he or she will not be permitted to subsequently elect to undergo review in the seventh year. The decision as to whether to undergo review in the sixth or the seventh year should be made after careful consultation with the department chair and the dean. Except as provided otherwise by this policy, the initial and final continuing faculty status reviews and their timing are mandatory. Requests to delay a scheduled review or to review a faculty member early for either continuing faculty status or rank advancement must be made in writing by the faculty member, and approved by the department chair, the dean and the Academic Vice President. A faculty member may withdraw from the process at any stage, but withdrawal constitutes a resignation from the university at the end of the contract year. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

4.2 Purpose of the Reviews. The purpose of the continuing faculty status reviews is to assure the present and future fulfillment of promise sufficient to warrant a permanent commitment to a faculty member by the university. Granting continuing faculty status creates a long-term relationship that significantly affects the quality of the university, its ability to fulfill its mission, and the lives of its students over many years. The principal reasons for the continuing faculty status reviews are to provide the best education for our students, to assist in faculty development, and to establish ongoing expectations for faculty. Assessments and recommendations by reviewers at all levels should be as candid, honest, and complete as feasible within the guidelines specified in this policy. Strengths and weaknesses of faculty members should be fully discussed by reviewers, and specific reasons for positive or negative recommendations should be clearly stated.

4.3 Initial (Third-Year) Review. The initial review will include an assessment of the faculty member's performance and promise in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty). Essentially the same procedures apply to initial and final continuing faculty status reviews, except that external reviews of scholarship are not required in initial (third-year) reviews. Candidates for both initial and final reviews in PWS are expected to present a seminar to the faculty (students also invited). Faculty who are progressing satisfactorily will be granted candidacy for continuing faculty status. The Faculty Council on Rank and Status will draft comments to the faculty member indicating areas for praise and concern to help the faculty member prepare for the final review. The letter will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and included in the final review file. Faculty who are not progressing satisfactorily and who do not become candidates for continuing faculty status will be notified that they will not receive another contract after the existing contract year ends. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere. The normal calendar for initial reviews is:

Department chair meets with candidates to initiate portfolio; notifies dean and department committee	October 15
Department committee begins collecting review letters of teaching and citizenship	December 1
Committee completes review; portfolio available for department review	December 15

Department reviews to colleges:	February 11
College reviews to university:	March 20
Final decisions to faculty:	June 1

4.4 Final (Sixth-Year) Review. The final continuing faculty status review will include an assessment of the faculty member's performance and promise in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty). To receive continuing faculty status, faculty must clearly demonstrate by their performance that they meet or exceed the department, college, and university standards as set forth in their rank and status documents. The rationale for a negative decision will be communicated to the faculty member by the chair, the dean, or the Academic Vice President for Faculty. Faculty

who are not granted continuing faculty status will be notified that they will not receive another contract after the existing contract year ends. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere. The normal calendar for final reviews is:

Chair and candidate meet; mentor identified; dean and department committee notified; review hire letter for special exceptions	January 15
Committee chair identifies potential external reviewers	May 1
Portions of portfolio to be sent to external reviewers are complete; reviewers contacted	June 1
All internal and external letters collected	August 1
Committee completes review; portfolio available for department review	September 10
Department discussion and vote	October 1

Department reviews to colleges:	October 15
College reviews to university:	December 1
Final decisions to faculty:	April 30

4.5 Delay of the Continuing Faculty Status Reviews. Professional development leaves taken during the first six years count as part of the six-year probationary period. By contrast, personal leaves (including leaves for illness or other significant extenuating circumstances) do not count as part of the six-year probationary period, and therefore delay the continuing faculty status reviews. Any eligible time off as defined by the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) will run concurrently with a qualifying university leave (see Faculty Leaves Policy). A faculty member who is unable to work full-time should request a full-time or part-time personal leave. Extenuating personal or family circumstances may also justify postponing a review. During the probationary period, a faculty member may request a one-time, one-year delay in the schedule of rank and status reviews because of specific extenuating personal or family situations, such as, pregnancy, childbirth, special parenting needs, personal or family illness, or other similar personal or family circumstances without taking a personal leave if they are able to meet their normal full-time teaching or other professional assignments. Delays of continuing faculty status reviews are exceptional, and must be approved by the chair, the dean, and the academic vice president in writing before the rank and status review process begins.

5 Rank Advancement for Professorial Faculty

The three academic ranks for professorial faculty are assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. The minimum university requirements for these ranks are:

5.1 Assistant Professor

A. Understanding of the importance of citizenship and willingness to engage in high quality citizenship.
B. Definite promise of high quality teaching.

C. Interest in and evidence of ability to produce high quality scholarship.
D. The doctoral degree or other appropriate terminal degree, such as the Master of Fine Arts (MFA) degree. In exceptional cases, when a master's degree, professional experience, or other training is considered sufficient by similar institutions of higher education, such degree, experience, or training may suffice.

5.2 Associate Professor

For promotion to Associate Professor, the scholar is expected to present evidence that indicates a strong promise of future success in achieving national recognition in their discipline. There should also be growing evidence of an independent research program demonstrated by increasing numbers of senior-authored publications.

A. A sufficient record of high quality university citizenship.
B. A sufficient record of high quality teaching.
C. A sufficient record of high quality scholarship since appointment as an assistant professor.
D. A minimum of six years in service as an assistant professor to demonstrate over time the faculty member's proficiency in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship. Therefore, the review for rank advancement will normally occur during the faculty member's sixth year of service as an assistant professor, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the six-year minimum.)

5.3 Professor

For promotion to Professor, the scholar is expected to be an independent researcher (sufficient number of senior-authored publications) and to present evidence that indicates achievement of national/international recognition as outlined in the Department document.

The department considers the following to be examples of evidence of a national/international reputation: associate editorship for a peer-reviewed professional journal; elected or appointed leadership of professional societies and committees; presentations and publications resulting from national or international invitations; presentations for invited seminars; publication in nationally or internationally recognized peer-reviewed journals; invitations and service on national/international research proposal review panels; role as principal investigator in successful grant proposals and awards; awards received from national or international professional groups for professional performance; invitations to testify as an expert witness in legal cases; and national/international media exposure associated with professional activities.

A. An established record of high quality university citizenship.
B. An established record of high quality teaching.
C. An established record of high quality scholarship since becoming an associate professor.
D. At least five years in service as an associate professor to demonstrate over time the faculty member's proficiency in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship. Therefore, the earliest that a review for rank advancement could occur is during the faculty member's fifth year of service as an associate professor, and rank advancement would take effect

fall semester of the following year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the five-year minimum.)

5.4 Calendar for Rank Advancement Reviews. The normal calendar for rank advancement reviews is the same as for final continuing faculty status reviews. (See 4.4.) A nomination for rank advancement, even though it accompanies a nomination for continuing faculty status at the time of the sixth-year review, must be considered and evaluated as a separate proposition. All reviewing bodies must make a recommendation regarding rank advancement separate from the recommendation regarding continuing faculty status.

6 Professional Faculty

6.1 Definition of Professional Faculty. Professional faculty are faculty who have specialized responsibilities. Professional faculty include teaching faculty, research faculty, clinical faculty, librarians, athletic professionals, and others. Professional faculty enjoy the same basic privileges as professorial faculty. They may receive continuing faculty status (except for athletic professionals, including trainers) and rank advancement. They may vote in departmental decisions regarding faculty appointments, continuing faculty status, rank advancement, and all other matters. They may serve as chairs or deans, on committees, and in other administrative assignments, and they are eligible for university awards.

6.2 Creating a Professional Faculty Position. To create a professional faculty position, the department and the dean must submit a written request to the academic vice president. The memorandum should justify the request and include a position description stating the specific responsibilities and expectations of the position and the ways in which performance will be evaluated. Transferring current faculty from one track to another should be done to meet university needs rather than to accommodate a faculty member who is not succeeding in his or her current track.

6.3 Evaluation of Professional Faculty. This rank and status policy applies to professional faculty, except that athletic professionals are not eligible for continuing faculty status. Professional faculty are evaluated in citizenship and professional service. The department review committee should solicit review letters of a faculty member's citizenship and professional service from those who have closely observed those activities. Except in third-year reviews, external review letters should also be sought when a faculty member's citizenship or professional service has extended beyond the university. A sample letter to external reviewers is attached as Appendix E. The department review committee needs to obtain external review letters of scholarship only if scholarship is a primary area of the faculty member's professional service.

6.4 Citizenship. The standards and assessment evidence for citizenship described in section 3.2 apply to professional faculty.

6.5 Professional Service. Professional service encompasses work in the specific university assignments given to a professional faculty member. Specific expectations regarding a professional faculty member's assignments should be set forth in the position description or in the department or college rank and status policy, and should be included in the file

prepared for the rank and status review. Faculty should be evaluated according to those expectations and the standards in this policy. While there are many types of assignments, some of the more common assignments and the related standards and assessment evidence are listed below:

6.5.1 Teaching Faculty. The standards and assessment evidence for teaching described in section 3.3 apply to teaching faculty. They also apply to other professional faculty to the extent that their responsibilities include teaching.

6.5.2 Research Faculty. The standards, criteria, and assessment evidence for scholarship described in section 3.4 apply to research faculty. They also apply to other professional faculty to the extent that their responsibilities include scholarship.

6.5.3 Clinical Faculty

6.5.3.1 Standards for Clinicians. A clinician provides professional service to clients. Clinicians should possess a high degree of competence. They should be well prepared, able to demonstrate sound clinical skills in working with clients, and effective in assisting students to develop clinical skills. Effective clinicians are mentors and role models to students. They command the high respect of colleagues, clients, and students because they are not willing to compromise professional standards of practice. They are highly interested in the progress and welfare of both clients and students and are appropriately available to them.

6.5.3.2 Assessment of Clinicians. Evaluation of clinical service should consider the following evidence:

A. The faculty development plan, which includes a statement of goals, description of past activities and accomplishments, and a plan for future professional development.
B. Self-evaluations.
C. Evaluations of clinical performance by supervisors, peers, and clients when applicable.
D List of journals regularly read.
E. Seminars, workshops, and conferences attended.
F. Participation in program development.
G. Professional development leaves to improve clinical expertise.
H. Presentations at professional meetings.
I. Licensure or national certification. Documentation of attendance at meetings or numbers of practice or recertification hours to maintain licensure or certification may be required, if applicable.
J. Teaching. If clinicians are assigned to teach courses, the standards and assessment evidence that apply to teaching faculty apply to that part of their assignment.
K. Scholarship. If clinicians are assigned to perform scholarship, the standards, criteria, and assessment evidence that apply to research faculty apply to that part of their assignment, unless their position description or the department or college rank and status policy sets forth different provisions to meet the needs of clinical activities in the department or college.

L. Program leadership. Performance will be evaluated by supervisors, peers, and subordinates.

6.5.4 Librarians

6.5.4.1 Standards for Librarians. The library's mission is to gather and preserve collections of recorded information and literary art and to provide the means to access these collections. The library also teaches members of the university community how to locate such information so that it can be used to enhance scholarship and spiritual and intellectual development. Librarians' accomplishments must be judged according to their contributions to that mission. Librarians participate in a wide variety of assigned activities throughout their careers. Certain activities in every position involve the day-to-day provision of library services. The diligent fulfillment of such responsibilities is essential but not sufficient for effectiveness. True professionals possess a vision that enables them not only to adapt to changing circumstances, but also to foresee change and prepare for it. They are able to look critically at their own work and creatively expand and enhance library services. They accept responsibility for resolving problems and overcoming obstacles. Commitment, leadership, innovation, and creativity characterize the effective librarian. The skills needed for librarianship are constantly changing as the means of collecting and disseminating information change. Beyond formal training, every librarian needs to have a broad range of professional experiences in order to develop the necessary competency, commitment, vision, and creativity.

6.5.4.2 Assessment of Librarians. Evaluation of librarianship should consider the following evidence:

A. The faculty development plan, which includes a statement of goals, description of past activities and accomplishments, and a plan for future professional development.
B. A summary of accomplishments that addresses areas of library assignment such as:
1. Setting and accomplishing significant goals.
2. Achieving a satisfactory quantity and quality of work in each major responsibility.
3. Using sound judgment in decision-making.
4. Managing personnel and budgetary resources effectively.
5. Participating on library committees that are directly related to assigned responsibilities.
6. Cooperating with librarians, other faculty, and patrons to accomplish library and university goals.
7. Demonstrating effectiveness in studying, evaluating, and building collections, and in selecting, acquiring, and providing access to materials.
8. Demonstrating effectiveness in developing and maintaining bibliographic control by verifying, ordering, and processing materials; by classifying and cataloging materials; or by utilizing other bibliographic processes, resources, or systems.
9. Demonstrating effectiveness in guiding and assisting students and faculty by satisfying reference needs, developing subject bibliographies, teaching research strategies both formally and informally, and promoting the

effective use of the library.

10. Demonstrating effectiveness in preserving or conserving the physical integrity and intellectual content of materials and in educating patrons in their careful use.
11. Demonstrating effectiveness in administering and managing the university library, division, department, or other sub-unit.

C. A description of steps taken to evaluate and improve the librarian's performance, including:

1. Studying relevant literature in the field and incorporating new ideas and knowledge into one's professional assignment.
2. Taking or teaching courses directly related to professional assignment (e.g., foreign languages, library science, computer science, business management, or subject specialty courses).
3. Attending seminars, workshops, and conferences.
4. Participating in professional development leaves to improve performance.

D. A description of scholarship that is an outgrowth of performance in one's professional assignment. Only scholarship directly focused on one's professional assignment will be considered. Examples include:

1. Researching, inventing, and implementing significant and effective library procedures, tools, or other innovative techniques, processes, or systems that result in the improvement of library services.
2. Presenting research or innovative or unique information at library conferences and professional meetings.
3. Publishing significant and original contributions that reflect the primary focus of one's professional assignment.

6.5.5 Athletic Professionals

6.5.5.1 Standards for Athletic Professionals. The athletic professional's primary focus is the education and development of individual student athletes. Good athletic professionals are experts in the technical knowledge relating to their sport. They also know how to teach this knowledge and to motivate their athletes to high achievement. They infuse their coaching with the excitement of learning, developing skill, and achieving excellence. Effective athletic professionals work hard and are well prepared for practices and games. They exemplify professional standards in their work and interpersonal relationships. They set high standards of moral and ethical behavior through both precept and example, and they help their athletes to observe these standards. They exemplify good sportsmanship and respect for opponents. They care about their athletes in all aspects of their lives. They become mentors and role models to their athletes both on and off the field, and they are available for individual discussion and counseling. They encourage athletes to be good students and to take advantage of opportunities on campus to develop spiritually, intellectually, and socially, as well as physically. Good athletic professionals are also good recruiters. They are effective in communicating the value of a BYU education. They recruit athletes who have the character and academic potential to be successful at BYU, and they

are honest and open in communicating university standards.

6.5.5.2 Assessment of Athletic Professionals. Evaluation of an athletic professional's performance should consider the following evidence:

A. The faculty development plan, which includes a statement of goals, description of past activities and accomplishments, and a plan for future professional development.

B. Accomplishments, records, and recognitions of the program.

1. Record of wins, losses, and championships.
2. Rank in the conference and national rankings.
3. Coaching honors and awards.
4. Record of all-conference performers and all-Americans.
5. Record of academic achievements of athletes: GPA, Cougar Club scholar athletes, conference scholar athletes, all-American scholar athletes, Co-SIDA academic all-Americans, and academic all-American citations by the Coaches Association.
6. Graduation rate of athletes.
7. Selected articles about achievements of the team and athletes.
8. Accomplishments of former student athletes.

C. Peer and Athlete Evaluations.

1. Review letters from other BYU athletic professionals and administrators.
2. Review letters from personnel of regional and national conferences or other organizations.
3. Review letters from peers outside the university.
4. Review letters from current and former athletes.
5. Review letters regarding relationships with parents and personnel.
6. Interview data from student athletes, including exit interviews conducted by or under the direction of the athletic director.

D. Professional Activities.

1. Competence in performance of professional responsibilities such as coaching, athletic of training, and rehabilitation of athletes.
2. Staying current with developments in the profession, including advances in theory and technique.
3. Adherence to conference and NCAA rules and regulations.
4. Evidence of good sportsmanship, good behavior of athletic professionals and athletes, and ethical management of the program.
5. Activities pursued to enhance expertise, including attendance and presentations at workshops, clinics, conferences, and program observations.
6. Literature reviewed, including journals and other professional materials.
7. Creative accomplishments related to coaching.
8. Books or articles published.
9. Evidence of counseling and mentoring for the development of student athletes.
10. Program activities that further the university mission or that create positive public relations for the university.
11. Fund raising and sports promotions.

6.6 Rank Advancement for Professional Faculty. Academic ranks for professional faculty include:

A. Assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, and teaching professor.
B. Assistant research professor, associate research professor, and research professor.
C. Assistant clinical professor, associate clinical professor, and clinical professor.
D. Assistant librarian, associate librarian, and senior librarian.
E. Assistant athletic professional, associate athletic professional, and athletic professional.

To hold these ranks, faculty must meet department, college, and university standards in citizenship and professional service. Any other rank designations must be approved by the academic vice president.

6.6.1 Assistant Professional (Assistant Teaching, Research, or Clinical Professor; Assistant Librarian; and Assistant Athletic Professional

A. Understanding of the importance of citizenship and willingness to engage in high quality citizenship.
B. Definite promise of high quality professional service.
C. An appropriate degree, such as a doctor's degree, a master's degree, or other degree as determined by the department. When appropriate, equivalent professional training or experience may be considered sufficient.

6.6.2 Associate Professional (Associate Teaching, Research, or Clinical Professor; Associate Librarian; and Associate Athletic Professional

A. A sufficient record of high quality citizenship.
B. A sufficient record of high quality professional service.
C. An appropriate degree, such as a doctor's degree, a master's degree, or other degree as determined by the department. When appropriate, equivalent professional training or experience may be considered sufficient.
D. A minimum of six years in service as an assistant professional that demonstrates over time the faculty member's proficiency in citizenship and professional service. Therefore, the review for promotion to associate professional will normally occur during the faculty member's sixth year of service as an assistant professional, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following academic year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the six-year minimum.)

6.6.3 Full Professional (Teaching, Research or Clinical Professor; Senior Librarian; and Athletic Professional

A. An established record of high quality citizenship.
B. An established record of high quality professional service.
C. An appropriate degree, such as a doctor's degree, a master's degree, or other degree as determined by the department. When appropriate, equivalent professional training or experience may be considered sufficient.
D. A minimum of five years in service as an associate professional to demonstrate

over time the faculty member's proficiency in citizenship and professional service. Therefore, the review for promotion to full professional will normally occur during the faculty member's fifth year of service as an associate professional, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following academic year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the five-year minimum.)

7 Procedures for Continuing Faculty Status and Rank Advancement Reviews

7.1 Overview. Initial and final continuing faculty status reviews and rank advancement reviews include evaluations at the department, college, and university levels. Essentially the same procedures apply to initial and final continuing faculty status and rank advancement reviews, except that external review letters of scholarship are not required in initial (third-year) reviews. Faculty preparing for third- and final reviews are solely responsible for their preparation, including preparation of their files. Failure of others to communicate with or to assist the faculty member being reviewed is not an excuse for lack of preparation or grounds for requesting an independent examination of the academic vice president’s recommendation.

7.2 Materials to Include in the File. The faculty member is responsible for developing a file that is professional and complete as defined in this document. Materials to include in the file for professorial faculty are described in sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 (citizenship); 3.3.2 and 7.9.4 (teaching); and 3.4.4.2 and 7.3 (scholarship); and are summarized in Appendix A. Materials to include in the file for professional faculty are described in sections 6.3 (evaluation of professional faculty); 3.2.2, 3.2.3, and 6.4 (citizenship); 6.5 (professional service); 3.3.2 and 6.5.1 (teaching faculty); 3.4.4.2, 6.5.2, and 7.3 (research faculty); 6.5.3.2 (clinical faculty); 6.5.4.2 (librarians); and 6.5.5.2 (athletic professionals); and are summarized in Appendix B. A copy of the file prepared for the third-year review should be retained by the department and made available if requested for review during the sixth-year review.

7.3 Examples of Scholarship. Only the best three examples of scholarship will be included in the file. The faculty member will include a brief explanation why they were selected. The faculty member will make available in the department office copies of all other written scholarship and evidence of all other creative work to be considered in the review. This work will be sent to subsequent review levels only if requested.

7.4 Size of the File. The faculty member should be selective about what to include in the file, because the file itself is an indication of professional maturity. A concise file that emphasizes the best evidence is more persuasive than a file cluttered with documents. Personal letters from students to the faculty member should not be included. Plastic page protectors should be avoided (copies of certificates should be used instead of originals). Generally, with the exception of books submitted as examples of scholarship, the file should fit in a two-inch binder.

7.5 Additional Information. Reviewers at any level may request, receive, or obtain additional information from the faculty member or others. If the college or university review committee adds documents to the file that materially affect the committee's recommendation, it is recommended that the documents be shared with the dean, the

department chair, and the college and department review committees so that they can consider whether to change their recommendations. Such additions include but are not limited to documents indicating the acceptance of additional publications, additional student evaluations, and late-arriving external review letters. Documents that strengthen the file need not be shared with prior review levels that made positive recommendations, and documents that weaken the file need not be shared with prior review levels that made negative recommendations, since those documents would not change the recommendations.

7.6 Allegations of Violations of University Policy. If reviewers believe that a candidate may have violated university policy, the reviewers will advise the faculty member of the specific allegations, and give him or her an opportunity to respond in writing. The allegations and the response will be included in the file.

7.7 Confidential Information. In some cases, the candidate or reviewers may feel that certain information is sensitive or confidential and should not be shared broadly. Sometimes the problem may be resolved by including the information in the file in a redacted form which preserves confidentiality. Generally, the decision of what to include in the file should allow as many reviewers as possible to see the information on a need to know basis, while still maintaining confidentiality. In all cases the information will be shared with the department chair, the dean, the associate academic vice president for faculty, the academic vice president, and the president. If questions arise, reviewers should contact the associate academic vice president for faculty who will determine a course of action that takes these needs into account.

7.8 Departmental and Disciplinary Perspective. Because the department is most familiar with the faculty member's performance and the standards in the department and the discipline, the reports of the department review committee and the department chair should specifically address the faculty member's performance in light of departmental and disciplinary standards to help guide reviewers at the college and university levels. Reviewers at the college and university levels should give appropriate deference to the department's perspective, although they should also conduct their own independent evaluation. College and university level reviews should reflect the perspective of the college and university at large.

7.9 Department Review

7.9.1 Department Review Committee. The department review committee is composed of at least three faculty members, all of whom have continuing faculty status. The department chair appoints the committee and the committee chair. In the Department of Plant and Wildlife Sciences the committee characteristically consists of a minimum of at least 5 faculty members having the rank of full professor. Every effort is made to include at least one member from each departmental focal group. If a focal area cannot be represented by a full professor on the committee, an associate professor with CFS status can be asked to serve on the committee. Only full professors may vote on advancements in rank to full professor. The department chair appoints the committee and designates a committee chair. The chair serves for no more than three years.

7.9.2 Waiver. The department review committee chair will request the faculty member to sign a

waiver of access to reviews solicited from students, faculty, external peers, and others. The signed waiver letter should be included in the faculty member's file. (See Appendix C.)

7.9.3 Review Letters of Citizenship Activities. The department review committee may solicit review letters evaluating a faculty member's citizenship activities from those who have closely observed these activities. Review letters should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the service. (See 3.2.3.)

7.9.4 Student Evaluations of Teaching. In initial and final continuing faculty status reviews, the department review committee will include in the file a report of all student evaluations for each class taught and a compilation of all student comments from all classes. Similarly, in rank advancement reviews, the file will include all student evaluations conducted during the past several years and a typescript of all student comments from those classes. Trends in ratings as well as the types of classes (e.g., large or small, undergraduate or graduate) should be considered. The department review committee may also solicit written or oral comments from a representative sample of students. (See 3.3.2.B.)

7.9.5 Peer Evaluations of Teaching, The department review committee will obtain written peer evaluations of teaching and include them in the file. (See 3.3.2.C.)

7.9.6 External Reviews of Scholarship. In final continuing faculty status and rank advancement reviews, the department review committee will obtain external reviews of the body of the faculty member's scholarship from at least three tenured faculty members at well regarded academic institutions who have achieved reputations in the relevant field. The faculty member may recommend reviewers, but the department review committee and the department chair are responsible for selecting the reviewers. Generally, reviewers should hold equal or higher rank to that being sought, and they should be persons whose personal association with the candidate would not be expected to bias the reviews. The committee report will describe how the reviewers were selected, the reasons they were chosen, their stature in the field, and any relationship they may have with the faculty member. Abbreviated Curriculum Vitae of each external reviewer should be included by departments in the candidate's confidential binder. The committee will send the reviewers the faculty member's curriculum vitae, information about the faculty member's teaching assignment, samples of scholarship from the file, and a summary of the university and department standards for assessing scholarship. Selection and invitation of external reviewers and distribution of review materials should take place by July 1. Appendix D is a sample letter to external reviewers. For professional faculty, the department review committee needs to obtain external review letters of scholarship only if scholarship is a primary area of the faculty member's professional service. Department chairs and department review committees should allow adequate time for selecting and contacting potential reviewers, conveying materials, and receiving review letters.

7.9.7 Review Letters of Citizenship and Professional Service for Professional Faculty. For professional faculty, the department review committee should solicit review letters of a faculty member's citizenship and professional service from those who have closely observed those activities. Except in third-year reviews, external review letters should be sought when a faculty member's citizenship or professional service has extended beyond the university. (See 6.3.) A sample letter to external reviewers is attached as Appendix E.

7.9.8 Department Review Committee's Vote and Report. After evaluating the faculty member's performance, the department review committee will, by majority vote, recommend to grant or deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. The committee will write a report to the department chair evaluating the faculty member's citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty), and reporting the committee's vote. A minority report may also be included in the file.

7.9.9 Availability of Committee Report and File. Before the department vote, the committee report and the file will be available to all continuing faculty status faculty and all continuing faculty status track faculty in the department except the faculty member being reviewed. Exceptions to this provision, allowing a department to restrict access to the file, or to parts of the file, must be approved by the dean and the academic vice president. The contents of the file and all recommendation letters are strictly confidential. Faculty may not make copies of documents in the file, and faculty should not discuss the contents of the file except in appropriate settings with other department faculty members.

7.9.10 Department Vote. The department review committee will report its evaluation and recommendations to the department. The committee will make its presentation in a meeting open to all continuing faculty status faculty. It is strongly recommended that departments invite to this meeting all continuing faculty status track faculty in the department except the faculty member being reviewed, since this process broadens the discussion, helps communicate expectations, and assists faculty who will be evaluated in the future. Restrictions on the attendance of continuing faculty status track faculty must be approved by the dean and the academic vice president. Only faculty with continuing faculty status may vote in initial and final continuing faculty status decisions, and only faculty with equal or higher rank to that being sought may vote in rank advancement decisions. The voting will be by secret ballot and by majority vote of faculty eligible to vote. The department chair will report the vote in the file. The department discussions are strictly confidential. Only the department chair should inform the candidate of the status of the person's file following the department vote.

7.9.11 Department Chair's Report. After the department vote, the department chair will write an independent evaluation of the faculty member's citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and include it in the file. The report will also assess the faculty member's progress in addressing concerns raised in past annual and rank and status reviews. The chair will then forward the file to the college committee.

7.9.12 Informing the Faculty Member of a Negative Recommendation. If the department committee, the department faculty or the department chair recommends to deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, the department chair will inform the faculty member, and explain the reasons for the recommendation, in order to allow the faculty member to withdraw the application. The withdrawal of an application for candidacy or continuing faculty status constitutes notice of resignation from the university at the end of the contract year. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere. If the faculty member elects not to withdraw the application, it will be forwarded to the college review committee.

7.9.13 Colleges without Departments. In colleges without departments, the college review committee and the dean will perform the department review committee's and the department chair's functions described in this policy.

7.10 College Review

7.10.1 College Review Committee. The college review committee is composed of at least three faculty members, all of whom have continuing faculty status. The dean appoints the committee and the committee chair. In the college, a representative from each department (with continuing faculty status and the rank of Professor) is appointed by the chair to serve on the rank and status committee. This committee holds meetings in both the fall and winter semesters to review sixth and third year files respectively as well as applications for rank advancement (fall). The associate dean for faculty development appoints a chair of this committee who serves for two years. Since the associate dean participates in a separate review within the deans' office, he/she does not participate in committee deliberations. The committee proceeds with its reviews as follows: depending upon the number of applications, each reviewer is assigned as a primary reviewer for one or two files and as a secondary reviewer for one or two files. Reviewers are not assigned a file for a faculty member from their departments. The primary reviewer reads the file carefully and drafts a letter for committee review then makes a brief oral presentation on the candidate's file. The secondary reviewer also reviews the file, edits the draft letter and adds commentary to the oral presentation.

7.10.2 College Review Committee's Vote and Report. The college review committee will recommend by majority vote to grant or deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. The committee will write an independent report evaluating the faculty member's citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty), and reporting the committee's vote. A minority report may also be included in the file.

7.10.3 Dean's Report. After the college review committee's vote, the dean will write an independent evaluation of the faculty member's citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and include it in the file. The dean will then forward the file to the appropriate Faculty Council on Rank and Status. In the college, the associate deans create summary reviews of citizenship, teaching and scholarship for each candidate. These review documents are used as the basis for discussion among the dean and associate deans. The dean then writes a letter that is included in the file.

7.10.4 Informing the Faculty Member of a Negative Recommendation. If the college committee or the dean recommends to deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, the department chair and the dean or an associate dean will inform the faculty member, and explain the reasons for the recommendation, in order to allow the faculty member to withdraw the application. The withdrawal of an application for candidacy or continuing faculty status constitutes notice of resignation from the university at the end of the contract year. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere. If the faculty member elects not to withdraw the application, it will be forwarded to the appropriate Faculty Council on Rank and Status.

7.11 University Review

7.11.1 Professorial and Professional Faculty Councils on Rank and Status. The Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status is composed of eight professorial faculty members, all of whom have continuing faculty status. It reviews the applications of professorial faculty. A quorum consists of six of the eight members. The Professional Faculty Council on Rank and Status is composed of six professional faculty members, all of whom have continuing faculty status. It reviews the applications of professional faculty. A quorum consists of four of the six members. The associate academic vice president for faculty serves ex officio as chair of each council, voting only in case of tie votes. The academic vice president appoints each council and the vice-chair of each council.

7.11.2 Faculty Council's Vote. The Faculty Council will recommend, by majority vote, to grant or deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, and will forward its recommendations to the academic vice president.

7.11.3 Recommendations that Differ from College Recommendations. If the Faculty Council's recommendation differs from that of the dean or the college review committee, the Faculty Council may ask the dean for clarification or for additional information for the purpose of further consideration. The Faculty Council will then forward its recommendation to the academic vice president.

7.11.4 Academic Vice President's Recommendation. After considering the Faculty Council's recommendation, the academic vice president will make an independent recommendation to the university president. This recommendation, informed by the recommendations produced by the department, college, and university level review bodies, is the university's official recommendation to the president. If the academic vice president's recommendation is against candidacy for continuing faculty status, the granting of continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, the candidate will be informed of the recommendation by means of a letter prepared and delivered to him or her by the associate academic vice president for faculty. The letter will state the recommendation, and summarize the reasons upon which the recommendation is based. Upon receipt of the letter recommending denial of continuing faculty status, candidacy for continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, the candidate may withdraw his or her application, request an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation as specified in Section 8, or allow the recommendation to go forward for the president's final decision without comment. Withdrawal of an application for continuing faculty status or candidacy for continuing faculty status constitutes resigning employment at the university at the end of the current contract period (See Section 7.10.4).

7.11.5 President's Decision. The president, after receiving the recommendation of the academic vice president and the results of any independent examination (See section 8), has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to decide whether to grant candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. The president also has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to determine whether the relevant standards have been met and whether the university will need the faculty member's particular contributions on a continuing basis. All determinations in the Rank and Status process other than the president's decision are only recommendations. The president will give the faculty member written notice of the decision. Copies of the letter will be sent to the academic vice president, the associate academic vice president

for faculty, the dean and the department chair.

8 Independent Examination of Academic Vice President's Recommendation

8.1 Filing a Request for an Independent Examination. A faculty member may request an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation to deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. A recommendation to delay a review for continuing faculty status or candidacy for continuing faculty status cannot receive an independent examination; however, a second recommendation to delay the same proposed action may be examined. A request for an independent examination may be based on either or both of two grounds: 1) that, given the information available in the file, the academic vice president's recommendation was unreasonable, or 2) that a substantial procedural error occurred in the rank and status process (see section 8.9). To request an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation, the faculty member must, within ten calendar days after receiving the letter stating the academic vice president's decision, deliver written notice to the academic vice president of the request. The faculty member may select from the faculty an advocate to assist in the preparation and presentation of the materials to be presented to the examining panel.

8.2 Examining Panel. The president will appoint an examining panel composed of two members of the Academic Vice President's Council (but not the associate academic vice president for faculty) and three faculty members who have continuing faculty status. The president will designate one of the members of the Academic Vice President's Council to chair the panel. The faculty members of the examining panel will be drawn from a pool of faculty nominated by their college deans as potential panel members. The faculty pool will be refreshed as needed as members accept other assignments or leave the university. Any member of the pool may serve on one or more examining panels during an academic year.

8.3 Copy of the File. The associate academic vice president for faculty will give the faculty member and the university representative a copy of the file. The academic vice president shall appoint a faculty member or administrator to serve as university representative to prepare and present the university's response to the case presented in the independent examination. The names and other identifying elements will be removed from the review letters of citizenship, teaching, scholarship, and professional service. Other information which the associate academic vice president for faculty determines in his or her discretion to be confidential may be provided in summarized form with identifying elements removed, provided that the information fairly reflects the substance of the confidential matters.

8.4 Confidentiality. The information provided to the faculty member and the university representative will be held strictly confidential and will not be disclosed except as follows:

A. The faculty member may share the information with the faculty member's advocate, and the university representative may share the information with such university employees as are reasonably necessary in preparing a case for the independent examination.

B. If the faculty member or the university representative determines that information must be disclosed to witnesses to adequately present the case or the response, the

faculty member or the university representative will request permission from the chair of the panel. The number of witnesses should be kept to a minimum. Witnesses will submit their testimony only in writing. Violations of confidentiality may be considered in the independent examination and may be dealt with as the panel deems appropriate.

8.5 The Faculty Member's Statement. Within 30 calendar days after receiving the file, the faculty member will provide a written statement to the chair of the panel and the university representative stating his or her case. The statement will:

A. Outline all claims on which the request for the independent examination is based.

B. Outline all arguments and information that the faculty member wishes to be considered.

C. List all witnesses whose statements are to be included in the independent examination.

D. Include copies of all documents (except those already in the file) included in the independent examination.

8.6 Response Statement. Within 30 calendar days after receiving the faculty member's statement, the university representative will provide a written response statement to the chair of the panel and the faculty member. The statement will:

A. Outline all responses to the claims on which the case for requesting for the independent examination is based.

B. Outline all arguments and information upon which the recommendation of the academic vice president was based.

C. List all witnesses whose statements are to be included in the independent examination.

D. Include copies of all documents included in the response to the faculty member's case.

8.7 Examination Meeting. The chair of the panel will provide to each member of the panel the complete rank and status file and the documents prepared by the faculty member and by the university representative. Only members of the panel will attend the meeting. The faculty member and the university representative will be invited to appear at the hearing to answer questions from the panel and to clarify the case they each prepared. The faculty member's advocate may attend during the faculty member's appearance before the panel. The faculty member will decide whether he or she, or the advocate, will take the lead in answering questions and clarifying for the panel. The amount of time allotted to the questions and clarifications will be limited, balanced for each side, and determined by the chair of the panel. Any exceptions to this process will be granted at the discretion of the chair of the panel. The panel's recommendation will be rendered on the basis of the documents provided and the case as clarified (See 8.9).

8.8 Additional Information. At the discretion of the chair the panel may request, receive, or obtain additional information from any source, including information not considered by other reviewers (See Section 7.5).

8.9 Presumptions. The panel will examine the academic vice president's recommendation with the following presumptions:

A. In considering the substantive merits of the case, the panel will presume that the academic vice president's recommendation is reasonable and justifiable. Therefore, the faculty member has the burden of persuasion to demonstrate that the academic vice

president's recommendation is without reasonable basis in light of all the information presented in the rank and status process.

B. Within this policy and the independent examination, a procedural error is defined as a violation of this policy and the procedures it specifies. A procedural error occurs when a procedure required by policy is either not carried out, or is not carried out according to policy and is of such a severe nature as to cause substantial prejudice and deny a fair review. Intrusions into the process by persons external to the process may also constitute procedural errors. Disagreement about a decision or evaluation resulting from a procedure does not constitute grounds for claims of procedural error. If the case for requesting an independent examination is based on a claim of procedural error, the faculty member has the burden of persuasion to demonstrate that:

1. A procedural error occurred.

2. Because of the procedural error the faculty member suffered substantial prejudice and was denied a fair review.

3. Upon full consideration of the case, including any information that was excluded because of a procedural error, the granting of candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement would be warranted.

8.10 Examining Panel's Recommendation. After considering the faculty member's case and the university's response, the panel will recommend by majority vote that the academic vice president's recommendation be sustained or reversed. The panel may make other recommendations regarding the case. Within 10 calendar days of the meeting the panel will give its recommendation and its reasons in writing to the president, the academic vice president, the associate academic vice president for faculty, the faculty member, and the university representative, the dean, and the department chair.

8.11 President's Decision. After receiving the panel's recommendation, the president will decide whether to grant or deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, or to delay the review. The president has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to make the decision. The president also has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to determine whether the relevant standards have been met and whether the university will need the faculty member's particular contributions on a continuing basis. All determinations in the Rank and Status process other than the president's decision are only recommendations. The president will give the faculty member written notice of the decision. Copies of the letter will be sent to the academic vice president, the associate academic vice president for faculty, the dean and the department chair.

8.12 Exhaustion of Remedies and Waiver of Claims. A faculty member may not initiate civil litigation or civil administrative remedies against the university or its employees, agents, officers, or trustees until all the remedies provided by these procedures have been exhausted. Failure to pursue an independent examination within the stated deadlines or to exhaust the remedies provided by these procedures will constitute a waiver of the faculty member's right to pursue any claim arising out of the university's actions in the matter, unless the right to pursue a statutory claim is preserved by law.

APPENDIX A: Please see Appendix A2 for department checklist specifications CHECKLIST OF MATERIALS TO INCLUDE IN FILE FOR PROFESSORIAL FACULTY

Please include the following material in the file in the order below. See section 7.2 regarding materials to include in the file. See section 7.4 regarding the size of the file.

Nomination Form

Curriculum Vitae

Reports from Review Committees, Department Chair, and Dean
_1. Dean's report. (7.10.3)
_2. College review committee's report. (7.10.2)
_3. Department chair's report. (7.9.11)
_4. Report of department vote. (7.9.10)
_5. Department review committee's report. (7.9.8)

Personal Statement
_1. Self-assessment of citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (also address any areas of concern raised in the last review; in the final continuing faculty status review, also include the letter from the initial continuing faculty status review. Show, item by item, how all issues and recommendations raised in the third-year review have been addressed.) (3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 7.11.6)

Citizenship (3.2)
_1. A description of committee assignments and other citizenship activities inside the university.
_2. A description of citizenship activities in the profession. (3.2.2.H)
_3. A description of other citizenship activities. (3.2.2)
_4. Review letters of citizenship activities. (3.2.3, 7.9.3)

Teaching (3.3)
_1. A list of courses taught by semester, with enrollment numbers, student credit hours taught, course rating, instructor rating, and average class grade as created by the *Scheduled Courses – Abbreviated Detail* custom report in Faculty Profile System. (identify new courses developed). (3.3.2.A.1, 3.3.2.A.2)
_2. A list of graduate students supervised (indicate whether you were the committee Chair or a committee member). (3.3.2.A.5)
_3. A description of other teaching activities. (3.3.2.A)
_4. A few illustrative copies of syllabi, handouts, assignments, examinations, etc. (3.3.2.G.1)
_5. A description of steps taken to evaluate and improve teaching. (3.3.2.D)
_6. A description of products of high quality teaching and mentoring. (3.3.2.F)
_7. Student evaluations and a typescript of student comments. (3.3.2.B, 7.9.4)
_8. At least two peer evaluations of teaching. (3.3.2.C, 7.9.5)
_9. A list of teaching awards. (3.3.2.E.1)

Scholarship (3.4)
____ 1. An annotated bibliography of all scholarly and creative works. For each entry include the following (3.4.4.1, 3.4.4.2):
____ A. Indicate whether the work was peer-reviewed.
____ B. Journal Impact Factor (if available).

____ C. Number of times cited by peers (Web of Science (Thomson Reuters) preferred, Google Scholar or other citation index if the work is not in Web of Science).

____ D. Describe your contribution to jointly authored works.

2. The three best examples of scholarship and a brief explanation why they were selected (all other scholarship will be available for review in the department office). (7.3)

3. Grants for research or creative works. (3.4.4.2.F) For submitted grants that were not funded include information regarding the proposal's score, ranking, and suggestions from reviewers on how to improve the proposal. Indicate when and where the proposal will be resubmitted.

4. A list of awards or recognition for scholarship. (3.4.4.2.I)

5. At least three external review letters of scholarship and a copy of the waiver letter. (7.9.2, 7.9.6)

APPENDIX A2:

CHECKLIST OF MATERIALS TO INCLUDE IN FILE FOR PROFESSORIAL FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANT & WILDLIFE SCIENCES

Department Chair and Committee should note each box ❑

Note to Department:

- ❑ It is difficult for university-level reviewers to adequately judge candidate records; the department carries the responsibility of "addressing the faculty member's performance in light of departmental and disciplinary standards to help guide reviewers at the college and university levels" (7.8)
- ❑ The university expects departments to attend to all relevant aspects of the university R&S policy for each candidate (3.1.3)
- ❑ Department oversight does not substitute for the candidate's individual responsibility to present persuasive evidence that he or she is appropriately qualified for receiving candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement (1.2)
- ❑ Sufficient time should be allowed for *all* eligible department faculty members to thoroughly review each candidate before the department meeting. Assure there is adequate time to fully discuss each candidate (7.9.9)

APPENDIX B:
CHECKLIST OF MATERIALS TO INCLUDE IN FILE FOR PROFESSIONAL FACULTY

Please include the following materials in the file in the order listed below. See section 7.2 regarding materials to include in the file. See section 7.4 regarding the size of the file.

Nomination Form

Curriculum Vitae

Reports from Review Committees, Department Chair, and Dean

1. Dean's report. (7.10.3)
2. College review committee's report. (7.10.2)
3. Department chair's report. (7.9.11)
    - ❑ Write independent "evaluative" letters that "assess" faculty member's progress (7.9.11)
    - ❑ Assess progress in addressing concerns (refer to annual and R&S reviews) Address strengths and weaknesses (4.2); *help interpret for outside-the-department readers*
    - ❑ Refer to letters from annual stewardship reviews as applicable (3.1.6; 7.9.11)
    - ❑ Include copy of 3rd-year review letter (for 6th-year reviews)

‡ 4. Report of department vote (7.9.10)
    - ❑ Report the department vote count; not just "majority approved/denied"
    - ❑ Stress confidentiality; breaches have caused numerous problems

5. Department review committee's report (7.9.8)
    - ❑ Consider prior (3rd year) review letter to help evaluators factor previous feedback (4.3)

† Prepared by the candidate
‡ Prepared by the department chair and/or department rank & status committee
§ Prepared by the dean or college rank & status committee

Personal Statement

1. Self-assessment of citizenship and professional service (also address any areas of concern raised in the last review; in the final continuing faculty status review, also include the letter from the initial continuing faculty status review. Show, item by item, how all issues and recommendations raised in the third-year review have been addressed.) (3.2, 4.3, 6.5-6.5.5.2, 7.11.6)

Citizenship (3.2)

1. A description of committee assignments and other citizenship activities inside the university. (3.2.2)
2. A description of citizenship activities in the profession. (3.2.2.H)
3. A description of other citizenship activities. (3.2.2)
4. Review letters of citizenship activities. (3.2.3, 6.3, 7.9.3)
    - ‡ ❑The committee and chair will comment on department/university citizenship load and assess whether candidates have appropriately calibrated involvement in

national professional service for the current stage of their careers, and whether they are contributing to the discipline at large in meaningful ways (see department's standards for "service" at the end of 3.2.2).

- ‡ ❑The committee and chair will comment on the candidate's collegiality.

‡ ____ 4. Review letters of citizenship activities. (3.2.3, 7.9.3, 7.9.11)

❑ Note: *The following is a version of the BYU citizenship standard suitable to send with a department letter asking external reviewers to evaluate a faculty member's citizenship* [adapted from University R&S Policy 3.2]:

The Citizenship Standard

Brigham Young University expects all faculty members to adhere to the highest standards of personal behavior and to exemplify honor and integrity and to follow the principles outlined in the mission of BYU. Faculty should willingly serve on committees and in other department, college, and university assignments—although care should be give to avoiding an overload of citizenship by any one faculty. They should mentor, encourage, advise, and collaborate with colleagues. Although professionalism requires rigorous review and critique, faculty should always interact with colleagues, students, and others with civility and respect. They should promote collegiality and harmony in their departments. They should not denigrate other faculty or students or engage in disruption, manipulation, or contention. They should not abuse the moral climate of discourse on the campus. Faculty should be involved in their discipline by serving as referees of scholarship and by providing service and leadership in professional associations. They should actively participate in the life of the university community by attending department, college, and university meetings.

Assessment of Citizenship

The following citizenship criteria will be used in the assessment of all faculty members:

A. Behavior reflecting honor, integrity, collegiality, civility, respect, concern for others.
B. Evaluation of citizenship should consider the following evidence:
    1. Collaboration with colleagues in citizenship, teaching, or scholarship
    2. Mentoring colleagues
    3. Service to the profession, including holding offices and committee assignments in professional associations, organizing professional meetings and panels, editing journals and newsletters, serving on editorial boards, and serving as referees of scholarship. Such service may include, but should extend beyond, strictly local and regional venues over a faculty member's career

Review Letters of Citizenship Activities

Review letters should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the service.

Professional Service (include those which apply):

Teaching (3.3)

1. A list of courses taught by semester, with enrollment numbers, student credit hours taught, course rating, instructor rating, and average class grade as created by the *Scheduled Courses – Abbreviated Detail* custom report in Faculty Profile System. (identify new courses

developed). (3.3.2.A.1, 3.3.2.A.2)
❑‡ A contextualization of candidate teaching loads (within department expectations)

_2. A list of graduate students supervised (indicate whether you were the committee chair or a committee member). (3.3.2.A.5)
_3. A description of other teaching activities. (3.3.2.A)
_4. A few illustrative copies of syllabi, handouts, assignments, examinations, etc. (3.3.2.G.1)
_5. A description of steps taken to evaluate and improve teaching. (3.3.2.D)
_6. A description of products of high quality teaching and mentoring. (3.3.2.F)
_7. Student evaluations and a typescript of student comments. (3.3.2.D, 7.9.4)

- ❑‡ An analysis of feedback from student evaluations and written comments (note trends; consider other evaluation criteria beyond overall course and instructor ratings)
- ❑‡ A contextualization of course GPAs (within department expectations)

_8. At least two peer evaluations of teaching. (3.3.2.B, 6.3, 7.9.5)
_9. A list of teaching awards. (3.3.2.E.1)

Scholarship (3.4)
____ 1. An annotated bibliography of all scholarly and creative works. For each entry include the following (3.4.4.1, 3.4.4.2):
____ A. Indicate whether the work was peer-reviewed.
____ B. Journal Impact Factor (if available).
____ C. Number of times cited by peers (Web of Science (Thomson Reuters) preferred, Google Scholar or other citation index if the work is not in Web of Science).
____ D. Describe your contribution to jointly authored works.

In addition to the above, department faculty provide:

- ❑†‡ An explanation for gaps in scholarly productivity records. An explanation of how the candidate's scholarship is consistent with disciplinary norms and department, college, and university mission (3.4.4.1 A)
- ❑†‡ Evidence that the scholarship is of high quality with some element of originality (3.4.4.1C)
- †An indication (evidence) of whether each work is peer reviewed (3.4.4.1 D)
- ❑‡ Information about the reputation and selectivity of scholarly presses and journals (3.4.4.1 E)
- † A description of the candidate's contribution to jointly-authored work, role of student authors, etc.
- ❑‡ An indication of whether the candidate is developing their own scholarly agenda
- † An indication of whether the candidate was presenter in a multiple-authored poster or paper
- † Evidence that presentations at professional meetings and conferences [have been or are] being developed into publications (3.4.4.2H)

_2. The three best examples of scholarship and a brief explanation why they were selected (all other scholarship will be available for review in the department office). (7.3)

2. Grants for research or creative works. (3.4.4.2.F) For submitted grants that were not funded, include information regarding the proposal's score, ranking, and suggestions from reviewers on how to improve the proposal. Indicate when and where the proposal will be resubmitted.
   † Indicate portion of grant assigned to candidate

4. A list of awards or recognition for scholarship. (3.4.4.2.I)
5. At least three external review letters of scholarship (only if scholarship is a primary area of professional service) and a copy of the waiver letter. (6.3, 7.9.2, 7.9.6)

- ❑‡ Contact external reviewers no later than June1 (7.9.6)
- ❑‡ Candidates may suggest names of possible reviewers. The department may select reviewers from among these suggestions but must also arrange to receive at least half of the letters from people not suggested by the reviewer
- ❑‡ The department will select external reviewers who are:
  - of equal or greater rank than that being sought (7.9.6)
  - persons whose personal association with the candidate would not be expected to bias the review (7.9.6)
  - faculty members at well-regarded academic institutions who have achieved reputations in the relevant field (7.9.6)
- ❑‡ Assure that BYU expectations/standards are communicated to external reviewers taking into account national disciplinary norms,
- ❑‡ Describe how reviewers were selected, reasons chosen, relationship with candidate. (7.9.6)
- ❑‡ Include a copy of the letter sent to external reviewers (7.9.6, Appendix D)
- ❑‡ Include a brief bio of reviewers indicating their stature in the field (7.9.6)

Clinical Service and Instruction (6.5.3)
1. A description of clinical activities. (6.5.3.2)
2. A description of steps taken to evaluate and improve clinical service and instruction. (6.5.3.2)
3. Student evaluations and a typescript of student comments. (3.3.2.D, 6.5.3.2.C, 7.9.4)
4. Review letters from supervisors and peers. (6.3, 6.5.3.2.C)
5. Indications of how licensure and certification requirements are being met and maintained. (6.5.3.2.I)

Librarianship (6.5.4.2)
1. A description of accomplishments in librarianship. (6.5.4.2.B)
2. A description of steps taken to evaluate and improve librarianship. (6.5.4.2.C)
3. Review letters from supervisors and peers. (6.3)

Athletic Professionals (6.5.5)
1. A description of accomplishments, records, and recognitions of the athletic professional, the team, and individual athletes. (6.5.5.2.B)
2. A description of steps taken to evaluate and improve coaching. (6.5.5.2.D.3)
3. Review letters from current and former athletes. (6.5.5.2.C.4)
4. Review letters from supervisors and peers. (6.3, 6.5.5.2.C)
5. A description of other professional activities related to coaching. (6.5.5.2.D)

Other Professional Service

1. A description of activities and accomplishments in professional service.
2. A description of steps taken to evaluate and improve professional service.
3. Review letters from supervisors and peers. (6.3)

APPENDIX C: WAIVER

Date

To Prospective Reviewers:

As part of the review process for continuing faculty status or rank advancement, I recognize that letters of evaluation will be requested from supervisors, peers, or students. For your information, the following represents my choice regarding the waiver of my rights to see those letters.

I waive the right to see the letters of evaluation requested in the review process.

Signed by Faculty Member

I do not waive the right to see the letters of evaluation requested in the review process.

_____

Signed by Faculty Member

APPENDIX D: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS OF SCHOLARSHIP

Date

Addressee

Dear Professor _____:

Dr. John/Mary Doe is being reviewed in his/her sixth year of service to determine whether his/her performance merits continuing faculty status and rank advancement to associate professor or whether his/her appointment at the university will be terminated [or, advancement to full professor]. The process will begin this fall semester.

Our policy requires evaluations from knowledgeable peers in the academic community. While our evaluation considers all aspects of performance--citizenship, teaching, and scholarly and creative work--we are interested in your assessment of his/her scholarship, particularly how the quality, originality, soundness of methodology, and productivity compare to that of other scholars at this stage of their careers. Your evaluation should also describe your relationship with Dr. Doe.

We need your assessment by (date). It would be helpful, however, if you could respond very briefly at your earliest convenience by phone (xxx-xxx-xxxx), fax (xxx-xxx-xxxx), e-mail (address), or letter to let me know that we can count on receiving your assessment by that time. [We offer an honorarium of $_____ for this service. Please include your social security number so that we can make arrangements for the honorarium payment.]

Enclosed for your consideration are a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae, information about his/her teaching assignment, samples of his/her scholarly work, and a summary of our university and department standards for assessing scholarship. Also included is a form indicating Dr. Doe's choice regarding the waiver of his/her rights to see the external review letters. The faculty member will see your letter only if he/she retains the right to review letters. However, if there is a negative decision and the faculty member appeals it, his/her entire file will be made available to him/her, although with names and other identifying factors removed.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

_____

APPENDIX E: SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS OF PROFESSIONAL FACULTY

Date

Addressee

Dear _____:

Dr. John/Mary Doe is being reviewed in his/her sixth year of service to determine whether his/her performance merits continuing faculty status and rank advancement to the associate level or whether his/her appointment at the university will be terminated [or, advancement to full _____]. The process will begin this fall semester.

Our policy requires evaluations from knowledgeable peers in the academic and professional community. While our evaluation considers all aspects of performance, we are interested in your assessment of his/her contributions in the area of _____. Your evaluation should also describe your relationship with Dr. Doe.

We need your assessment by (date). It would be helpful, however, if you could respond very briefly at your earliest convenience by phone (xxx-xxx-xxxx), fax (xxx-xxx-xxxx), e-mail (address), or letter to let me know that we can count on receiving your assessment by that time. [We offer an honorarium of $_____ for this service. Please include your social security number so that we can make arrangements for the honorarium payment.]

Enclosed for your consideration are a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae, information about his/her professional assignment, and a summary of our university and department standards for assessing professional service in his/her field. Also included is a form indicating Dr. Doe's choice regarding the waiver of his/her rights to see the external review letters. The faculty member will see your letter only if he/she retains the right to review letters. However, if there is a negative decision and the faculty member appeals it, his/her entire file will be made available to him/her, although with names and other identifying factors removed.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

_____