



AUBURN UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

GUIDELINES

Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work Department

Workload
Faculty Annual Review
Third-Year Review
Promotion and Tenure

9/30/11

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, AND PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Updated 4/1/11, Approved by Provost 5/11, Updated 9/30/11 to reflect FHB changes

The **Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work** Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the Auburn University Faculty Handbook and College of Liberal Arts guidelines. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of these guidelines is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and guidelines for faculty assignments, faculty evaluation, and promotion and tenure at the departmental level. Department guidelines are intended to conform to those of the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (revised 6/17/11) and the College of Liberal Arts. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in these guidelines and in the University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is University, College, Department. Any reference to the Faculty Handbook in this document refers to the current version.

The **Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work department's** faculty evaluation process is intended to guide faculty toward enhanced success; clarify faculty goals; inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department; include faculty in discussions and decisions; and provide consistent and clear criteria for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the College of Liberal Arts includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual workload assignment, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track and Clinical track positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are subject to a third-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, outreach, and service (as applicable to the faculty member's assignment) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance at any time before tenure. The focus of the third-year review for clinical track faculty is the faculty member's progress toward achieving promotion to associate clinical professor, yet still recognizing that clinical faculty are on continuing appointments that necessitate annual contract renewal. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in assigned areas of performance (such as clinical teaching, clinical outreach, service, scholarship, professional development) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance, effective at the conclusion of the annual contract in force.

Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

The Appointment Letter

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, outreach, and service. Examples of appointment letters may be found at the following URL:

https://sites.auburn.edu/academic/COLA/CLA_Dean/cladeptguidelines/SitePages/Home.aspx

Annual Workload Assignment

Annual faculty assignments reflect that faculty members working in various disciplines contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and department chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

The College of Liberal Arts Workload Guidelines state:

Initial workload assignments for tenure-track faculty (TTF) are negotiated upon hire, and are distributed across all areas of responsibility; teaching, research/creative scholarly works, outreach, extension and service. Occasionally, administrative duties may also be included as a percent of a faculty member's workload if it is part of their normal assignment. Workload assignments may be adjusted on an annual basis during the annual review process to reflect any changes in a faculty member's assignment for the following year. The department head/chair meets with each faculty member during the faculty annual review process to discuss and negotiate anticipated workload changes. The faculty member signs the annual review which includes the stated workload assignment for the following year to assure that every faculty member is aware of his/her responsibilities. The original signed annual review is to be kept in the departmental personnel file. Three copies are to be submitted to the Office of the Dean (one copy will be kept on file in the Dean's Office, one copy will be placed in the CLA's faculty personnel file and one copy will be delivered to the Office of the Provost).

Description of Types of Faculty Positions

Tenure Track Faculty (TTF):

The "typical" annual teaching assignment for "research active" TTF is 5 courses¹ (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 62.5% per year. Consistent with university guidelines, all research active TTF are assigned a minimum 25% research/creative/scholarly outreach² workload for promotion and tenure purposes. The annual teaching assignment for "highly productive" research TTF is 4 courses³ (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 50% per year. The status of highly productive research TTF requires the approval of the Dean. In situations where a tenured associate professor or professor is not fulfilling a 25% requirement for scholarly activity, the department chair will provide a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to ensure that a tenured faculty member has a 100% workload. In this case, the faculty member would be assigned a differential workload with a minimum of 10% research, in order to stay current in the field for teaching purposes. It is expected that the faculty member will receive an increase in the teaching load, with the understanding that he/she cannot be promoted just on teaching. Research

¹ A course is defined as a 3 contact hour course.

² "In terms of your questions, it is my understanding that the former Provost said that a tenure track faculty member on hire must have a minimum of 25% research, scholarship of pedagogy or outreach, or creative activity. Therefore, I will continue that tradition."
- Email from Dr. Mazey sent to Paula Bobrowski 5/10/2009.

³ Ibid.

productivity will be considered over a 3 year period. If a faculty member is not research productive for 3 years, then there will be an increase in the teaching load proportionally. During that 3-year period, if he/she does become productive and demonstrates that he/she can be productive for 3 years in research, then there will be a reduction in the teaching load to acknowledge the increase in research.

Clinical Track Faculty (CTF) :

CTF are generally assigned teaching loads ranging from 5-8 courses a year (or department FTE equivalent). There is not a minimum research workload requirement. According to AU guidelines⁴ the clinician title series is a professional series for appointment of appropriately qualified individuals who contribute to the university's academic mission by participation in activities which (1) predominantly involve clinical practice, (2) are of contractually specified duration, and (3) operate under contracts, grants, generated income, or other designated funds. Note, however, that CTF are expected to teach in the clinical setting.

Instructors/Lecturers :

Instructors and Lecturers will be assigned 100% teaching loads of 8 courses per year. Any exceptions will need approval by the Dean. In addition to the definition of teaching stated in the faculty handbook, teaching in CLA includes: holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current in the field, attendance of departmental meetings relevant to teaching, participating in departmental life and the engagement of students.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF – as designated by HR):

NTTF may be assigned some teaching; but it cannot exceed one course per semester and three courses per year.

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Workload adjustment for sabbaticals and leaves. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to research would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

[See Appendix 2 for Departmental Workload Guidelines.](#)

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

⁴ http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/clinician_positions.html#appointment

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

Performance Descriptors. The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed a performance score of 4 - Exemplary (characterizing performance of high merit), 3 - Exceeds Expectations (characterizing performance of merit), 2 - Meets Expectations (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), 1 – Marginal (characterizing performance that may not be sufficient to justify continuation) or 0 – Unacceptable (characterizing performance not sufficient to justify continuation).

See Appendix 3 for Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart.

The annual review normally covers performance for the preceding calendar year. Research productivity will be considered over a 3-year period. Evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable, to their appointment.

[See Appendix 4 for Departmental Annual Review Guidelines.](#)

Written evaluation report

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

The unit head shall prepare a written report summarizing the major points of the conference. A copy of the report shall be provided to the faculty member within a month of the conference. If there are no objections, the faculty member shall be asked to sign it as confirmation of having seen it. If the faculty member does not agree with the material in the report, he or she may write a response to be appended to the report. A copy of the signed report and response, if there is one, is to be retained for the faculty member's departmental personnel file; another copy is to be given to the faculty member; a third copy is sent to the Office of the Provost. To the extent permitted by law, the report is to remain confidential, available only for the use of the concerned faculty member and any University officials who have supervisory power over the faculty member.

Third-Year Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Each department shall conduct a third year review of all its probationary faculty members. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's third year. The head shall request a current vita and any supporting material the head or the faculty member deems appropriate prior to the review. The particular focus of this review is the faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure. The review therefore must address the criteria for tenure set forth in this document. To be maximally useful to the candidate

and the department, the review shall involve the entire tenured faculty. In order for it to accurately reveal the judgment of tenured faculty, it shall conclude with a vote on whether or not, in the judgment of the tenured faculty, the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure. The result of the vote shall be announced at the meeting. Faculty should understand that this vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future.

The head shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the review, and characterizing the nature of the vote. The procedure described above for the report on the yearly conference shall be followed, with the difference that this report may be consulted by the tenured faculty when the faculty member is a candidate for tenure; otherwise, the report is to remain confidential [to the extent allowable by law].

[See Appendix 5 for Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines.](#)

Promotion and Tenure Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of 1) teaching and/or outreach and 2) research/creative work. He or she is further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years. In addition, he or she is expected to have contributed some service to the University. Candidates covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines will be evaluated accordingly. For candidates not covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines, the criteria for teaching, research/creative work, and outreach described below [see Appendix 1] shall be considered by the faculty in the evaluation of a candidate's performance and achievement. The candidate's employment conditions and academic assignments shall determine which criteria are most emphasized, and standards for promotion are based on the weights of each performance area as described in the letter of offer and subsequent annual evaluations. Credit shall also be given for contributions above and beyond specifically assigned duties.

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Regarding tenure, the AU Faculty Handbook states:

Auburn University nurtures and defends the concept of academic tenure which assures each faculty member freedom, without jeopardy at the department, college or school, or University level, to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, policies, and institutions and guarantees faculty members the right to support, without jeopardy, any colleague whose academic freedom is threatened. Tenure establishes an environment in which truth can be sought and expressed in one's teaching, research/creative work, outreach work, and service. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) research/creative work, 3) outreach and 4) service as described above under Promotion Criteria and, where applicable, in approved departmental guidelines, the candidate for tenure must also demonstrate potential to contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit in all relevant areas.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should carefully read the Promotion and Tenure policies found in the AU Faculty Handbook. A timeline for the candidate's submission of materials for evaluation for promotion and tenure will be established each year by the Office of the Provost.

See [Appendix 6 for Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty at Auburn are subject to post-tenure review as outlined on the Provost's website at the following URL:

http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies/2009-11_post-tenured-review-policy.pdf

Appendix 1

Auburn University's Expectations for Teaching, Research, Outreach, and Service

Teaching

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Since a primary activity of the University is the instruction of students, careful evaluation of teaching is essential. Because of the difficulty of evaluating teaching effectiveness, faculty members are urged to consider as many relevant measures as possible in appraising the candidate. These include consideration of the candidate's knowledge of the subject and his or her professional growth in the field of specialization; the candidate's own statement of his or her teaching philosophy; the quality of the candidate's teaching as indicated by peer and student evaluations and teaching awards; performance of the candidate's students on standardized tests or in subsequent classes; the candidate's contributions to the academic advising of students; the candidate's development of new courses and curricula; the quality of the candidate's direction of dissertations, theses, independent study projects, etc.; and the quality of pedagogical material published by the candidate.

Research/Creative Work

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

A faculty member engaged in research/creative work has an obligation to contribute to his or her discipline through applied and/or basic research, through creative endeavors, or through interpretive scholarship. To a large extent, each discipline and each department must determine how much and what quality of research/creative work is appropriate for promotion (and/or tenure) and judge its candidates accordingly. In appraising the candidate's work, faculty members should consider the quality and significance of the work, the quality of the outlet for publication or exhibition, and, in cases of collaborative work, the role of the candidate.

Research and creative work ordinarily can be documented by a candidate's publications or performances/exhibitions. Publication subjected to critical review by other scholars as a condition of publication should carry more weight than publication that is not refereed. Nevertheless, all forms of publication, including articles intended for a non-academic audience, should be considered provided they are of high quality in relation to the purpose intended. Scholarly papers subjected to peer review and delivered at a regional or national conference and

creative work subjected to peer review and performed or exhibited on a regional or national level should carry more weight than work done only on a local level. Successful efforts in obtaining extramural support for research/creative work (as well as for teaching and outreach programs) should also be positively considered in evaluation of the candidate.

Outreach

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as outreach scholarship for purposes of tenure and promotion if all the following conditions are met: 1) there is a substantive link with significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns; 2) there is a direct application of knowledge to significant human needs and societal problems, issues, or concerns; 3) there is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise; 4) the ultimate purpose is for the public or common good; 5) new knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele; and 6) there is a clear link/relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit's mission. Outreach is not expected of all faculty. Participation in this function varies from major, continuing commitments, as is the case with the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, through intermittent engagement for individual faculty as needs and opportunities for a particular expertise arise, to no involvement at all.

The commitment of faculty time to outreach is a decision to be made by the faculty member with the approval of the department in which the faculty member will seek tenure and/or promotion. It may be accomplished in the initial appointment, as is typically the case for Extension faculty, in annual work plans, or during the year in response to unexpected needs. In any case, this decision should be made with due consideration to the professional development of the faculty member, the expected public benefits of the outreach activities, and mission of the department and/or other supporting units. Departmental approval carries a commitment to assess and appropriately weigh outreach contributions in salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

Demands for quality in outreach are the same as in teaching and research/creative work; however, outreach activities are different in nature from other activities and must be evaluated accordingly. See Appendix 1 of Faculty Participation in Outreach Scholarship: An Assessment Model, which is available along with other publications on the assessment of outreach under "Outreach Publications" on the University web site. Department heads should request any material necessary from the candidate to facilitate faculty assessment of the type, quality, and effectiveness of the candidate's involvement in extension activities and evaluation of any resulting publications.

Service

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

University service includes participating in departmental, college or school, and University governance and committee work, assisting in the recruitment of new faculty, and developing and assisting in the implementation of new academic programs. Faculty should note particularly distinctive contributions to University life on the part of the candidate, including service to the candidate's profession, such as offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; and editorships and the refereeing of manuscripts.

Appendix 2

Departmental Workload Guidelines for Tenure-Track and Clinical-Track Faculty

The Department Chair is responsible for making teaching assignments in consultation with the respective program directors. The conditions governing such assignments are (a) the budgetary and faculty resources available, (b) the nature and volume of student requests for classes and, (c) the responsibilities and obligations of individual faculty such as scholarly research, assigned departmental or university committee service, or public service and outreach. All faculty members are expected to accept requests from the DC of their respective program directors to serve on committees that conduct departmental affairs.

Tenure Track Faculty Workload to supplement the CLA guidelines:

- 3-2 course load for TT faculty involved in research that results in a demonstrable product/outcome
- 3-3 course load for TT faculty involved in 10% research as the minimum required by CLA and the Provost
- 4-4 course load for full time instructors who receive university benefits
- 2-2 course load for TT faculty with part-time administrative appointments (Program Coordinators)
- 2-2 course load for highly productive research faculty after tenure and with the Dean's approval and a MoU with the Department Chair
- 1-2 courses per semester and 1 course in summer for the Social Work program director
- 1-1 course load for the Department Chair
- Exceptions must be negotiated and are usually based on course buy-outs from grants and contracts.

Clinical Faculty Workload:

Commensurate with tenure track faculty, the clinical faculty will maintain a workload comparable to 3:3:2. Specifically, one unit equates to 15 students for liaison work OR a section of integrative seminar OR one three-credit course. Over the academic year, a typical workload may be:

Fall and Spring	One load of 15 students for liaison work One section of integrative seminar One three-credit course
Summer	One load of 15 students for liaison work One section of integrative seminar or another Social Work course

Appendix 4

Annual Evaluation of Faculty Performance

- A. The departmental process for annual evaluations follows the process laid out in the Faculty Handbook. At the end of the calendar year, the chair will distribute the annual evaluation forms that follow the outline below and all faculty will fill in their details. A meeting will be scheduled with the chair to discuss the faculty member's performance and check the details recorded on the evaluation form. During the annual conference with the Chair, faculty members must provide copies of material in print that supports performance in Teaching, Research, Service and Outreach. These items may include: teaching evaluations, copies of published material in print, proof of acceptance for accepted material; copies of programs for participation in conferences, etc. An unfavorable annual review for tenure-track faculty may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation at any time prior to tenure. An unfavorable annual review for clinical-track faculty may result in nonrenewal of the clinical faculty member's contract.

I. TEACHING (50% — 75%) *

The rating system utilized to measure teaching performance is as follows:

- 4 Exemplary = mean of 4+ on teaching evaluations and 4 other items from the list below
- 3 Exceeds Expectations = mean of 3.5 - 3.9 on teaching evaluations and 3 items on list
- 2 Meets Expectations = mean of 3 – 3.4 on teaching evaluations and 2 items on list below
- 1 Marginal = mean of 2.5 – 2.9 on teaching evaluations and 1 item on list below
- 0 Unacceptable = mean of 2.4 or lower on teaching evaluations and no items from list

1. Factors to be taken into consideration to evaluate teaching performance, in addition to the required student evaluations, are the following: (each counts as 1 point):

- a. Teaching a graduate level class
- b. Independent studies directed
- c. Service on a master thesis
- d. Chair (or director) of a master's thesis (counts as 2 points)
- e. Service learning or civic engagement component added to course
- f. Organizing a class trip or event related to coursework
- g. Teaching honor or award
- h. Number of new or updated courses (with documentation)
- i. Serving as faculty member for an undergraduate research program
- j. Service on doctoral thesis (dissertation) as member
- k. Service as outside reader for master's thesis or Ph.D. committee

1. Teaching grant received by faculty

Clinical faculty: In addition to the above list, include:

- m. Development of new agency field education resources
- n. Creation of innovative teaching resource for practice methods and other professional courses

*In the exceptional cases of faculty members whose teaching load is 6 or 7 courses instead of 5, a minimum 12.5% amount of research activity is expected for annual faculty evaluation purposes; thus, the percentage for the evaluation of teaching performance is not to exceed 75%.

2. Number of student evaluations and items to be taken into consideration in the evaluation of teaching performance (each academic year-summer not included):

Tenure-Track & Clinical-Track:

- a. Faculty members teaching 7 classes may select to be evaluated based on student evaluations from 5 or more of the classes taught during the calendar year
- b. Faculty members teaching 6 classes may select to be evaluated based on student evaluations from 4 or more of the classes taught during the calendar year
- c. Faculty members teaching 5 classes may select to be evaluated based on student evaluations from 3 or more of the classes taught during the calendar year
- d. Faculty members teaching 4 classes may select to be evaluated based on student evaluations from 2 or more of the classes taught during the calendar year
- e. Faculty members teaching 3 classes may select to be evaluated based on student evaluation from 2 or more of the classes taught during the calendar year

3. In order to obtain the most representative samples, it is recommended that faculty members be evaluated by their peers in different class levels. Faculty members may use some of their peer evaluations to supplement and enhance the student teaching evaluations. Peer evaluations may be conducted by colleagues in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work, by specialists from the Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, or faculty from a related department. The evaluation conducted by the Biggio Center is a Classroom Observation; it is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to set it up. For more information about this evaluation, please consult the Biggio Center's website. It is recommended, however, that faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure be generally evaluated by colleagues from within the program, the department or the social sciences.

4. The faculty member should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of teaching to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

II. RESEARCH: SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS AND CREATIVE WORKS *

(25% — 37.5%): **

** In the exceptional cases of faculty members whose teaching load is 6 or 7 courses instead of 5, a minimum 12.5% amount of research activity is expected for annual faculty evaluation purposes; thus, the percentage for the evaluation of teaching performance is not to exceed 75%.

The rating system utilized to measure research performance is as follows:

- 4 Exemplary = at least 1 item in section 1 and 2 items in section 2 below
- 3 Exceeds Expectations = 1 item in section 1 and 1 item in section 2 below
- 2 Meets Expectations = no items in section 1 and 2 items in section 2
- 1 Marginal = no items in section and 1 item in section 2
- 0 Unacceptable = no items in either section

1. Factors to be taken into consideration to evaluate research performance include the following (each counts as 1 point):

Section 1:

- a. A single authored book in the faculty member's area of interest (will be counted for three years: once when accepted, and twice after publication- publications must be in peer-reviewed & reputable press);
- b. A major textbook with ancillary material (will be counted for three times: once when accepted, and twice after publication)
- c. An edited book, with appropriate introduction and scholarly context (will be counted once when accepted and once after publication)
- d. An article published in a refereed journal (will be counted once)
- e. A full-length article published as a book chapter in a referred book (will be counted once)
- f. Receipt of research grant from extra-mural agency (will be counted twice after approval of funding)
- g. Receipt of competitive internal research grant
- h. Receipt of conference paper award

Clinical faculty add:

- i. Development and evaluation of in-service training material
- j. Assessment of community needs and development and/or evaluation of programs or services
- k. Evaluation of service learning activities
- l. Full length article published in referred journal or professional medium
- m. Engagement in an interdepartmental and/or university/community collaborative research project
- n. Presentations at a professional conference

Section 2:

- a. Presentation of a scholarly paper or poster at a local, state or national conference
- b. Publication of a book review
- c. Publication of an encyclopedia article
- d. Proof of submission of a research article
- e. Entry in reference book or supplemental text
- f. Publication of lab manual
- g. Unfunded grant application
- h. Reader or a text book without full ancillary materials

Clinical faculty add:

- i. Assist in provision of in-service training material
- j. Assessment of community needs and development and/or evaluation of programs or services
- k. Conduct one service learning activity
- l. Proof of submission of a full length article published in referred journal or professional medium
- m. Proof of submission of article for presentation at a professional conference

2. The faculty member should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of research to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

III. UNIVERSITY AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICE (6.25%)

The rating system utilized to measure university and professional service is as follows:

- 4 Exemplary = at least 1 item in section 1 and 3 items in section 2 below
- 3 Exceeds Expectations = 4 items in section 2 below
- 2 Meets Expectations = 3 items in section 2 below
- 1 Marginal = 2 items in section 2 below
- 0 Unacceptable = either 1 item in section 2 or no items in either section

1. Factors to be taken into consideration to evaluate university and professional service are the following:

*Section 1:

- a. Service as chair of a university or departmental search committee
- b. Service as chair of other university or departmental committee
- c. Service in a substantial ad hoc capacity to the department, the college, or the university
- d. Organizing a film or lecture series or other ongoing departmental function involving students or colleagues
- e. Serving as departmental Senator
- f. Creating a new curriculum or a new option within an existing program
- g. Service as an officer or member of the executive board of a professional organization
- h. Membership on the editorial board of an academic journal

Clinical faculty add:

- i. Membership on curriculum committee to comply with accreditation standards
- j. Active participation and involvement in accreditation activities
- k. Professional advising for curricular and professional career development
- l. Maintain professional licensure

*Section 2:

- a. Nominating a colleague for a major college, university, or national honor or award
- b. Sponsoring an honor society or other student organization
- c. Inviting a speaker of national or international reputation to present a campus-wide lecture
- d. Serving as peer reviewer for two faculty members
- e. Membership on a departmental search committee
- f. Membership on a department, college, or university committee
- g. Nominating a student for a college, university, or national honor or award

- h. Creating a scholarly club
 - i. Colloquium
 - j. Nominating a student for a departmental honor or award
 - k. Service as a reader for an academic journal, having reviewed at least one refereed article
 - l. Consultant to an academic press having reviewed at least one book manuscript
 - m. Reviewer of a tenure or promotion dossier from another academic institution
2. For each service activity, faculty members should describe briefly their involvement, roles (e.g. leadership), and how often the committee or group met.
3. The faculty member should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of service to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

IV. OUTREACH (6.25%)

The rating system utilized to measure outreach and professional service performance is as follows:

- 4 Exemplary = at least 2 items in section 1 and 1 item in section 2 below
- 3 Exceeds Expectations = 1 items in section 1 and 1 item in section 2 below
- 2 Meets Expectations = No items in section 1 and 2 items in section 2
- 1 Marginal = 1 item in section 1 or 1 item in section 2
- 0 Unacceptable = either 1 item in section 2 or no items in either section

1. Factors to be taken into consideration in the evaluation of outreach and professional service are the following:

Section 1:

- a. Service as an officer or member of the executive board of a state, regional, national, or international organization
- b. Activity involving university outreach or civic engagement
- c. Chairing a session at a regional, national, or international conference
- d. Organizing a regional, national or international conference (counts as 2 activities, or more by prior arrangement with the Chair)
- e. Organizing a state conference (counts as 2 activities, or more by prior arrangement with the chair)
- f. Organizing a student trip to a special out-of-town event
- g. Receiving an award from a professional organization
- h. Writing a document or paper - white paper or consulting (free). If there is compensation for consulting services then this activity may not also be counted as service

Clinical faculty add:

- i. Maintain professional licensure
- j. Host continuing education opportunities for licensed social workers in the community
- k. Create and maintain active, responsive relationships with current and potential practicum and intern sites
- l. Develop, revise, implement and analyze data from field performance evaluations
- m. Conducting initial, mid-semester and crisis intervention agency field visits
- n. Arranging internships for over 10 students
- o. Plan and implement social work month activities
- p. Interviewing and consulting with students to ensure social work optimal learning experience for interns
- q. Engagement in university/community collaborative research project
- r. Attend professional conferences on changes to accreditation standards
- s. Develop mechanisms to increase passing rate of professional licensure for students

- t. Develop continuing education opportunities for graduates and community practitioners
- u. Conduct annual student convocation/ field fair

Section 2:

- a. Presentation of a scholarly paper or poster at a local, state or national conference
- b. Publication of a book review
- c. Publication of an encyclopedia article
- d. Proof of submission of a research article
- e. Entry in reference book or supplemental text
- f. Publication of lab manual
- g. Unfunded grant application
- h. Reader or a text book without full ancillary materials

Clinical faculty add:

- i. Assist in provision of in-service training material
 - j. Assessment of community needs and development and/or evaluation of programs or services
 - k. Conduct one service learning activity
 - l. Proof of submission of a full length article published in referred journal or professional medium
 - m. Proof of submission of article for presentation at a professional conference
2. For each outreach activity, faculty members should describe briefly their involvement, roles (e.g. leadership), and how often the committee or group met.
 3. The faculty member should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of outreach to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

Summary of the Annual Review Evaluation

All faculty members are to be evaluated in the areas of Teaching, Research, Service and Outreach. Faculty members will be evaluated according to the percentages of their assigned duties since teaching assignments vary according to administrative duties, preferences and needs.

During spring semester, each faculty member, together with the Department Chair, will establish a tentative teaching load to be determined according to individual responsibilities and enrollment needs, as well as available funding. Tenured faculty members who do not have an extensive research program may opt to teach a higher number of courses, so that teaching would constitute a larger part of their duties.

The full teaching load is 8 courses per year; however, tenure-track faculty members are expected to engage in research and service/outreach. To that end, they receive a course reduction of 2 courses for research, and 1 course for service/outreach, thus they generally teach 5 courses per year. In exceptional cases, and although it is not encouraged, a tenured faculty member, in consultation with the Department Chair, may select to teach an extra course or two (6 or 7 courses per year instead of the standard 5), in order to devote less time to research (only 1 or no course reduction instead of 2). As required by the Provost and the College, the faculty member may not set their research percentage to less than 10% of total effort.

Clinical Faculty Workload: Commensurate with tenure track faculty, the clinical faculty will maintain a workload comparable to 3:3:2. Specifically, one unit equates to 15 students for liaison work OR a section of integrative seminar OR one three-credit course. Over the academic year, a typical workload may be: Fall and Spring semester-One load of 15 students for liaison work; 1 section of integrative seminar; and, 1 three-credit course.

The following rating system is used for evaluating faculty performance:

- Exemplary = mean of 3.0-4.0 as per criteria listed in the evaluation guidelines
- Exceeds Expectations = mean of 2.0 – 2.9 as per criteria listed in the evaluation guidelines
- Meets Expectations = mean of 1.0-1.9
- Marginal = mean of 0-0.9
- Unacceptable = 0

ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION FORM
 (To be filled out by the Chair and the faculty member and used confidentially)

Faculty Member's Name: -----

	<u>TEACHING</u>	<u>RESEARCH</u>	<u>IN-HOUSE</u>	<u>OUTREACH</u>
Evaluation of performance	-----%	-----%	6.25%	6.25%
based on the following percentages				

Teaching (50%--62.5%, or 75%)

Exemplary	----- --	(4)		
Exceeds Expectations	----- -	(3)		
Meets Expectations	----- -	(2)		
Marginal	----- -	(1)		
Unacceptable	----- -	(0)		
	x ----- % = -----			

Research (12.5%--37.5%)

Exemplary	----- --	(4)		
Exceeds Expectations	----- -	(3)		
Meets Expectations	----- -	(2)		

Marginal	----- (1)	-
Unacceptable	----- (0)	-
	----- x ----- % = -----	

Professional & University Service

Exemplary	----- (4)	--
Exceeds Expectations	----- (3)	-
Meets Expectations	----- (2)	-
Marginal	----- (1)	-
Unacceptable	----- (0)	-
	----- x ----- % = -----	

Outreach

Exemplary	----- (4)	--
Exceeds Expectations	----- (3)	-
Meets Expectations	----- (2)	-
Marginal	----- (1)	-
Unacceptable	----- (0)	-
	----- x ----- % = -----	-----

Total:

Exemplary	-----	(4)
Exceeds Expectations	-----	(3)
Meets Expectations	-----	(2)
Marginal	-----	(1)
Unacceptable	-----	(0)
	----- x -----	% = -----

Appendix 5

Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines for Tenure-track and Clinical Faculty

The University requires that all probationary faculty undergo a third-year review for the purpose of determining the status of their progress toward tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. Clinical Assistant professors will also undergo a third year review in preparation for promotion to Associate Clinical professor. The department regards this review as diagnostic and advisory in character. As such, the Department does an intensive annual review of all untenured and clinical faculty members and makes a recommendation as to retention. Since the third year review has been within the sequence leading to the eventual formal determination of a tenure-track faculty member's tenure and promotion possibilities, the tenured faculty of the department will be given the opportunity to participate in the process. Since tenured faculty, Associate Clinical professors, and Full Clinical professors vote on the promotion of Assistant Clinical professors, they will be given the opportunity to participate in the third-year review of Assistant Clinical professors.

The Third-Year Review Guidelines for probationary faculty in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work follow the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Faculty Handbook. It is highly recommended that the third-year review dossier follow the Promotion and Tenure format contained in the Faculty Handbook. An unfavorable third-year review may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation; however, a letter of non-continuation may be issued at any time prior to tenure.

The DC shall conduct a third year review of all its assistant clinical professors. The program director for Social Work will organize the third-year review of the assistant clinical professor and write a recommendation letter to the DC. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before May 31 of the clinical faculty member's third year. As with the annual review, the DC shall request a current vita and any supporting material the DC, the program director, or the clinical faculty member deems appropriate prior to the third year review. The particular focus of this review is the clinical faculty member's progress toward achieving promotion to associate clinical professor. The review, therefore, must address the specific department and college criteria for promotion. The DC shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the review. The suggestions for improvement and concerns as well as the nature of the final vote will be expressed to the candidate. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in assigned areas of performance (such as clinical teaching, clinical outreach, service, scholarship, professional development) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance, effective at the conclusion of the annual contract in force.

Appendix 6

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Appendix 6

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Tenure Track and Clinical Track Faculty

The current document addresses three milestones in the professional career of faculty in the Department: tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or Clinical Professor, promotion to Full Professor or Clinical Professor, and elevation to the rank of Distinguished Professor. The following paragraphs reference all three but pay particular attention to the tenure decision. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work will be evaluated with respect to their accomplishments in research, teaching, outreach and service.

Although a “meets expectations” mark each year on an annual evaluation is not a guarantee that a faculty member will meet the tenure and promotion criteria after five or six years, the annual faculty evaluation criteria do help to establish minimum standards. A “meets expectations” standard for annual reviews is a minimum standard, so it is in the faculty member’s best interests to aim for a ranking of “exceeds expectations” or “exemplary” in at least two of the four categories evaluated each year.

AU guidelines require that candidates for promotion to Associate Professor demonstrate distinction in at least two areas, normally research and teaching. For Associate Clinical Professor it is expected that the candidates will excel in at least teaching and outreach. Distinguished Professors are expected to excel in all four areas. An additional general guideline is that candidates for Associate Professor should have achieved a regional or national reputation and for Associate Clinical Professor a regional reputation. Candidates for Full Professor are expected to enjoy a national or international reputation in their research area. AU has published guidelines that candidates should consult. The links are as follows:

Faculty Handbook: <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/facultyHandbook/>

Clinical Faculty Guidelines:

http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/clinicalpromotions_guidelines.html

Teaching

From Assistant to Tenured Associate Professor

Candidates must demonstrate a sustained commitment to excellence in teaching. Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated in a number of ways apart from student evaluations, including peer evaluations of classroom performance, instructional materials (e.g. syllabi, exams), supervision of interns, honors theses, and University Scholars, and course and curriculum development.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching:

The tenure-track and clinical-track faculty members of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work are required to participate in a yearly peer evaluation process designed to assess their teaching performance. Information gained through the peer evaluation process will be used to support the applications of faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure, and will also be used to assist all faculty in addressing any issues that need special attention.

In order to obtain the most representative samples, it is recommended that faculty members be evaluated by their peers in different class levels. Faculty members may use some of their peer evaluations to supplement and enhance the student teaching evaluations. Peer evaluations may be conducted by colleagues in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work, by specialists from the Biggio Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, or faculty from a related department. The evaluation conducted by the Biggio Center is a Classroom Observation; it is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to set it up. For more information about this evaluation, please consult the Biggio Center's website. It is recommended, however, that faculty members seeking promotion and/or tenure be generally evaluated by colleagues from within the program, the department or the social sciences.

Peer evaluation of tenure-track faculty members:

All tenure-track faculty members, together with the Department Chair, will select one tenured member of the Department to evaluate their teaching performance each year. It is recommended that in any three-year period a tenure-track faculty member not be evaluated by the same person more than twice. Tenure-track faculty members must have all their classes evaluated by students, and at least one class each year evaluated by their peers. However, only some of the student evaluations may be taken into consideration in the annual review with the Chair.

Items to be taken into consideration in peer evaluations:

Evaluators will comment on the following items when reporting on the classes they visit (please see the Peer Review Evaluation Form for more details):

- a. **Course syllabus:** general compliance of the course syllabus with the structure required by the College of Liberal Arts, including but not limited to course objectives, required textbooks, required reading materials, additional print and/or electronic required or recommended materials, grading procedure, and boilerplate.
- b. **Class preparation and interaction:** ability of instructor to supplement and enrich textbook materials, to encourage class discussions, to ask questions that stimulate students' intellect, to use the target language where appropriate, and to create a comfortable learning environment;
- c. **Completion and use of peer evaluations:** copies of the signed reports of peer evaluators

will be given to the faculty member and the Department Chair within ten working days from the date of the class visit, and a copy will be placed in the faculty member's permanent file. Faculty members being evaluated and their evaluators must sign the peer evaluation form completed by the evaluators. If necessary, they may add their own comments on the reports, or write separate responses to be attached to the evaluators' reports.

From Associate to Full:

In addition to the above accomplishments, candidates for Full Professor will usually be expected to have successfully chaired several students to the MA when possible.

Research

The intrinsic heterogeneity of the disciplines in the Department requires flexibility with respect to specific research expectations. We distinguish generically between two trajectories in our Department: a science/humanities model in which one or more scholarly books or many peer refereed journal articles are expected and an applied model in which outreach publications and activities are stressed and valued using measures of impact. However the Department recognizes that members of any discipline may be found in either tradition or may straddle the two. This requires flexibility in the evaluation of dossiers.

From Assistant to Tenured Associate Professor

- 1) Candidates must have established a sustained program of research in their areas of expertise that has been published in refereed journals and/or in nationally or internationally recognized presses. Although prime attention will be given to the volume and the quality of the scholarly output, the reputation of the journals and publishers will also exert an impact on departmental and college assessment of publications.
- 2) For those whose tenure and/or promotion relies heavily on books and articles, it is always preferable that the book or article be published and available for purchase. It is also an institutional custom at AU and at other institutions, to count books and articles that have been accepted for publication and can be shown, through letters from the publisher, to be in the final pre-publication stage. As a general rule books in university presses almost automatically carry weight. But there are also highly respected peer-reviewed presses that are suitable indicators of high quality and potentially influential work. A sole authored book will weigh more heavily than a co-authored book and both of these will have more weight than an edited volume. The important criterion is that any book being used as a primary document for tenure and / or promotion contain independent scholarship by the author and not merely be a synthesis and presentation of the work of others. In that light a textbook summarizing for students the state of knowledge in the field will count for much less than a book presenting the candidate's own research.
- 3) Without a book, a significant number of peer refereed articles published in respected journals, refereed chapters in books, or articles in refereed anthologies is expected. It is

expected that at least half of the articles will be solely authored or that the candidate will be a principal author. The Department refrains from establishing a hard-and-fast rule with regard to the number of required articles and chapters for tenure and promotion, but past expectations at both the department and College level have been in the range of six to nine refereed publication (without a book). The quality of the publisher and rigor of the peer review, as measured by, for example, the journal's or book's impact factor, are also considered as part of the candidate's evaluation.

- 4) Besides books, refereed journal articles, and book chapters, other types of written output will be considered as additional evidence of scholarship. Among these are scholarly monographs, including lengthy applied contract research documents entailing data collection and analysis, book reviews, scholarly encyclopedia articles, commentaries, research notes, preliminary research reports, as well as films and other products of visual media studies. For any of these categories, evidence of peer-juried review, e.g., juried ethnographic films, will have more weight than non-peer reviewed outlets.
- 5) The publication of dissertation-derived research is encouraged; however, evidence of however, evidence of expanded or new research must also be presented.
- 6) The ability to obtain fellowships, grants, and awards will enhance the candidate's standing, as will paper presentations at conventions or other scholarly meetings.

From Associate to Full

Candidates for promotion to Full are expected to show a level of sustained research productivity in their areas of expertise that is equivalent to the original output expected of a candidate for tenure, e.g. a second book in disciplines requiring a book, roughly twice the number of refereed articles as a tenure candidate without a book requirement, and a general productivity of approximately two articles or equivalent publications or other scholarly output per year since tenure in disciplines that do not require a book. It is important that the candidate show the achievement of a national reputation in his or her areas of expertise.

Service

From Assistant to Tenured Associate Professor

- 1) Candidates must have demonstrated, through sustained on-campus presence and regular involvement in on-campus service activities, their commitment to enhancing the life of the Department, the College, and the University. Off-campus sabbaticals are a normal part of the academic trajectory. The University and College also grant occasional semesters of extramural professional activities on a leave-of-absence basis. For tenure and promotion to Associate, however, on-campus semesters must substantially outnumber off-campus leaves of absence. Regular tenured faculty are expected to organize their professional lives in a manner compatible with service to AU and to its students.

- 2) The service contributions of untenured assistant professors are kept relatively light to facilitate excellence in teaching and research, but service on at least two department committees is expected each year. In addition, student advising and committee work are expected as noted above.
- 3) Regular participation in faculty meetings as well as attendance at recruitment colloquia is expected.
- 4) Scholarly service to the discipline (e.g. reviewing submissions to journals and panel participation at professional meetings) is also expected. Service contributions to state or nation—including those in which research was carried out – are encouraged.

From Associate to Full

- 1) Promotion to Full Professor presupposes an even higher level of extended on-campus service than is required of candidates for tenure. Between the granting of tenure and the application for Full Professor, the candidate should demonstrate a history of substantial and sustained service on department committees, e.g., serving as chair of standing or search committees or serving as a departmental officer, is expected, along with service on College and/or University Committees.
- 2) The categories of scholarly service to the discipline and to the larger community expected in the dossier of the candidate to Full Professor are the same as those at the tenure decision, but the level of expected service is greater. This includes service to professional associations (as officer or committee member), journal editor, service on NSF or NIH panels, and the like.

Such extramural service, however, is a supplement to, not a substitute for, the earlier mentioned requirement of on-campus service to the university and its students.

Outreach

Outreach is defined as scholarly engagement that applies academic expertise for the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. Faculty should consult the Faculty Handbook for specific guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration. Outreach can take the following forms: community or civic engagement, outreach scholarship, extension, continuing education, distance education, technical assistance, service learning, clinical work and others as defined by specific program activities. Outreach is considered a valuable part of the Department's mission and expertise. The College does not require a tenure track faculty member to assign a minimum percentage to outreach activities but such work is strongly encouraged in the Department. Clinical track faculty are required to allocate at least ten percent of their annual effort toward outreach, and in many cases this percentage is set higher. The outreach activities of a faculty member at the assistant or associate professor level will be evaluated for tenure and promotion on the basis of the specific needs addressed and met, the benefit to target audiences, the efficiency of time and effort involved and creativity and innovativeness. Outreach projects should be defined in annual reviews and tenure

and promotion dossiers in terms of the above indicators and target audiences, needs, and time and effort should be documented as specifically as possible.

Procedures for application

From Assistant to Tenured Associate Professor

The College and the Department have institutionalized a mentoring system for junior faculty by which they will be linked to a senior faculty member in their department or the university early in their career at AU. The mentor will guide and counsel them during the advancement process. The mentor may change over the course of the candidate's career.

AU and the Department have instituted the practice of "third year reviews" for junior faculty (see Third Year Review document). Though less intensive than the tenure process, the third-year review does entail the compilation of a dossier that will be examined not only by the chair and the mentor but also by tenured faculty in the department. Feedback from this third year review is essential in assisting junior faculty in identifying which if any mid-course corrections will be required in their research, teaching, or service to ensure a smooth transition into tenure.

AU T&P decisions are normally made during the fall and spring of the academic year. At the end of the spring semester, the Chair of the department consults with the faculty to prepare a list of candidates to undergo formal consideration for tenure and/or promotion during the fall of that year.

The Chair provides each candidate with department, college, and university guidelines and forms for tenure and promotion in the spring term. The selection of outside evaluators should be in accordance with CLA and Provost guidelines found at:

<http://cla-web.auburn.edu/cla/index.cfm/faculty/promotion-and-tenure/>

<http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/guidelines.html>

The Chair's letter of request to the external evaluators will follow College and Provost guidelines, and it will provide referees with the candidate's curriculum vitae and a sample of the applicant's research. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide these materials to the chair.

Candidates should follow the dossier instructions found in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook. Candidates have a right to review their T&P dossier therein--except for confidential reference letters--prior to the packet's submission.

The tenure and promotion procedure and evaluation process should follow the guidelines found in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook.

Faculty should consult the Faculty Handbook for requirements of time in service. Probationary faculty who do not have prior service at another institution of higher education generally come up for promotion and tenure review in their fifth year at Auburn. Although this is not a requirement and faculty may seek tenure and promotion at any time before their sixth year if they have met departmental promotion and tenure standards, they *must* come up for tenure and

promotion by their sixth year of appointment (except in the case of documented FMLA leave or leave without pay, as described in the Faculty Handbook).

From Associate to Full

Candidates for Full Professor will compile a dossier that documents their research, teaching, outreach, and service. Outside reviewers will be selected in accordance with College and Provost guidelines found at:

<http://cla-web.auburn.edu/cla/index.cfm/faculty/promotion-and-tenure/>

<http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/guidelines.html>

It is important that the candidate show the achievement of a national reputation in his or her areas of expertise. The promotion procedure and evaluation process should follow the guidelines found in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook.

The faculty member should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the areas of teaching, research, service, and outreach to advance the mission of the department, college, and university.

Clinical Series Promotion Guidelines

A. Procedure for Promotion

1. Initiation of the Process

The promotion process can be initiated by the unit head or by the candidate. It is the joint responsibility of the unit head and the faculty member to see that the promotion process begins at the appropriately scheduled time. The steps delineated below are the procedures to follow for promoting a clinical faculty member.

Candidates and unit heads should supply information necessary for evaluation in the format outlined. This information should be made available first to eligible faculty members, a college/school committee (if appropriate), then to the dean. The information requested is sufficiently detailed so that a candidate can be evaluated in terms of both potential and achievement. Unit heads and candidates who have questions about material to be submitted should feel free to contact the dean of the appropriate college/school.

2. Information on the Candidate

The outline printed below indicates the kind of information each candidate for promotion and his/her unit head should supply and describes the format to be followed in presenting that information.

Guidelines and/or criteria are subject to periodic revision with approval from the appropriate dean's office and the Office of the Provost.

A. General Instructions

All lists (of positions held, publications, and, if applicable, courses taught, etc.) should be in reverse chronological order with dates clearly indicated.

Supporting material such as publications, slides, evaluative material (book reviews, published critiques, adjudicated production reviews, practice portfolio, etc.) should be made available for review by the unit head and later by the dean. The candidate and unit head should agree on the selection of material to be made available.

B. Information to Be Supplied by the Candidate

1. A Standard Biographical Data sheet (see Faculty Handbook for form).
2. A percent breakdown of the allocation of time and effort as specified by the terms of his/her contract for the past three years.
3. A list of honors and awards. Include academic honors, research, clinical, and professional service awards, fellowships (such as NEH, NEA), internal support, election to professional societies, etc.
4. A list of scholarly contributions in accord with the following outline. A candidate should present his/her work as informatively and accurately as possible. A candidate should cross-reference work that falls in two areas (e.g.: See X.x.).

C. Scholarly Contributions by the Candidate

1. Teaching
 - a. Actual courses taught for each semester of the past three years including clinical rounds, clinical clerkships/practicums. Indicate lecture/lab, hours per week and enrollment.
 - b. Responsibilities including supervision and evaluation of interns, residents, post-doctoral fellows and/or professional students in a small group, case-oriented teaching hospital environment.
 - c. Teaching students, in small group settings.
 - d. Graduate students whose work has been completed. Indicate degree awarded to the student, year, and, if known, position now held by the student; indicate whether the candidate was the major professor or a committee member.
 - e. Graduate students on whose committee the candidate is presently serving. Indicate whether the candidate is the major professor or a committee member. Indicate the degree the student is working towards and the work that the candidate has done.

- f. Courses and curricula developed.
- g. Grants received related to teaching.
- h. Publications pertaining to teaching. Include textbooks, manuals, and articles on pedagogy.
- i. Other contributions to teaching.
- j. Statement of candidate's teaching philosophy and self-evaluation in terms of his or her stated values. This should be no longer than one page.

2. Research/Creative Work

For publications, provide complete publication data. For publications with multiple authors, please list names of all authors in correct order. Inform the committee of the significance of author order on publications in the candidate's discipline. Indicate percent of the candidate's contribution or describe the nature of the candidate's contribution; indicate, by means of an asterisk, student contributions. Provide, in an appendix, proof of acceptance of publications in press and proof of publications of which acceptance is conditional. Do not submit manuscripts that have not been accepted for publication. For exhibitions and performances, provide dates and locations.

- Collaboration for academic and/or scholarly purposes with others, including clinicians, researchers, physicians, and instructors.
- Books.
- Article-length publications. Distinguish by type: book chapters, articles in refereed journals and invited articles, bulletins, proceedings, transactions, abstracts, book reviews, non-refereed articles, etc.
- Papers or lectures. Distinguish by type: papers at professional meetings, invited lectures, etc.
- Exhibitions. Distinguish between juried or invitational shows; identify work(s) and juror (juries); indicate regional, national, or international exhibitions.
- Patents and inventions.
- Other research/creative contributions.
- Grants and contracts. Note all co-authors, identifying the principal investigator and the involvement of the candidate; indicate funding source and amount. Distinguish between grants received and grants applied for but not funded. (Note: internal support and NEH and NEA fellowships should be listed under Honors and Awards above.)

- Description of candidate's scholarly program. Work in progress and work anticipated should be described in no more than one page.
- Presentations at local, regional, and national continuing education programs/workshops.

3. University Outreach

The purpose of this section is to document achievement in outreach scholarship. It is divided into two parts. Part 1 is a reflective commentary on the candidate's outreach program or programs. It is intended to highlight and explain the candidate's most significant contributions. Part 2 is a list of all of the candidate's outreach activities and products.

1. **Commentary.** The commentary should describe and explain the scholarship involved in one or more outreach programs that you consider the major achievements of your efforts. A program is a set of activities that share a common focus and depend upon a particular expertise. The entire commentary is limited to five pages, single spaced. Each program should include the following.

- Description.** Provide a brief overview of the addressed needs, the objectives, methods, and target audience. Describe selected activities and/or products from Part B that are most illustrative of the candidate's contribution to this program. Include example in the portfolio.
- Mission.** Indicate how the program was compatible with university and unit missions.
- Scholarship.** Describe the role of the candidate's professional expertise in the design and execution of the program. Describe how the activities applied the candidate's discipline to the needs of society, required integration with other disciplines, and/or generated new knowledge for the discipline and/or audience. Explain how this knowledge was communicated to broader audiences. Indicate how the program led to increased recognition of the candidate's professional expertise by external audiences. Indicators would include requests for information, invitations to make presentations, service on review panels, receipt of contracts, grants, and professional awards, etc.
- Impact.** Describe observed impacts and/or explain any unobserved impacts that are to be expected according to the discipline(s) applied. Identify the direct and indirect beneficiaries. Evidence of impact can include both quantitative results (e.g. changes in test scores, increased crop production, or widespread adoption of a product or technique) and qualitative results (e.g. testimonials from clients, reviews by knowledgeable scholars/critics).

2. **Activities and Products.** List activities and products using the categories outlined below. There is no page limit on Part B, but candidates are encouraged to be concise in order to focus reviewers' attention on the most important contributions. In particular, numerous activities or products of the same type should be summarized to the extent possible. Brief descriptions accompanied by examples and totals will suffice.

- a. Clinical Work/Clinical/Practice activities. Clinical activities participated in, including diagnosis, treatment, and management of cases. Consultations provided for local, regional, national and international health care professionals. Service provided to clients, patients, referring clinicians and other professionals.
- b. Instructional activities. List the title or subject of each distinct course or presentation, the type (curriculum, course, workshop, exhibit, etc.), the duration (usually in hours), the candidate's role in creating (developer, presenter), the target audience, the method of reaching the audience (conference presentation, telecommunications, site visit, etc.) and the number of presentations given.
- c. Technical assistance. List each type of assistance (e.g. job classification), the clientele, the contribution, and the number of times provided.
- d. Outreach publications. Distinguish by type as indicated in paragraphs B1-B3 above: books (including published manuals and reports), article-length publications, papers and lectures. Provide complete publication data, including number of pages, names of all authors in correct order, and percentage of candidate's contributions. Indicate all refereed or peer-reviewed publications.
- e. Electronic products: computer programs, web sites, etc.
- f. Other outreach products: videos, job aids, etc.
- g. Copyrights, patents, and inventions.
- h. Contracts, grants, and gifts.

D. Service

1. University Service: Distinguish among service to the University, to the college/school, and to the department. University service as part of a previously held position may be listed here. Administrative work which reduces the candidate's teaching or research assignment should be listed here.
2. Professional Service: Service to professional associations and learned societies such as offices held, committees served on, etc.

D. Information to be supplied by Unit Head

Information should be supplied in each of the following areas:

1. Teaching
2. Research/Creative Work

3. University Outreach

4. Service

Statement as to how the level of support (dollars, personnel, space, etc.) provided to the candidate compares to others engaged in similar work in the department.

5. Outside Referees

The unit head (or the dean) shall solicit information from outside referees in the case of candidates nominated for associate clinical professor and clinical professor. In consultation with the candidate, the unit head (or dean) shall compile a list of potential evaluators. He/she shall then seek responses from at least three of the potential evaluators. These evaluators shall be people outside of Auburn University who are nationally acknowledged experts in the candidate's field and can comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate's work. If the evaluator is from an academic institution, he/she shall be of higher academic rank than the candidate. Letters from the candidate's major professor for a graduate degree, or professional degree faculty, post-doctoral residents or fellows, from former graduate students, and from ongoing research partners and past collaborators are unacceptable. Evaluators may be associated with industry, government agencies, foundations, etc. Letters must be part of the file.

6. Consideration of the Candidate and the Unit's and College/School Recommendation

E. Consideration of the Candidate

The candidate's dossier (consisting of the information supplied by the candidate and the information supplied by the unit head) and supporting material shall be available for review exclusively by faculty eligible to vote on the candidate. After the faculty has had time to review the dossier and supporting material, the unit head, as a non-voting participant, shall convene a meeting of all eligible faculty (as approved in written college/school guidelines) to discuss nomination of the candidate. Confidentiality and the right of faculty members to express their viewpoints openly without fear of retaliation shall be the hallmarks of the discussion. Unit deliberations shall be confidential to the extent permitted by law.

F. The Unit's and College/School's Recommendations

After the candidate has made a presentation of his or her credentials if he or she so wishes, and after the faculty eligible to vote have had time to discuss the candidate's qualifications in a closed meeting, a secret ballot shall be taken at the meeting of eligible faculty (as approved in written college/school guidelines) to determine the final recommendation of the department faculty. Faculty members may participate in the recommendation in one of the following ways:

- a. present and voting,
- b. present and abstaining,
- c. absent but submitting a written vote prior to the meeting, or
- d. absent and not voting (This response does not count as part of the total vote.).

The unit head, dean, and any other faculty member serving as an administrator who has an official vote on the candidate at a higher administrative level shall not vote at the department level (if applicable). Faculty members who serve on committees at the school/college level may choose to vote at the department level or at higher levels, but they may vote only once on candidates from their departments. Immediate family members shall excuse themselves from voting.

The unit head shall announce the vote at the meeting. The vote shall be transmitted itemized as a, b, c, and d as listed above in writing, to the dean of the candidate's college or school and the College/School Committee (if applicable) along with the other information requested in this document.

The eligible unit faculty who voted on a candidate's promotion will write a summary letter that reflects the vote and represents all aspects of the discussion leading to that vote. The department head will also write an evaluative letter with a recommendation for or against promotion. In addition to these two required letters, individual faculty members may write letters explaining why they do or do not favor promotion. Where there are fewer than three faculty members in a department who are eligible to write letters of evaluation, the head may ask for letters from faculty members in other departments who have knowledge of the candidate's professional performance. Letters should address the quality of the clinical work and the candidate's potential for continued work, teaching effectiveness, effectiveness in the area of extension, service contributions.

Faculty should bear in mind that letters are an important source of information. Letters can help all involved to make an informed judgment about the candidate by addressing the candidate's performance of his or her duties within a department. Letters can also help others who may not come from the candidate's field, understand the significance of the candidate's work and make a fair appraisal of it. Faculty, department heads, and chairs should note that, unlike letters from outside reviewers that remain confidential, their letters will be made available to and may be rebutted by the candidate.

The unit head shall communicate the unit's vote to the candidate and also make available to the candidate all letters submitted by the committee, the unit head, and individual faculty members. After reviewing the letters, the candidate has five working days to write a rebuttal if desired. The candidate can also make an informed decision about whether or not to continue with the process of seeking promotion. If the candidate wishes to continue the process despite a negative recommendation, the unit head and dean shall honor the candidate's request.

If there is a college committee, its members will review the dossier, letters, and the candidate's rebuttal (if submitted), and they will vote by secret ballot. The committee will write a summary letter that reflects the vote and represents all aspects of the discussion leading to that vote. The dean will also write an evaluative letter with a decision for or against promotion. The dean shall communicate the college/school committee vote and make available to the candidate the college/school's and dean's letters. After reviewing the letters, the candidate has five working days to write a rebuttal if desired.

G. Submission of the Candidate's Dossier

Units will submit dossiers in PDF format to the Dean's office in an approved electronic format. Dossiers are to be collated as follows and separated with a title page for each section:

1. Standard biographical data sheet.
2. Information supplied by the candidate.
3. Information supplied by the department head.
4. Evaluations and recommendations from: the dean, the department head, the director of any relevant funding source (e.g.: the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, the Scott Ritchey Research Center, etc.), faculty members, and outside referees and the rebuttal letters from the candidate.

H. Schedule

Nominations for promotion shall be transmitted to the dean by the deadline. The specific date shall be announced in the annual call for nominations from the Provost. The candidate's dean and/or College Committee shall request material early enough to allow for recommendations from the faculty, the department head and the dean and rebuttals from the candidate to be forwarded with the candidate's dossier. The final decision must be reported to the Provost's Office by the deadline noted in the annual call for nominations from the Provost. As the Chief Academic Officer of Auburn University, the Provost retains the right to review all promotions and act appropriately.

K. Appeal of Promotion Decisions

Grounds for appeal exist when, in the opinion of the candidate, one or more of the following occurred:

1. The denial of promotion resulted from the fact that all evidence in support of the candidate was not presented at the time of the original consideration.
2. The denial resulted from procedural irregularities concerning advisement and periodic review or a failure to follow promotion procedures of the department, college, school, or University.
3. The denial was based significantly on considerations violative of academic freedom.
4. The denial was based significantly on discrimination as described in the University's EEO Policy (<https://sites.auburn.edu/admin/universypolicies/Policies/EqualEmploymentOpportunityPolicy.pdf>). In these cases, the appeal should begin with the candidate immediately contacting the

Office of Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity at 334.844.4794 as well as following the appeals process below.

A faculty member who contends unjust denial of promotion may choose to discuss the reasons for denial and the appeals process with the Dean. Appeals should be made in writing through the unit head and dean within 14 calendar days of the date of the faculty member's receipt of written notification of denial.

If the faculty member bases his/her appeal on alleged violation of academic freedom or discrimination, the appeal must include a statement of the grounds on which the allegation is based and evidence to support his/her case. If the faculty member succeeds in establishing a prima facie case, it is incumbent upon those who made the decision against continuation to come forward with evidence in support of their decision. Statistical evidence of discrimination may be used by the candidate in establishing a prima facie case.

The Dean shall respond promptly to the faculty member's appeal by forming an Appeals Committee and setting the date, time, and place for the hearing of the appeal.

The Appeals Committee shall be comprised of the following:

1. One current member of the College/School Promotion Committee (if applicable), selected by the Promotion Committee.
2. Five members of proper rank who represent the college, but not department, of the appealing candidates. If more than five members are needed to represent the appellants, more than five members will be chosen as needed. If the college/school has a college/school level Promotion committee, then past members of that committee should be utilized, if available.

After the merit of the appeal has been judged, the recommendations of the Appeals Committee and all supporting documents shall be submitted to the Dean for final action.

In the appellate process, appeals must be taken and decisions rendered so as to prevent postponing a promotion decision to the next year.

These departmental guidelines were taken from *Provost's Guidelines for Unit Specific Clinical Title Series Promotion Criteria* that were approved by Tim Boosinger, Interim Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and adopted on August 10, 2011. They were approved by the department in August 2011 **and approved by the Provost's office on September 23, 2011.**