

**Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures**

**of the**

School of Film & Photography

(Name of Department/School/College)

Effective Date: 8-15-19

APPROVALS

SIGNATURE

DATE

Dr. Andrew NELSON  
Department Faculty

[Signature]  
Chair, Primary Review Committee

THEO LIPPERT  
Primary Administrative Reviewer

[Signature]  
Department Head/Director

7-6-19

REGINA GEE  
Intermediate Review Committee

[Signature]  
Chair, Intermediate Review Committee

8-15-19

Dean Adams  
Intermediate Administrative Reviewer

[Signature]  
College Dean

8-15-19

College Review Committee

Chair, College Review Committee

DAVID J. SINGEL  
University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

[Signature]  
Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

8/15/19

Robert L. Morkwa  
Provost

[Signature]

# ROLE AND SCOPE DOCUMENT FOR THE SCHOOL OF FILM AND PHOTOGRAPHY

College of Arts and Architecture  
School of Film and Photography

Date of this revision:

May 1, 2019

Proposed date to be effective:

August 22, 2019

Date of last approval:

July 1, 2010

Date of last revision:

May 10, 2010

## Article I. Role and Scope of Unit

Montana State University, the State's land-grant institution, educates students, creates knowledge and art, and serves communities by integrating learning, discovery, and engagement. The faculty, staff, and administrators in the School of Film and Photography support the fulfillment of the University's teaching, scholarship, and service mission in the areas of filmmaking and photography, and the scholarly study thereof. The school's undergraduate curriculum consists of a Bachelor of Arts degree in Film and Photography with curricular options in Film and Photography, and a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in Integrated Lens-Based Media. Both degrees emphasize actual production within a framework of ideas shaped by the history and criticism of film, photography, and related media. The school also offers a Master of Fine Arts in Natural History and Science Filmmaking, featuring intensive, specialized training in this form of documentary filmmaking.

## Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

Not Applicable.

## Article III. Annual Review Process

An annual review assesses a faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year and is based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, assigned percentages of effort, annual assignments, annual productivity report, and evaluations of teaching. Reviews must be completed by April 10 or the date specified by the provost. The annual review with ratings and any written appeals to the review shall be included in the candidate's personnel file.

An annual review is an assessment of the faculty member's performance over a one-year period. This is in contrast to retention, tenure, and promotion reviews which are based upon the cumulative performance of the faculty member in each area (teaching, scholarship, and service) over the review period appropriate to the review. Thus, a record of having favorable annual reviews does not guarantee the candidate has assembled and demonstrated a cumulative record that meets the standards for retention, tenure or promotion.

### 3.1. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS

a. The faculty member and the SFP Director annually review the faculty member's performance relative to the faculty member's assigned percentages of effort and currently assigned responsibilities. Reviews assess the faculty member's performance in each of the major areas of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, and service) over the preceding calendar year. Student evaluations of teaching must be collected and considered in the evaluation of teaching. If the faculty member has a split or joint appointment with 20% or more effort assigned to another unit, input from the other unit must be solicited and considered in the evaluation and rating of the faculty member.

- b. The SFP Director rates the performance of each faculty member in each area of responsibility and calculates an overall rating for the faculty member's performance for the year, weighted by the assigned percentages of effort using the Annual Review form approved by the Provost. The faculty member will be given a copy of the completed form, or access to it if created electronically.
- c. The faculty member will have the opportunity to meet with the SFP Director.
- d. The SFP Director and the faculty member will develop goals and assignments for the next calendar year. The goals and assignments for individual members of the faculty will reflect school needs and professional opportunities consistent with school strategic plans or articulated school priorities.
- e. If the assigned percentages of effort are inconsistent with the faculty member's current activities and levels of performance, a revision of the assigned percentages of effort should be discussed. If a modification of the assigned percentages of effort is made as outlined in Section 4, it will be documented using the Faculty Assigned Percentages of Effort Update form.
- f. The faculty member and the dean will be provided with a copy of or access to the annual review, ratings and any revision of the assigned percentages of effort.

Copies of all annual reviews and the performance ratings of each faculty member will be maintained in the faculty member's personnel file in the school. These files shall be kept confidential and maintained as outlined in the [Faculty Personnel Files](#) policy.

### **3.2. APPEAL OF REVIEW TO DEAN**

A faculty member who disagrees with an annual review or individual rating may appeal by submitting a rationale for their disagreement and forwarding it to the dean. The rationale must be filed with the dean within ten (10) days of the receipt of the annual review in Section 2e. The dean shall consider the appeal and may support or assign a different performance rating in any area of responsibility. The dean shall notify the faculty member and SFP director, in writing, of the decision regarding the appeal within ten (10) days of receipt of the request.

### **3.3. CHANGE IN ASSIGNED PERCENTAGES OF EFFORT**

Either the faculty member or the SFP director can propose changing the faculty member's percentages of effort, but mutual agreement must be reached before the change can be made. The revised percentages of effort might be for a specified term or might reflect a long-term change of focus for the faculty member and the school. If the revised percentages are for a specified term, the end date will be noted and the percentages of effort will revert back to the assignments and assigned percentages of effort in place before the term.

Changes to a faculty member's assigned percentages of effort are made using a Faculty Assigned Percentages of Effort Update Form. Any changes require approval by the faculty member, school director, and dean.

### **3.4. RATINGS AND PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

A faculty member who receives a performance rating of "Below Expectations" or "Unacceptable Performance" rating during the annual review process will be given a Performance Improvement Plan, developed by the Director in consultation with the faculty member. This plan will document the actions required to obtain at least an "Acceptable Performance" rating on the following annual review. The plan should be completed within thirty (30) days after the faculty member has received the "Below Expectations" or "Unacceptable Performance" rating or denial of the faculty member's appeal, whichever is later. If the parties cannot agree to the terms of the plan, the dean will resolve the disagreement.

### **3.5. POST-TENURE REVIEW**

Failure to receive at least an Acceptable Performance rating for two (2) consecutive years will require a post-tenure review to determine whether the faculty member should be retained as a tenured faculty member of the University. The review will be conducted during the Fall semester following the second 'Below Expectations' or 'Unacceptable Performance' rating using the criteria and standards relevant to tenured faculty at the same rank in the school. If the faculty member does not meet the standards for a tenured faculty member of the same rank in the school, the faculty member will not be retained and the University will proceed with discharge proceedings under Corrective Action and Discipline Policy for failure to carry out the responsibilities of a faculty member. If the faculty member is discharged, the faculty member may grieve the discharge under the Grievance Policy.

### **3.6. ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURES**

By the 31st of January, all SFP faculty members are required to submit a complete record of all of their scholarship, teaching, and service activities in the preceding year (January 1 – December 31) through the Activity Insight online portal (<https://www.montana.edu/provost/faculty/activityinsight/>).

Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated by the Director in terms of (1) his or her annual goals statement, (2) his or her performance in prior years, (3) the performance of colleagues in the respective option, the school, the university and the profession.

A final evaluation is then forwarded to the Dean by the Director, which includes the faculty member's rating. The faculty member and Director must sign and date the review. No performance rating may be submitted without the faculty member's signature. The faculty member's signature indicates he/she has read the document but does not necessarily indicate agreement. In all cases, the faculty member has the right to append to the signed document an explanation of his/her position and to forward it, within ten (10) days, to the college dean, who shall take this explanation into account.

If the faculty member does not receive a copy of the written annual review prior to April 10, he/she has the right to bring, in writing, the matter to the attention of the college dean.

### **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR**

The Director shall assign each faculty member the specific duties and responsibilities that meet school needs and enable the faculty member to fulfill the responsibilities of the position. The Director shall ensure that, taken collectively, the assignments of the faculty shall meet the school's and college's obligations to the University. The Director and the faculty member shall annually review the faculty member's role within the school and make any modifications as may be necessary, after consultation with the faculty member. Any substantial modification of the faculty member's role within the school must be approved by the Director, Dean and Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, after consultation with the faculty member.

## **Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator**

### **Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment**

The Primary Review Committee is elected by vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Only tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on any review committees. Normally, at least one-half of the members will have attained the rank of professor. The unit may request approval from the University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTC) Chair to make an alternate tenured faculty appointment.

Emeritus faculty members are ineligible to serve.

Before conducting a review, committee members will attend the orientation regarding retention, tenure, and promotion offered by the provost's office for the review cycle.

The University encourages diversity in the composition of all review committees. Units are encouraged to adopt selection procedures for committee members that will promote membership that is inclusive of the categories protected by the university Non-Discrimination Policy.

Committee members and administrative reviewers will take orientation sessions that promote bias-literacy in retention, tenure, and promotion reviews. Before conducting a review, they will attend the bias-literacy training offered by the university for the review cycle.

Committees will be available for service throughout the academic year. Faculty on leave will be ineligible for service. Committees will be constituted and their membership reported to the provost's office by the date established by the provost.

#### **Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator**

Director of the School of Film and Photography

#### **Section 4.03 Identification of responsible entities**

(a) The Primary Review Administrator will establish the Primary Review Committee by facilitating the election of the members as described.

(b) The Primary Review Committee will select external reviewers and solicit review letters.

(c) The Primary Review Committee will select internal reviewers and solicit review letters.

(d) The Primary Review Committee will ensure the following materials are included in the Dossier:

(i) Internal and external reviewer letters of solicitation, letters from the reviewers and, in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch of the reviewer.

(ii) Applicable Role and Scope Document.

(iii) Letter of hire, any Percentages of Effort changes, all annual reviews, and all Evaluation Letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.

(iv) Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the unit will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review.

(e) The Primary Review Administrator will maintain copies of all review committee evaluation letters and internal and external review letters after the review.

#### **Section 4.04 Next Review Level**

The next level of review is conducted by the College of Arts and Architecture Promotion and Tenure Committee.

### **Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator**

**REFER TO THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE ROLE AND SCOPE DOCUMENT FOR THE FOLLOWING:**

**Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee - Composition and Appointment**

**Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator**

**Section 5.03 Level of Review following Intermediate Review Administrator**

## **Article VI. Review Materials**

### **Section 6.01 Materials submitted by Candidate**

Materials for external review must include:

1. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
2. A brief statement that identifies the candidate's area of Scholarship.
3. Articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represents their Scholarship.

#### **Materials for Dossier must include:**

1. The "Cover Sheet", obtained from the Provost's office.
2. A comprehensive CV with Teaching, Scholarship, and Service activities of the candidate.
3. A Personal Statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of Scholarship.
4. Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation shall include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition itemized by year over the relevant Review Period.

### **Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions**

In cases of collaborative scholarly activities, candidates must clearly delineate and provide evidence of their individual contributions to the work in question.

### **Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure**

The Primary Review Committee will solicit external review letters from at least four respected authorities appropriate to the candidate's area of Scholarship who will provide an independent and objective evaluation of the candidate's Scholarship. The Primary Review Committee will invite recommendations from the candidate, but at least one half of the external reviewers must be persons other than the reviewers recommended by the candidate. The Primary Review Committee will document which, if any, of the external reviewers were recommended by the candidate.

## **Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents**

**Section 7.01 Retention Review** – Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

**Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review** – Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

**Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review** – The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee. Only tenured Associate Professors may be promoted to the rank of Professor. Unsuccessful candidates may reapply.

## Article VIII. Retention Reviews

**Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Review.** Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

**Section 8.02 University Standards.** The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

- a) effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and
- b) integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- c) satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

### Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Performance indicators are the categories of products and activities used to evaluate the performance of the faculty undergoing review. The following performance indicators are considered in the review to determine if the standards detailed in 8.02 are being satisfied. Evaluation of performance indicators will additionally be weighted commensurate with the percentage distribution of duties specified in the candidate's contract.

The primary performance indicators that may support the attainment of standards in **Scholarship** include: the exhibition of creative work at peer-reviewed exhibitions, festivals, or other venues; the publication of creative work in peer-reviewed publications; the publication of refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and textbooks; awards of extramural funding; invited major talks (e.g. plenary or keynote); and invited high-profile seminars or colloquia (e.g. at prestigious venues).

Other performance indicators that may support the attainment of standards in Scholarship include: artistic performances; curation or programming activities; invited papers or presentations at professional meetings; contributed papers or presentations at professional meetings; grant proposals submitted (internal and external); non-refereed publications; development of intellectual property; creation of impactful knowledge or creative work that serves local, national or international audiences.

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in scholarship, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

Performance indicators that may support the attainment of standards in **Teaching** include: results of periodic and systematic peer evaluation based on class visitations; the review of course materials including syllabi and examinations; the results of the candidate's teaching in courses prerequisite to those of other members of the unit; supervision of research, theses, dissertations, or other independent or collaborative student projects; teaching awards; evidence of student success through a sequence of courses; papers co-authored with students and projects with student collaborators; review of student portfolios; implementation of teaching techniques informed by pedagogical scholarship.

The results of periodic and systematic student evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments will also be considered as performance indicators applicable to teaching, but the School recognizes that student evaluations are vulnerable to various forms of bias (e.g. evaluations may be based on criteria other than quality of instruction). Therefore, evaluation scores and averages should be applied with caution as a measure of teaching effectiveness and supplemented by other evidence. In

particular, written student comments may be viewed as formative feedback to be used for instructor improvement, but are not considered a form of evaluation.

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in teaching, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

Performance indicators that may support the attainment of standards in **Service** include: participation in the governance of the University at the school, college, or university levels; contributing to school projects and programs; mentoring faculty colleagues; delivery of knowledge and scholarship to constituent groups and the public; serving in leadership roles in professional organizations; serving as jury member or judge of creative work or journal editor or referee of scholarly papers or proposals; and applying professional expertise in public service activities.

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in service, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP committee will determine the weight of such indicators.

Particular attention will be paid to the attainment of standards in **Integration**, defined as the creation of synergistic relationships between the teaching, scholarship, and service contributions of faculty. As indicated in 8.02, candidates are expected to demonstrate integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service. The nature and extend of integrated activities will vary depending on the candidate's discipline and areas of specialization. Performance indicators may include: bringing new discoveries or creative works into the classroom; fostering student learning in the field or studio; engaging the wider community with scholarly or creative products or innovations in teaching; fostering engagement to address community needs. The School recognizes that integration can take many forms. The candidate must clearly define and describe how integration has been achieved.

#### **Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations**

Faculty in the School of Film and Photography are expected to maintain an active, ongoing, clearly defined program of scholarly activity; to help students to achieve positive outcomes through effective and meaningful teaching and advising; to provide service to the University; and to engage the public.

Recognizing that the very nature of creative endeavors often defies the strict application of quantitative evaluative criteria, any quantitative measures will also consider the qualitative aspect of the activity or product.

Effectiveness in **scholarship** may be assessed in the following ways: sustained progress leading toward the completion of creative works or publications; presentation of completed works (or works in progress for on-going projects) to professional colleagues, select audiences, and the general public; and complexity of projects. **Quality of scholarship** is documented by peer statements; published reviews; grants and contracts for creative work and publications; awards; comments from adjudicators; written comments from external peer reviews. Other considerations may include the prestige of the venue of presentation or publication; the mechanisms by which the work was selected for exhibition or publication; and audiences, reach, and impact.

Effectiveness in **teaching** will be evaluated in terms of a range of criteria, including course content and



learning objectives; classroom effectiveness; student learning and achievement; and student advising. **Quality of teaching** is documented in the results of periodic and systematic peer evaluation based on class visitations and the review of syllabi, assignments, and other relevant instructional materials, and the measured consideration of the results of periodic and systematic student evaluation using University-approved instruments. The School expectation is that normally, for each course taught, the overall mean score for the student evaluation instrument is not less than the instrument's indicator for "average." Other indications of quality teaching may include awards for teaching; evidence of student success and achievement; and the implementation of teaching techniques informed by pedagogical scholarship. Any issues related to teaching noted in the retention review should be addressed prior to tenure review.

Effectiveness in **service** will be evaluated based on sustained involvement in University committees, whether at the school, college or university level; service within one's field, including activities within professional or scholarly organizations; professional consulting service; and the sharing of creative work or scholarship with the public. **Quality of service** is documented in peer statements; published reviews or commentary; invitations to provide service; awards for service; written comments by external peer reviewers.

Effectiveness in **integration** will be evaluated based on the candidate's documentation of efforts to integrate scholarship and teaching, scholarship and service, and/or teaching and service. **Quality of integration** is documented using an appropriate combination of criteria listed above, with particular emphasis on demonstrating how integration has led to enhanced or improved outcomes.

In addition to clearly meeting standards for effectiveness in scholarship, teaching, service, and integration, the candidate's activities are expected to demonstrate the **promise of Accomplishment** in scholarship and the **promise of sustained Effectiveness** in teaching, service, and integration. Accomplishment is defined as sustained and commendable performance reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. These activities and products must have impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university.

#### **Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators**

Candidates must include in their Dossier **evidence for all performance indicators** that support their attainment of the standard of effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, service, and integration. This includes, but is not limited to, digital copies of: creative work and/or publications; publicity about exhibitions, presentations, or lectures; materials related to instruction, including syllabi, assignments, samples of student work, and course evaluations; awards; grants; reviews or commentary.

In cases where digital copies cannot be provided, or would not accurately reflect the nature or scope of the work, physical copies may be placed with the Dean's office.

#### **Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products**

Recognizing that candidates for retention are reviewed early in their careers, and recognizing that the production of creative and/or scholarly work can take several years, the retention review will consider as evidence of effectiveness in scholarship any works-in-progress that are reasonably documented, and for which preliminary steps towards publication or exhibition have been made.

## **Article IX. Tenure Review**

### **Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review**

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

### **Section 9.02 University Standards**

The University standards for the award of tenure are:

- a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
- b) integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- c) accomplishment in scholarship.

### **Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting**

Performance indicators and weighting for tenure are the same as in Section 8.03.

### **Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations**

Candidates for Tenure are expected to demonstrate **Accomplishment** in the area of scholarship and to demonstrate **sustained Effectiveness** the areas of teaching and service and continued efforts at the integration of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Accomplishment is defined as sustained and commendable performance reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. These activities and products include peer-reviewed publications, formal peer-reviewed presentations, or comparable peer-evaluated works appropriate to the discipline. These activities and products must have impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond Montana State University.

Accomplishment in **scholarship** requires the candidate to demonstrate that they have exceeded the standards of effectiveness detailed in 8.04 over a substantial period of time, typically three years from the date of retention. This requires the completion by the time of tenure of a significant body of work that receives national or international recognition from peers or clients and is regarded as having made a contribution to the body of knowledge or creativity germane to the candidate's discipline or profession. Accomplishment in scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of exhibited and/or published creative and/or scholarly works, with exhibitions of work in peer reviewed venues and refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicators. The usual School expectation for scholarly productivity is that tenure candidates average two scholarly products/activities per year, as described in 8.03, with those deemed "primary performance indicators" given greater weighting.

Regardless of quantity of scholarly products and activities, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as documented by External Reviewers is of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of festivals, exhibitions, journals, and other scholarly venues, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process.

In some cases, a relatively small number of products with high impact may be acceptable for satisfying scholarship expectations, while in other cases a large number of products may not be sufficient. If the number of products is near the average of scholarly products per year, and one or more of the products are documented by the External Reviewers as having little to no impact in the discipline, then scholarship expectations may not be satisfied. Also, if the candidate's contribution to one or more products or activities is documented as minimal, then it is expected that the number of scholarly products would need to sufficiently exceed the average to offset the candidate's limited contributions.

Sustained Effectiveness in **teaching and service** requires the candidate to demonstrate that they have consistently met the standards of effectiveness detailed in 8.04 over a substantial period of time, typically three years from the date of retention.

Sustained effectiveness in **teaching** requires evidence of continual innovation and maturity in the classroom, and of increasing mastery of the performance indicators listed in 8.04. A candidate is additionally expected to demonstrate evidence of ability to mentor graduate students. Evidence may include chairing or serving on graduate committees, but can also be exhibited through other types of graduate student interactions.

Sustained effectiveness in **service** requires that the candidate demonstrate active participation and competent execution of tasks in any of the areas of service described by the performance indicators. Service is expected to include at least one assignment to a School, College, or University committee at MSU. Participation in other activities that contribute to the candidate's discipline or profession (e.g., task forces or special programs) is also valued, especially when such participation raises the stature and reputation of the School or the University in the state, the nation, or internationally.

With respect to **integration**, the candidate is expected to offer evidence of successful efforts at integrating scholarship, teaching, and service.

In addition to clearly meeting standards for Accomplishment in scholarship and sustained Effectiveness in teaching, service, and integration, the candidate's activities are expected to indicate the **promise of Excellence** in scholarship and the **promise of Accomplishment** in teaching, service, and integration. Excellence is defined as sustained, commendable, and distinguished performance reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. These activities and products must have notable impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university.

### **Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators**

Evidence in support of performance indicators must be provided as directed in Section 8.05.

For tenure, only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the Review Period may be considered. The Review Period is typically five years from the candidate's start date, unless otherwise specified. Scholarly products that have been accepted for publication or exhibition but are not yet published or exhibited should be included among the candidate's materials.

## **Article X. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor**

### **Section 10.01 University Standards**

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

## **Article XI. Promotion to Rank of Professor**

### **Section 11.01 Timing of Review**

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service in the current rank, however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they meet the same

standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.

#### **Section 11.02 University Standards**

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

- a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
- b) sustained integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- c) excellence in scholarship.

#### **Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting**

Performance indicators and weighting for promotion to the rank of Professor are the same as in Section 8.03.

#### **Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations**

Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor are expected to demonstrate **Excellence** in the area of scholarship and to demonstrate **Accomplishment** in the areas of teaching and service and sustained efforts at the integration of scholarship, teaching, and service.

**Excellence** is sustained, commendable, and distinguished performance reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. The activities and products must have a notable impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university. Whereas Associate Professors are regarded as emerging authorities in their area(s) of their disciplines, Professors are nationally and/or internationally acknowledged experts who demonstrate both a substantial command of their disciplines as well as continued growth within their area(s) of specialization.

Excellence in **scholarship** requires the candidate to demonstrate that they have consistently met and exceeded the standards of Accomplishment detailed in 9.04 over a substantial period of time, typically five years since the award of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. This requires the completion of a significant body of work that receives substantial national or international recognition from peers or clients and the public and is regarded as having made a substantial contribution to the body of knowledge or creativity germane to the candidate's discipline.

Although the candidate's complete body of work since the tenure review is important, the candidate's scholarship performance will be reviewed primarily on the most recent 5 years of appointment, regardless of the amount of time that has elapsed since the candidate's tenure review.

Accomplishment in **teaching and service** requires the candidate to demonstrate that they have consistently met and exceeded the standards of sustained effectiveness detailed in 9.04 over a substantial period of time, typically five years since the award of tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Accomplishment in **teaching** requires the candidate to demonstrate some combination of the following: a reputation for teaching excellence; substantive contributions to pedagogy; educational leadership activities; mentorship of graduate students. These may include: an active role in developing and continuously improving the curriculum of the school; mentoring colleagues to help them improve their teaching performance; helping students become involved in research processes; service as a role model for teaching excellence in the College, the University, and the discipline.

Accomplishment in **service** requires recognition of the candidate's activities by peers and colleagues within the University and within outside organizations. Such recognition may include election to leadership roles within University committees or scholarly organizations; evidence of the breadth and significance of impact of activity or organization; professional recognition for service or letters pertaining to the quantity and quality of service activities.

Sustained efforts at **integration** require the candidate to demonstrated ongoing, successful efforts at integrating scholarship, teaching, and service.

#### **Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators**

Evidence in support of performance indicators must be provided as directed in Sections 8.05 and 9.05.

## **Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document**

Faculty members are entitled to propose changes to Role and Scope Documents of their academic unit. Review committee members or administrators that identify a need for improvement, clarification, or other revision to an academic unit's Role and Scope Documents may submit the request for changes to the Chair of UPTC. The UPTC Chair will forward the recommendations to the unit. Submission to the UPTC Chair should occur after the review committee or administrator completes all reviews for the year. Units will act on any proposed changes received from the UPTC Chair on an annual basis and will undertake a full review of their Document no less than every three years.

## **Article XIII. Approval Process**

Role and Scope Documents of the academic units must be approved, as detailed below, before taking effect. Effective dates for approving Documents will be established by the provost. The provost, working with the UPTC, will resolve any conflicts that arise during the approval of Role and Scope Documents of the academic units. Once approved by all required parties, the provost will establish the effective date for the revised documents. Current documents will remain in force until revised documents are effective.

#### **Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document**

- a) Tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit
- b) Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (usually colleges)
- c) URTPC, and
- d) Provost.

#### **Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document**

- a) Promotion and Tenure Review Committee and administrator of the intermediate unit
- b) (UPTC), and
- c) Provost.

#### **Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document**

- a) (UPTC)
- b) Faculty Senate
- c) Deans' Council, and
- d) Provost.

## Appendix A

### DEFINITIONS

**Teaching** is the set of activities performed by faculty that fosters student learning, critical and ethical thinking, problem solving, and creativity. It requires the faculty member to have a command of the subject matter, to maintain currency in the discipline, and to create and maintain instructional environments that successfully promote learning. In addition to the instructional responsibilities in the Academic Responsibilities policy, teaching includes incorporation of current pedagogical innovations, incorporation of new technologies and approaches to learning and assessment, course and curriculum design and development; thesis and professional project assistance, mentoring, and participation in student projects, theses, and dissertations; academic and career advising of undergraduate and graduate students; supervision of student teachers, graduate teaching and research assistants, student interns; and any valuable contributions to the university's instructional enterprise.

**Scholarship** is the original intellectual work of faculty that includes:

- The discovery, application, and/or assimilation of new knowledge and the dissemination of that knowledge. This work includes conducting research projects; securing and administering grants and contracts; writing/editing books, articles, and other research-based materials representing one's original or collaborative research; developing new clinical practice models; presentations at scholarly conferences.
- The generation of new knowledge in pedagogy and the dissemination and putting into practice of that knowledge. This work includes creation, development, implementation, study, and publishing of pedagogical innovations (including textbooks, peer reviewed articles and publications); documented studies of curricular and pedagogical issues; and pedagogically-oriented research; innovation in community engagement.
- The generation of new creative products and experiences through composition, design, production, direction, performance, exhibition, synthesis, or discovery and the presentation of that experience. This work includes creating and presenting new works of art, film, theater, music, and architecture; public performance and exhibiting creative works.
- The creation of partnerships, programs, and plans through Extension, or other community-based research, that leverage the knowledge and resources of the university and the public/private sector to enhance learning, discovery, and engagement; educate and engage citizens; strengthen communities; address locally identified issues and problems; apply and disseminate knowledge; and contribute to the public good.

**Service** is the contribution of faculty knowledge and expertise to assist and engage individuals and/or organizations to meet goals and solve problems. Service activities generally fall into three categories: professional service, which includes contributions to, or holding office in, a professional society, serving on an editorial board, and reviewing manuscripts for professional journals; public service, which entails providing the faculty member's professional expertise to, collaboration and engagement with, local, state, national, and global communities; and university service, which includes service to faculty governance, serving on university committees, advising student groups, and participation in other activities that contribute to the institution and its programs.

**Integration** is the creation of synergistic relationships among the teaching, scholarship, and service contributions of faculty, such as bringing new discoveries into the classroom, fostering student learning in the lab, field, and studio, engaging the wider community with scholarly products or innovations in teaching, or the fostering engagement to address community needs.

**Effectiveness** is successful performance, appropriate to years of service.

**Accomplishment** is sustained and commendable performance reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. These activities and products include peer reviewed publications, formal peer-reviewed presentations, or comparable peer-evaluated works appropriate to the discipline. The activities and products must have impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university.

**Excellence** is sustained, commendable, and distinguished performance reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. These activities and products include peer reviewed publications, formal peer-reviewed presentations, or comparable peer-evaluated works appropriate to the discipline. The activities and products must have a notable impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university.

**Academic unit** is the designation for the various departments, schools, and colleges within the university. Primary academic units, typically schools, are the units in which a faculty member's tenurable position resides. Intermediate units, typically colleges, are units that support more than one primary unit.

**Areas of Responsibility** in the context of retention, tenure, and promotion, refers to the components of MSU's mission: teaching; scholarship; service.

**Candidate** means any tenurable faculty member who is being reviewed for retention, tenure, or promotion.

**Dossier** is the collection of materials submitted by a faculty member who is being reviewed for retention, tenure, and/or promotion and the materials added thereafter by review committees and administrative reviewers as authorized under the university policies.

**Evaluation Letters** are the letters submitted by review committees and administrative reviewers that include the recommendation and rationale regarding the retention, tenure, or promotion of the candidate.

**External Review** is the critical evaluation of a faculty member's scholarly products and activities by respected authorities in their field who are not affiliated with the university.

**Indicators** are the categories of scholarly products and activities used to evaluate performance of the faculty undergoing review. Peer reviewed articles, juried exhibitions, published monographs, teaching evaluations, peer review of teaching, teaching awards, and other recognition are examples of indicators.

**Intermediate Review Unit**, if applicable, is the academic unit that includes the candidate's primary academic unit.

**Internal Review** is an evaluation by individuals within the university other than Review Administrators and Review Committee members.

**Primary review administrators** and **Intermediate review administrators** are the administrators of the primary and intermediate academic units, respectively.

**Primary review committees** and **Intermediate promotion and tenure review committees** are the promotion and tenure review committees of the primary and intermediate academic units, respectively.

**Primary Review Unit** is the academic unit in which the candidate's tenurable position resides.

**Review Period** is the period of performance to be considered for review. The review period for retention and tenure begins on the first day of employment in a tenurable position and ends on the deadline established by the provost for submission of dossiers. If hired with credit for years of service, the review period includes the time of prior service specified in the letter of hire. The review period for promotion to professor is the period from the end of the previous review period for the candidate's last mandatory review to the deadline established by the provost for submission of the dossier for promotion to professor.

**Role and Scope Document** is the document prepared by each academic unit that describes its responsibilities and obligations in furtherance of the mission of the university. It includes the indicators, standards, and procedures that, in conjunction with university standards, policies, and procedures, govern the reviews of its faculty members.

**Student**, for purposes of references related to retention, promotion, and tenure, includes the clients served by the MSU Extension faculty.



