

# College of Human Sciences

---

## Guidelines on Faculty Effort Assignment, Annual Review and Promotion and Tenure

*Department of Nutrition, Dietetics, and Hospitality Management*

August 17, 2011

---

# College of Human Sciences

---

*Department of Nutrition, Dietetics, and Hospitality Management*

<b>List of contents:</b>	<b>Page #</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Background</li><li>• Purpose</li><li>• Key stakeholders</li><li>• Intent</li></ul>	
<b>Annual distribution of effort</b>	<b>5</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Description of effort assignment</li><li>• The composition of effort assignment</li><li>• Compensation</li></ul>	
<b>Annual Faculty Review</b>	<b>7</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• General guidelines</li><li>• Annual assessment and faculty assignment procedure</li><li>• Submission of review materials</li><li>• Written evaluation of faculty</li><li>• Formal conference</li><li>• Report receipt</li></ul>	
<b>Promotion and tenure</b>	<b>11</b>

# College of Human Sciences

---

## *Department of Nutrition, Dietetics, and Hospitality Management*

### Draft Guidelines on Effort Assignment, Annual Assessment, Promotion and Tenure

#### Introduction

##### **A. Background**

The Department values and supports the creation and dissemination of knowledge through the activities of its academic faculty including scholarly research, instruction, outreach and service. In its continuing pursuit of excellence in each of these key activities the Department has deemed it necessary to identify and establish workable guidelines for the establishment of equitable faculty effort assignment, annual assessment and promotion and tenure. The Departmental Guidelines are supplemental to the *Auburn University (AU) Faculty Handbook*, and accordingly may be updated periodically in response to changes in the *AU Faculty Handbook* or to relevant Departmental criteria.

##### **B. Purpose**

The purpose of these guidelines is threefold:

1. To ensure an equitable distribution of faculty effort assignment among and across the different disciplines within the Department;
2. To ensure faculty and Departmental accountability in relation to agreed upon annual effort assignment; and
3. To provide a mechanism to recognize excellence in faculty achievement and ensure that the appropriate rewards are allocated.

##### **C. Key Stakeholders**

Key stakeholders with an interest in this document include Departmental faculty, College of Human Sciences (CHS) Administrators, internal and external peer reviewers in the Auburn University (AU) promotion and tenure and post-tenure reviews processes, members of the AU Promotion and Tenure Committee and the AU central administration office. A full version of the Departmental Guidelines will be provided to external peer reviewers with each candidate dossier. The Dean, the Department Heads, and faculty may reference these guidelines in the support letters that go to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee with a candidate's package.

##### **D. Intent**

It is intended that these guidelines will serve to guide Departmental faculty discussions on the issues of workload distribution, the annual review process, promotion and tenure and post-tenure review. The document is not designed to lead discussions on any such matter; rather it is to be viewed as a catalyst

to discussion in the development of a fair, equitable and totally transparent set of Departmental guidelines.

## **Annual Faculty Effort Assignment**

### **A. Description of effort assignment**

Effort assignment often referred to as “faculty load,” is the combined total of work undertaken by a faculty member over the course of the normal “academic year.”

### **B. The composition of effort assignment**

A faculty member’s effort assignment includes teaching and/or outreach, scholarly research, service, and possibly administration. A full-time teaching load is 12 credits per semester. The standard teaching load in the College is 6 credits per semester, 12 credits per academic year. This teaching load represents 50% of a faculty member’s workload. Each individual course is 12.5% of the faculty effort assignment. Faculty load credit is not given for individualized instruction (e.g., directed readings, special problems). Any variation in the standard teaching load (i.e., 2-1, or 1-1) reflects conditions of the original hire, or is the result of negotiations with the Department Head. In cases where faculty do not meet performance expectations, appropriate adjustments will be made to their work load assignments following a thorough review by the Department Head and Dean. All faculty receive a copy of their annual effort assignment for the upcoming academic year at the time of their annual performance evaluation. Involvement in international teaching, research or outreach activities is also encouraged and should be documented in the dossier as to the type of program, the faculty member’s role in that program, and evaluative information about the program/faculty member’s involvement.

Faculty receive one undergraduate course reduction for the completion of theses or dissertations at the following rate: (a) three dissertations = one course reduction; (b) five theses = one course reduction; (c) two dissertations and two theses = one course reduction; (d) one dissertation and four theses = one course reduction. Thesis/dissertation co-Heads receive  $\frac{1}{2}$  credit for thesis/dissertation completion. The course reduction is given at a time that is agreeable to the faculty and the Department Head.

In consultation with the Department Head, faculty may buy out of an undergraduate course with external grant funds. For each buyout, the teaching workload is reduced by 12.5% and the research workload is increased by 12.5%.

Research workloads will vary depending on percent time teaching and/or outreach, and administration. Faculty with administrative responsibilities (e.g., graduate program officers, program coordinators) receive a one course reduction (undergraduate) per academic year. All faculty members receive a total of 10% load credit for student advising and recruiting (Instruction and Advising) efforts and 5% load credit for service. Service includes Departmental, college, and University service, as well as professional service responsibilities. Interdisciplinary efforts in teaching, research and outreach are encouraged and should be documented in the dossier as to the faculty members role and percentage contribution to the program.

## **Compensation**

The College of Human Sciences does not provide additional compensation for teaching overloads.

## Annual Faculty Review

Teaching, research and scholarly work, outreach, collegiality, and service are addressed as part of the annual assessment of faculty and for tenure and/or promotion applications. The annual assessment process takes into account yearly faculty activity and productivity and considers the yearly contribution in the larger context of the faculty member's body of work. Specific teaching and scholarship goals are reviewed and revised every year for each faculty member and faculty load may be renegotiated based upon achieved goals in the preceding year.

### A. General Guidelines

According to the *AU Faculty Handbook*, each faculty member should undergo a formal performance review each year before April 30. The Department Head will conduct the review and the subsequent faculty annual review report which will provide the basis for recommendations related to salary, promotion, tenure, work re-allocation, reappointment and dismissal. The annual assessment cycle is based on the calendar year. This period includes the spring semester of one academic year, the summer semester of that academic year if applicable, and the next fall semester of the following academic year. Actual review guidelines are offered as follows:

#### I. Annual Assessment and Faculty Assignment procedure

Within NUFs the Department Head will conduct the annual review of each faculty member before April 30. The *AU Faculty Handbook* addresses the annual review *stating*, "in the case of faculty members who have not achieved tenure or promotion to associate professor or professor, particular care shall be taken by the Department Head to relate the faculty member's job performance to the promotion and tenure criteria set forth in this document (the Handbook)."

##### a) Phase 1. Submission of Review Materials (by January 15)

Each year faculty members will submit review materials to the Department Head by January 15. Required materials include:

- i. An updated current Auburn University promotion and tenure formatted **dossier** of accomplishment in order to prepare for the tenure and/or promotion submission. The format is described in the *AU Faculty Handbook, Chap 3.11.c.1*.
- ii. *The College of Human Sciences Annual Assessment Form* requiring (Appendix I):
  - a. A summarized list of teaching assignments, scholarly research activity and accomplishments over the assessment period. A web template is available and aligns with the requirements in the AU Faculty Handbook. Distribution of time and effort for the assessment period should be specified.
  - b. An annual planning record for the next assessment period indicating work load and goals anticipated in the next assessment year. Any agreement between the faculty and Department Head regarding teaching activities not directly related to credit hours should be detailed in the annual planning record.
  - c. A copy of the previous annual planning record.

b) Phase 2. Written evaluation of faculty (by February 15)

Based upon the materials submitted the Department Head will systematically set about the objective evaluation of each faculty member. The Department Head will prepare a written report by February 15<sup>th</sup> covering the major points of their evaluation over the previous assessment period. The report should indicate the faculty member's overall performance level based on the following assessment categories:

- i. Exemplary performance– Exceeds all Departmental expectations consistently.
- ii. Exceeds performance expectations – Exceeds most standards consistently, performance is generally above average; merit.
- iii. Meets performance expectations – Meets most or all standards of responsibility; performance is generally good.
- iv. Marginal expectations – Partially meets standards; marginal performance in some areas; needs improvement.
- v. Unacceptable performance – Inadequate performance in all areas; rarely meets performance assignments; unsatisfactory.

In all cases faculty will be evaluated in relation to each component of their individual work assignment (teaching, scholarly research, service and/or outreach) and in an overall sense.

Normal performance expectations for faculty include, but are not limited to the following:

- i. Teaching and Learning  
Since a primary activity of the University is the instruction of students, careful evaluation of teaching is essential. Accordingly, an individual should be an accomplished teacher, well prepared, with a mastery of the fundamentals of subject matter. Evidence of “effective” teaching includes: peer evaluations of teaching, student evaluations of teaching, letters from former students commenting on the applicant's teaching effectiveness, quality of dissertations and theses directed, instruction outside of the classroom (e.g., directed studies), publications with students, advising activities, and the faculty member's teaching philosophy. When relevant, innovations in instruction, products related to teaching, and teaching grants will be considered.
- ii. Research and Scholarly work  
A faculty member engaged in research and scholarly work has an obligation to contribute to his or her discipline and others through applied and/or basic research, through creative endeavors, or through interpretive scholarship. Evidence of research and scholarly work will be assessed depending upon an individual's particular research assignment, which at the proposed 35% level is normally:
  - a. Tenure track faculty – the establishment of a research agenda of demonstrated merit to the University, college and Department's mission, evidence supporting the publication of at least three peer reviewed publications every two years; evidence of internal grant writing activity and evidence of engagement in external grant writing activity.



- b. Tenured faculty – evidence supporting the publication of at least three peer reviewed publications every two years, presentation at professional meetings and evidence of continuing successful external grant writing activity.
- iii. University/Professional Service
 

A candidate should have some committee responsibility in the Department of Nutrition and Food Science, the College of Human Sciences, and Auburn University. Faculty should be participating in local or national committees of professional organizations and/or provide service to the local community as appropriate. Departmental citizenship, including cooperation with and participation in Departmental initiatives, active participation in supporting Departmental goals and promoting the Department’s reputation on and away from campus, will also be considered. Evidence of professional service includes: student recruitment (of both graduate and undergraduate students but especially of the former); involvement with professional organizations that are in line with the NUFS mission; service on Department and College committees, as well as University committees; editorial boards for journals; manuscript reviews; and grant reviews.
- iv. Outreach
 

Faculty may also report on community outreach activities that demonstrate an integrated program of outreach scholarship showing evidence of quality, impact, and dissemination of resulting programmatic products and expertise. Interaction with the wider community of outreach scholars should be visible, and a reputation for excellence among peers at this and other institutions should be emerging.

The report should also detail the faculty member’s assignment for the next calendar year and the consequences of over and underperformance. For example, where a faculty members performance is assessed as:

- i. “Exemplary” they would be recommended for a relative meritorious pay rise – subject to prevailing budgetary conditions.
- ii. “Exceeds expectations” they would be recommended for a relative meritorious pay rise – subject to prevailing budgetary constraints.
- iii. “Meets expectations” there should not ordinarily be any reassignment of workload. This classification would lead to a lesser meritorious pay rise.
- iv. “Marginal expectations”, this may lead to some form of workload reassignment for the next academic year (for example an increase in teaching and/or research assignment) if performing under par in any of these areas and counseling on improving current performance
- v. “Unacceptable” they will, depending upon circumstance:
  - a. Tenured faculty – will be put on 12 months performance probation of the instigation of the University’s Post-tenure review process. During this time it is expected that faculty performance will improve to at least meet Departmental expectations in the next review cycle. If not, the post-tenure review process will begin immediately
  - b. Untenured / tenure-track – will be put on 12 months performance probation in which a significant improvement in performance must occur – to at least meet Departmental performance expectations. If the faculty

member fails to do so during the next performance cycle, immediate dismissal proceedings will begin.

c) Phase 3. Formal Conference (before March 15)

The Department Head will review the current and cumulative contributions and progress of each faculty member in the areas of teaching, scholarly research activity, service, and collegiality. The Department Head and faculty member will meet to discuss the faculty performance over the review period and to discuss the faculty member's assignment for the coming year.

d) Phase 4 - Report Receipt Confirmation by Signature (due back by April 15<sup>th</sup>)

The faculty receives a copy of the report, which must be signed by both the Department Head and the faculty member and returned to the Dean's Office by April 30<sup>th</sup>. Each faculty member is responsible for signing a copy of the report in order to indicate that it was received. If the faculty member disagrees with information in the report, then she or he may write a response to be appended to the report. One copy of the signed report and response, if applicable, is to be retained for the faculty member's Departmental personnel file. The faculty member should receive a final copy also.

## Promotion and Tenure

### A. General Criteria and Considerations

Because the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook* is a living, and thus, changing document, but also the final guide to procedure pertaining to the review process, faculty should refer to the *Faculty Handbook* for all matters concerning that process. Below, the criteria by which scholarly contribution is evaluated in the Department of Nutrition, Dietetics and Hospitality Management in the areas of (a) research; (b) teaching; (c) outreach; and (d) service are outlined. Guidelines regarding due process for promotion and tenure and documentation in support of a candidate's application are found in the *Faculty Handbook*.

#### 1. Appointment as Associate Professor or Promotion to Associate Professor

A tenure track Assistant Professor with no previous experience will normally complete five years in the Department to be eligible for consideration of promotion and tenure. However, individuals with exceptional records may be considered after as few as three years in the Department. Experience and productivity prior to the assumption of a position with the Department at Auburn University will be taken into account, but faculty with prior experience in a post-doc or (assistant or associate) professor position elsewhere are still required to complete a minimum of two years of scholarly activity after joining the Department prior to tenure or promotion. Normal expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor include:

- a) Teaching and Learning - An individual should be an accomplished teacher, well prepared, with a mastery of the fundamentals of subject matter. The opinions of colleagues, summaries of student evaluations, and the quality of the graduate students supervised will be important in this evaluation. The individual should demonstrate efforts towards continued growth as a teacher. Evidence of "effective" teaching includes: peer evaluations of teaching, student evaluations of teaching, letters from former students commenting on the applicant's teaching effectiveness, quality of dissertations and theses directed, instruction outside of the classroom (e.g., directed studies), publications with students, advising activities, and the faculty member's teaching philosophy. When relevant, innovations in instruction, products related to teaching, and teaching grants will be considered.

Note: An individual with a substantial Extension appointment may have a small teaching load, yet may provide instruction through venues other than University teaching, e.g., community-based education, on-line webinars, etc. Refer to the Outreach section of this document for Departmental recommendations regarding criteria for evaluating these activities.

- b) Research and scholarly work - Appointment or promotion from assistant to associate professor is based on scholarly research accomplishments that reflect independent and programmatic scholarly activity appropriate to the candidate's field and area of specialization. A reputation for excellence among peers at this and other institutions should be emerging. This reputation will be evidenced by publications, grantsmanship, attendance and presentations at national meetings, and invited participation in post-graduate programs, national meetings and symposia. The candidate's efforts and results should be attracting the attention and respect of professional peers.

Given the diversity of appointments individuals have, research activity should be evaluated in the context of the position description and the candidate's assignment. For example a faculty member on 35% research appointment would normally be expected to produce three scholarly articles every two years.

It should be noted that research productivity will be considered a function of both quality and quantity. Judgments of quality will be made by Department members after reviewing the candidate's scholarly work. The esteem and publishing practices of the journals and publishing houses with which the candidate publishes add weight to a judgment of quality. Additionally, reviews in scholarly journals, citations by others in journal articles or books, reviews conducted for journals, and reviews of grant applications also add weight to a judgment of quality. Each candidate will be expected to make the case for his/her research activities and present quantifiable evidence of their achievements in this area.

Evidence of "independent and programmatic" research includes: a sustained record of research publications in respected, carefully reviewed scholarly journals or book chapters and books; a publication record at least matching the faculty members agreed research assignment, a significant number of which are senior-authored; evidence of efforts to obtain internal/external funding; presentations at the national level and intellectual property patents and copyrights. For faculty with extension appointments, extramural funding can support curriculum/program evaluation, development/testing of best practices, testing of the effectiveness of new resources (e.g., videos, web sites), and other applied research projects. Publications can include papers published in journals focusing on informing practice or social policy. Research reports published by extension faculty may also be located in refereed publications designed for applied audiences.

While external letters in support of the candidate's appointment or promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor are not required, they will be sought with the candidate's permission. It is felt that they will strengthen the case for promotion and/or tenure.

- c) University/Professional Service - A candidate should have some committee responsibility in the Department, the College of Human Sciences, and Auburn University. The candidate for promotion from assistant to associate professor should also be participating in local or national committees of professional organizations and/or provide service to the local community as appropriate. Departmental citizenship, including cooperation with and participation in Departmental initiatives, active participation in supporting Departmental goals and promoting the Department's reputation on and away from campus, will be important for promotion and tenure at the Assistant Professor level.

Evidence of professional service includes: student recruitment (of both graduate and undergraduate students but especially of the former); involvement with professional organizations that are in line with the Departmental mission; service on Department and College committees, as well as University committees; editorial boards for journals; manuscript reviews; and grant reviews.

- d) Outreach - Appointment or promotion from assistant to associate professor is based on accomplishments that demonstrate an integrated program of outreach scholarship showing evidence of quality, impact, and dissemination of resulting programmatic products and expertise. Interaction with the wider community of outreach scholars should be visible, and a reputation for excellence among peers at this and other institutions should be emerging. An outreach program is characterized by a clearly identifiable focus, based on relevant basic and applied research, and established in partnership or consultation with regional and state professionals working in related areas of focus. An *integrated* outreach program involves some combination of the following outreach activities: the development of multiple educational resources (e.g., curricula, professional development materials, guidesheets, videos, websites or other internet-based educational technologies); providing training for professional and/or lay audiences to support program implementation; internal and/or external grant submissions; evaluation studies; and presentations and publications related to the outreach program.

Evidence of quality is seen in the achievement of some combination of the following visible, evaluatable outcomes: publication of articles related to the outreach program in appropriate, peer-reviewed outlets; the development of innovative program materials or delivery methods (e.g., original web- or print-based resources, webinar trainings, digital resources); receiving funding support for the development or delivery of outreach program innovations when such grants and contracts are competitive and subject to peer review; the adoption or adaptation by outside individuals of curricular or other program materials, processes, and resources developed for the outreach program.

Evidence of impact is seen in two or more of the following ways: documentation of data collected to assess the efficacy of the program implementation; documentation of data collected to assess achievement of short-term program goals; documentation of data collected to assess achievement of long-term program goals; cost-benefit analyses of program impacts.

Evidence of dissemination is seen in activities such as the provision of training to lay and professional audiences within and outside the State; outreach publications; lectures, presentations, workshops, on program-related processes, products, results, etc; and publication in other scholarly, peer-reviewed outlets of new or improved outreach education methods, new understandings of current knowledge, or new applications of knowledge in specific settings.

## **2. Appointment as Full Professor or Promotion to Full Professor**

A tenured Associate Professor will normally complete five years at the associate rank to be eligible for consideration for promotion to Full Professor. Experience and publications prior to the assumption of a position at Auburn University will be taken into account but a minimum of two years of scholarly activity after joining the Department must be accomplished prior to tenure or promotion.

- a) Teaching and Learning - An individual should be an accomplished teacher, well prepared, with a mastery of the fundamentals of subject matter. The opinions of

colleagues, summaries of student evaluations, and the quality of the graduate students supervised will be important in this evaluation. The individual should demonstrate efforts towards continued growth as a teacher.

Evidence of “effective” teaching includes: peer evaluations of teaching, student evaluations of teaching, letters from former students commenting on the applicant’s teaching effectiveness, quality of dissertations and theses directed, instruction outside of the classroom (e.g., directed studies), publications with students, advising activities, and the faculty member’s teaching philosophy. When relevant, innovations in instruction, products related to teaching, and teaching grants will be considered.

Note: An individual with a substantial Extension appointment may have a small teaching load, yet may provide instruction through venues other than University teaching, e.g., community-based education, on-line webinars, etc. Refer to the Outreach section of this document for Departmental recommendations regarding criteria for evaluating these activities.

- b) Research and Scholarly Work - Promotion from associate to full professor is based on research accomplishments that reflect independent and programmatic scholarly activity appropriate to the candidate’s field and area of specialization. The candidate should have a record of continuing research productivity and evidence that the research has had a significant impact on the field. Evidence of research productivity includes a sustained record of research publications in respected, carefully reviewed scholarly journals or book chapters and books; sustained publication of high impact research papers (consistent with their research assignment), a significant number of which are senior-authored; extramural grant support; appointment to editorial boards; appointment to study sections; election to a national office in a professional society; invitations to speak at national and international meetings; and intellectual property patents and copyrights. For faculty with extension appointments, extramural funding can support curriculum/program evaluation, development/testing of best practices, testing of the effectiveness of new resources (e.g., videos, web sites), and other applied research projects. Publications can include papers published in journals focusing on informing practice or social policy. Research reports published by extension faculty may also be located in refereed publications designed for applied audiences.

The esteem and publishing practices of the journals and publishing houses with which the candidate publishes, reviews in scholarly journals, citations by others in journal articles or books, reviews conducted for journals, and reviews of grant applications all add weight to a judgment of quality. Judgments of quality will be made by Department members after reviewing the candidate’s research and scholarly work. Evidence of impact on the field includes recognition by the national and international scientific community that the candidate has made substantial contributions to their field. Each candidate will be expected to make the case for his/her research activities and present quantifiable evidence of their achievements in this area.

Three external letters in support of the candidate’s appointment or promotion from associate to full professor are required. None of these letters can come from colleagues who have collaborated with the candidate. The solicitation of these letters must follow

the very strict guidelines laid down by the Office of the Provost at the following url:  
<http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/guidelines.html>

- c) University/Professional Service- A candidate for promotion from associate to full professor should have some committee responsibility in the Department of Nutrition and Food Science, the College of Human Sciences, and Auburn University. The candidate should also be participating in local, national and international committees of professional organizations and/or provide service to the local community as appropriate. Departmental citizenship, including cooperation with and participation in Departmental initiatives, active participation in supporting Departmental goals and promoting the Department's reputation on and away from campus, will be important for promotion to Full Professor. Continued leadership responsibilities and Departmental, College, and University-level service should be evident.

Evidence of professional service includes: student recruitment (of both graduate and undergraduate students but especially of the former); involvement with professional organizations that are in line with the Departmental mission; service on Department and College committees, as well as University committees; editorial boards for journals; manuscript reviews; and grant reviews.

- d) Outreach - Appointment or promotion from associate to full professor is based on accomplishments that demonstrate an integrated program of outreach scholarship with an established reputation showing strong evidence of quality, impact, and dissemination of resulting programmatic products and expertise. Interaction with the wider community of outreach scholars should be visible, and a reputation for excellence among peers locally, regionally, and nationally should be well-established.

An outreach program is characterized by a clearly identifiable focus, based on relevant basic and applied research, and established in partnership or consultation with regional and state professionals working in related areas of focus. An *integrated* outreach program involves some combination of the following outreach activities: the development of multiple educational resources (e.g., curricula, professional development materials, guidesheets, videos, websites or other internet-based educational technologies); providing training for professional and/or lay audiences to support program implementation; internal and/or external grant submissions; evaluations studies; and presentations and publications related to the outreach program.

Evidence of quality is seen in the achievement of some combination of the following visible, evaluatable outcomes: publication of articles related to the outreach program in appropriate, peer-reviewed outlets; the development of innovative program materials or delivery methods (e.g., original web- or print-based resources, webinar trainings, digital resources); receiving funding support (preferably some funding at the federal level if available for a candidate's outreach programming) for the development or delivery of outreach program innovations when such grants and contracts are competitive and subject to peer review; the adoption or adaptation by outside individuals of curricular or other program materials, processes, and resources developed for the outreach program. Recognition by groups at the state and national level

(evidenced by awards, invited presentations, and invitations to serve as a reviewer of programs, portfolios, and other extension products) of the candidate's leadership and contributions to the field.

Evidence of impact may be provided in a number of ways: documentation of data collected to assess the efficacy of the program implementation; documentation of data collected to assess achievement of short-term program goals; documentation of data collected to assess achievement of long-term program goals; cost-benefit analyses of program impacts.

Evidence of dissemination is seen in activities such as the provision of training to lay and professional audiences within and outside the State; outreach publications; lectures, presentations, workshops, on program-related processes, products, results, etc; and publication in other scholarly, peer-reviewed outlets of new or improved outreach education methods, new understandings of current knowledge, or new applications of knowledge in specific settings.

### **3. Tenure**

Academic tenure is a principle that affords the individual faculty member academic freedom in the University environment. The *AU Faculty Handbook* explains that Tenure exists in order to ensure academic freedom by protecting "the faculty member's ability to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, policies and institutions". A candidate's collegiality and work load productivity are the primary factors in achieving tenure.

### **4. Collegiality**

The Auburn University *Faculty Handbook* defines collegiality in terms of whether a member's contributions are in line with the mission and goals of the department and whether the member demonstrates a willingness to participate in the shared academic and administrative tasks of the unit. Collegiality is one of the two primary appraisal factors in tenure decisions and is judged at the departmental level by tenured departmental faculty. Within HDFS, collegiality is understood to include active participation in shared governance of the unit and professional interaction with faculty, staff, and students. Examples include, but are not limited to: regular and constructive participation in faculty meetings, contribution of time and effort to departmental initiatives and events, participation in activities related to peer review and faculty recruitment, and professional interaction with external constituencies.