

COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE
MANUAL

Adopted May 2002

Prepared by 2000-2001 CHHS Promotion and Tenure Committee:

Kristine Baber, Family Studies
Stephen Calculator, Communication Sciences and Disorders (Chair)
Michael Gass, Kinesiology
Raelene Shippee-Rice, Nursing

Table of Contents

Subject	Page No.
INTRODUCTION	5
I. STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENTS AND EVALUATION	6
A. Non-tenure track faculty	6
1. Appointment of non-tenure track faculty	6
2. Evaluation of non-tenure track faculty	7
B. Tenure-track faculty	7
1. Appointment and Promotion of tenure track faculty	7
a) Instructor	7
b) Assistant Professor	8
c) Associate Professor	8
d) Professor	8
II. EVALUATION OF TENURE-TRACK PRIOR TO MANDATORY PROMOTION & TENURE REVIEW	8
III. TIMING OF REVIEWS	9
IV. DOCUMENTATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE	9
V. TEACHING	10
A. Documentation of teaching	10
B. Materials provided by candidate in teaching portfolio	11
1. Process	11
a. Items that must be included	11
b. Additional suggested items	12
2. Content	13
a. Items that must be included	13
b. Additional suggested items	13
3. Outcomes	13
a. Items that must be included	13
b. Additional suggested items	13
C. Evaluation of Teaching	15
1. Evaluation by Department P & T Committee and Chair	15
2. Outside Letters of Evaluation	15
D. General Expectations for Teaching at Each Rank	16
1. Instructor	17
2. Assistant Professor	17
3. Associate Professor	17
4. Professor	18
VI. SCHOLARSHIP	18
A. Documentation of scholarship	19
B. Materials provided by candidate in scholarship portfolio	19
1. Items that must be included	20
2. Additional suggested items	21
C. Evaluation of scholarship	21
1. Evaluation by Department P & T Committee and Chair	22
2. Outside Letters of Evaluation	22
D. Primary Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship	23

E. General Expectations at Each Rank for Scholarship	24
1. Instructor	24
2. Assistant Professor	24
3. Associate Professor	25
4. Professor	25
VII. SERVICE	26
A. Documentation of service	26
B. Materials provided by candidate in service portfolio	26
1. Service to Dept., College and University	27
2. Service to Profession	27
3. Public Service and Outreach	28
C. Evaluation of service	29
1. Evaluation by Department P & T Committee and Chair	29
2. Outside Letters of Evaluation	30
D. General Expectations at Each Rank for Service	30
1. Instructor	30
2. Assistant Professor	31
3. Associate Professor	31
4. Professor	31
VIII. ADDITIONAL CRITERIA	31
A. University Programmatic Considerations	31
IX. PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES	32
A. Role of the Department Chair	32
B. Departmental Evaluation and Recommendation	33
C. CHHS Committee	33
D. CHHS Dean	33
VI. APPENDICES	34
A. Time Deadlines	34
B. Sample Letters for External Reviewers	35
1. Sample Teaching Letter #2	37
3. Sample Scholarship Letter #3	38
4. Sample Service Letter #4	40

CHHS GUIDELINES RELATED TO APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND TENURE

IMPORTANT!

CANDIDATES, DEPARTMENT COMMITTEES, CHAIRS AND OTHERS ARE REFERRED TO THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT STEPS AND ACTIVITIES OCCURRING IN THE VARIOUS LEVELS OF REVIEW, CORRESPONDING DATES, AND OUTCOMES OF THE REVIEW.

This document provides cursory information related to the appointment and promotion of non-tenure track faculty. However, its primary purpose is to provide guidelines regarding the appointment, promotion, and tenure process for tenure-track faculty in the College of Health and Human Services, and for the individuals and committees involved in reviewing those faculty members.

PREAMBLE

The purpose of this document is to provide to all faculty in the College of Health and Human Services systematic information about the process and procedures related to appointment, promotion, and tenure. The University's *Procedures and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure* and the AAUP *Collective Bargaining Agreement* provide basic information about these processes that should be followed closely when preparing a case for appointment or promotion and tenure. These documents, while providing a basic framework, do not describe in detail the types of information that may best demonstrate all of a candidate's competencies in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

This CHHS document is designed to supplement these university guidelines and make clearer the expectations regarding standards for appointment or advancement in the College. The information presented here is based on a portfolio model for accumulating and organizing materials. This model is based on the assumption that the use of multiple sources of information about teaching, research, and service is in the candidate's best interests because it provides a more complete picture of the individual's contributions and achievements. One pragmatic aspect of the document is the identification of concrete examples of information that may be included in teaching, scholarship, and service portfolios. The intent is not to overwhelm readers with the sheer volume of information presented, but to acknowledge and include the wide range of documentation that might be used to develop a thorough, comprehensive case for appointment, promotion, and tenure. Some of the material is designated as required, because it is believed that such information is basic to a complete promotion and tenure document. Other items are denoted as additional or optional in recognition of the wide range of activities in which faculty in the College are involved.

It was the feeling of the authors of this document that by making the descriptions of the various procedures and processes more explicit, we might demystify the promotion and tenure process as much as possible for everyone involved. The goal is not to impose a rigid standard on everyone, but to document agreed-upon expectations and offer recommendations that should help candidates and department promotion and tenure committees to present comprehensive and thorough documentation for subsequent review by the College P&T Committee.

INTRODUCTION

There are three major areas of performance on which appointments and evaluations are judged, (1) teaching, (2) scholarship, and (3) service. Specific criteria corresponding to each of these areas are described in Section VI. General descriptions follow.

In CHHS, *teaching* occurs in a variety of settings and in numerous ways. Although teaching occurs in the traditional classroom, it also takes place in a number of other less traditional and less obvious settings. Even in classrooms, teaching may involve less traditional methods such as team teaching, experiential learning, and the use of new teaching technologies. Teaching occurs in research laboratories, research projects, and practice settings. Teaching also may occur when faculty supervise master theses, doctoral dissertations, other forms of student-directed research, and in field training activities. Furthermore, teaching occurs in conjunction with academic advising of students. CHHS faculty members do a considerable amount of continuing education. Such activities are considered to be within the realm of teaching.

Competency and achievement in teaching can be evaluated in several ways including student evaluations, faculty/peer evaluations, external evaluations, and contributions to course

development. Measures of teaching excellence include but are not limited to receiving positive comments from students and peers and demonstrating appropriate responses to student, peer, and chair evaluations to improve performance.

Scholarship in the College of Health and Human Services involves foremost the systematic collection, analysis, and dissemination of information. It may involve the generation of new knowledge or the advancement of existing knowledge that is useful in solving important health and human service problems. Scholarship includes quantitative and qualitative investigations conducted in settings such as laboratories, communities, clinics, and libraries. It may also involve studies conducted in collaboration with health and human service agencies, organizations, institutions and/or communities to assist them in assessing health and human services problems, enhance the delivery of health and human services, or develop policies related to health and human services.

Excellence in *scholarship* is documented primarily by important publications in scholarly, refereed journals. Both the quantity and quality of publications are critical. Some areas of scholarship, and some research methodologies, may require more time and effort than others and may affect the trajectory of an individual's publications. Trajectory relates to the number, nature, and inter-relations between publications from one year to the next as a program of research evolves. The program of research should be dynamic enough to continue meaningfully in the years following a promotion and tenure decision.

In addition to peer-reviewed publications, the 'gold standard', there are other ways in which scholarship may be demonstrated. These include (but are not limited to) presentations at scientific and professional meetings, service on masters and/or doctoral committees, awards received in recognition of outstanding research, grants and contracts awarded to the candidate, and evidence that the candidate's work has had a substantial impact on health and human service practices.

Service in CHHS is evaluated relative to three primary domains: contributions to the university, profession and/or community at large through public service and outreach. Special attention should be paid to connections between service activities and the candidate's teaching and/or scholarship.

Service to the university refers to administrative roles in the department (and/or program option), College, university, or USNH system. All tenure-track faculty are expected to share in the work necessary to maintain the operation of the institution. Furthermore, faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts aimed at improving programs and faculties. University service usually includes membership on, and perhaps leadership of, committees, work groups, task forces, or other special efforts.

Faculty are expected to contribute to the maintenance and growth of their profession. *Service to the profession* refers to activities such as holding major leadership positions in professional organizations, serving on editorial boards, serving on state, national, or international boards, commissions, review panels, etc. As rank increases, there should be commensurate positive changes in the quantity and quality of service to one's profession. For example, candidates for Associate Professor may serve as reviewers for journals and be members of professional committees. They may assume leadership positions in state chapters of their professional organizations. Professors are more likely to serve on editorial boards as editors and associate editors. They may assume leadership positions at the national level of their professional organizations.

Public service and outreach refer to serving the community at large in a professional capacity enhancing the stature of the College and university. This is especially important at a land, sea, and space grant institution such as UNH. Activities may involve working with national, state, or local agencies/ communities, or helping to solve a current health or human service problem. This may require the candidate's expertise in assessing problems, assuring the delivery of services, developing policies, and planning, implementing or evaluating the effectiveness of programs.

I. STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENT AND EVALUATION

Tenure-track faculty members are expected to demonstrate a pattern of performance indicating present and future excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. Although this document is designed to address expectations for tenure-track faculty, it also should be useful to department chairs and the Dean of CHHS in developing criteria and process for evaluating non-tenure track faculty.

A. Non-tenure track faculty

1. Appointment of Non-tenure-track Faculty Members

All part-time and full-time faculty members in non-tenure track appointments should have a clear understanding of the responsibilities, criteria, and process used to evaluate their performance. Responsibilities and evaluation criteria should be documented and the agreement signed by the faculty member, Department Chair, and Dean of CHHS. These expectations will remain in effect unless and until a subsequent agreement delineating different job expectations replaces a prior agreement. The faculty member, Chair, and CHHS Dean should sign the modified document.

Faculty-in-residence, research, and clinical appointments are usually expected to show quality achievement in only one of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty members with lecturer or clinical appointments are typically expected to show quality achievements in teaching and/or service while those in research appointments are expected to demonstrate quality achievement primarily in research and grantsmanship. Faculty members in these positions may be evaluated in two or all three areas when they, in concert with their Department Chair, have a shared understanding of expectations for performance. Non-tenure track faculty write an annual report prior to their annual review that serves as the basis for evaluation.

2. Evaluations of non-tenure track Faculty

All non-tenure track faculty are evaluated every year. Annual evaluations may occur in each department according to department guidelines. Non-tenure track faculty complete a Faculty Annual Report each academic year. This report, which combines self-evaluation and objective data (e.g., students' evaluations of teaching, list of publications, number of advisees), is used by the Chairperson and Dean to provide written feedback to faculty in their respective annual evaluations. These evaluations also are intended to be prescriptive, providing a formal means by which the Chairperson and Dean can make suggestions for improving the faculty member's performance in the following year.

B. Tenure-track faculty

1. Appointment and Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty Members

The following are general descriptions of the four primary ranks to which tenure-track faculty are appointed or promoted: a) Instructor, b) Assistant Professor, c) Associate Professor, and, d) Professor. This material is based on the current *Collective Bargaining Agreement* and the *Procedures and Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure: Guidelines for Deans, Department Chairpersons and Members of College and College Promotion and Tenure Committees*. The latter document also states, "the general qualifications expected for promotion to a given academic rank are the same as those expected for initial appointment to that rank."

Demonstrated achievement is expected to increase as rank increases. The following comments apply to faculty in general. More specific information pertaining to expectations by rank in each of the three primary areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, and service) can be found in Section IV of the present document.

a. Instructor

Individuals appointed to the instructor rank shall have the potential to be promoted to the assistant professor rank. In all but special circumstances, instructors should hold (or be working toward) the terminal degree in their profession. All faculty are expected to hold the necessary degrees, certifications, and licensures that are required to practice in their profession.

If a new tenure-track faculty member has not completed the appropriate terminal degree (usually a doctorate), the formal notice of appointment from the Dean to the new instructor will specify a time by which the terminal degree must be completed, not to exceed one (1) year from the date of the initial appointment. If the degree is completed during that time, the Dean shall have the authority to recommend to the President a change in title from Instructor to Assistant Professor. If the degree is not completed during the specified time, the Dean shall have the authority to provide an additional one-year appointment as Instructor, subject to agreement by the appropriate area faculty and program director (and/or Chair). If the terminal degree is granted after the end of the grace period, promotion to Assistant Professor can only be accomplished through the regular promotion procedure, as per the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

An instructor is not eligible for tenure. As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement, after four years of full-time service in this rank, an Instructor must be promoted or notified the appointment will not be renewed at the end of the fifth year. Additional information about the timing of tenure decisions appears later in the present document.

b. Assistant Professor

Initial appointments or promotions to the rank of assistant professor should be reserved for those individuals who possess a terminal degree in their field and show promise for promotion to higher ranks. Assistant Professors are typically expected to have earned a doctoral degree in an area related to their teaching, research, and service and had successful teaching and/or other relevant experience. New tenure-track faculty members who have the appropriate terminal degree will normally be hired as assistant professors. Those who have not completed the appropriate terminal degree are hired as instructors, as indicated above.

Tenure is not normally granted to faculty members who hold the rank of Assistant Professor. If a department wishes to recommend tenure for an Assistant Professor, its members must demonstrate clearly why this proposed action is in the best interest of the candidate, the department, and the university.

c. Associate Professor

An Associate Professor shall have completed formal advanced study (earned doctorate), have completed several years of successful teaching or other relevant experience, shown evidence of professional development and scholarly achievement as reflected in research publications and other individual creative efforts, and made substantial contributions in the area of service. This is a senior rank with tenure when it is earned after the candidate has been a full-time member of the UNH faculty for no less than three (3) years. As stated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, a person with relevant prior experience who is hired as an Assistant Professor may be considered for promotion to Associate Professor without tenure during their first two years of UNH employment. Such decisions are usually reserved for those individuals who have demonstrated distinctive value to the University and who possess outstanding capability for further development and contributions.

d. Professor

A Professor shall have a background of successful teaching, research, and service marked by a perspective of maturity and experience or some outstanding creative attribute that is recognizable in the academic world as a special asset to the university faculty. Appointment and/or promotion to the rank of Professor pays particular attention to the candidate's professional stature, both within UNH and in the academic community at large. There are no time limits associated with recommendations for promotion to the rank of Professor.

II. EVALUATIONS OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY PRIOR TO MANDATORY REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

All tenure-track faculty are evaluated every year. Annual evaluations may occur in each department according to department guidelines. Tenure-track faculty complete a Faculty Annual Report each academic year. This report, which combines self-evaluation and objective data (e.g., students' evaluations of teaching, list of publications, number of advisees), is used by the Chairperson and Dean to provide written feedback to faculty in their respective annual evaluations. These evaluations are also intended to be prescriptive, providing a formal means by which the Chairperson and Dean can make suggestions for improving the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. The evaluations also provide feedback to faculty on their status relative to promotion and tenure.

The CHHS Promotion and Tenure Committee completes a more extensive evaluation in the faculty member's third year. Departments have the option of involving the departmental Promotional and Tenure Committee in this process. The CHHS Committee considers the following sources of information: 1) annual reports of the faculty member (three years); 2) curriculum vitae; 3) annual letters of evaluation from the Chairperson (three years); and evaluations from the CHHS Dean (two years). Portfolios containing information about the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service activities will also be submitted as part of the 3rd year review. These portfolios will continue to be expanded and should be presented again at the time of the review for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure. More information on portfolios can be found in Sections V, VI, and VII under Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.

III. TIMING OF REVIEWS

Faculty are strongly encouraged to review the Collective Bargaining Agreement for information pertaining to the timing of reviews for promotion and tenure. Some highlights follow:

1. Tenure is granted only to faculty members on 100% academic or fiscal year appointments.
2. Instructors are not eligible for tenure.
3. At the time of initial appointment, each tenure-track faculty member is notified in writing that a decision on tenure will be reached for him/her no later than the end of a certain number of years of full-time service. Typically, this occurs following the sixth year of full-time service to the University. This includes years of service as an Instructor. A decision can be reached before that time (see Collective Bargaining Agreement); policies for doing so vary relative to faculty rank and special circumstances.
4. Faculty may ask to undergo review for promotion and tenure before the mandatory sixth year. Generally, such cases shall only go forward when the Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, informs the faculty member that the faculty member's credentials are exceptionally strong and permit such an action.
5. A tenure decision is rarely deferred to a later date, even if the candidate and department members agree that a delay would be desirable. Reasons for deferring a tenure decision may include official interim disability and periods in which the faculty member is on leave without pay for nonprofessional reasons. (see Collective Bargaining Agreement for exceptions to this policy).
6. There are no time limits associated with recommendations for promotion to the rank of Professor.

IV. DOCUMENTATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

It is the responsibility of each tenure-track faculty member to compile an academic portfolio where information pertaining to teaching, scholarship, and service is maintained and regularly updated. The portfolio should contain objective information (e.g., reprints of refereed journal publications, letters from former students reflecting on quality of their teaching, letters of appreciation and awards from agencies in which faculty members have provided service) as well as subjective information (e.g., self-evaluations of teaching effectiveness and description of research program and its significance). Portfolios can be used to provide data for faculty members' evaluations of their performance during the period covered by the review. It also provides an organized document used by the department chair, the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the CHHS Promotion and Tenure Committee in their reviews of faculty members' accomplishments.

Faculty should submit their portfolios to the Department Chairperson for their third-year and sixth-year promotion and tenure reviews. Faculty are encouraged to seek input from their mentor and members of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee about the content and organization of their portfolio. Tenured faculty are also strongly encouraged to maintain a

portfolio documenting their continuing growth and maturity in teaching, scholarship and service. This may be very helpful in constructing a case for promotion at a future time.

V. TEACHING

As stated in the Introduction, teaching may occur in various settings and ways in addition to traditional classroom teaching. Teaching may involve team teaching, experiential learning, and the use of new teaching technologies. It may occur in research laboratories, research projects (and supervision of theses and doctoral dissertations), continuing education, and practice settings. Teaching also occurs in conjunction with academic advising of students.

A. Documentation of teaching

The primary resource used to evaluate teaching effectiveness is the teaching portfolio. A teaching portfolio is a comprehensive, factual description of a professor's teaching accomplishments. A portfolio includes documents and material collectively suggesting the scope and quality of a professor's teaching performance. This documentation serves to demonstrate teaching accomplishments in a similar manner that lists of publications, grants, and research honors depict faculty members' scholarship/research.

A teaching portfolio is not an exhaustive compilation of all the documents and materials representing teaching performance. Rather, it presents selected information on teaching activities and evidence of their effectiveness. The specific information included may vary across departments. Just as statements in a curriculum vita should be supported by convincing evidence (e.g., published papers, reports), statements in the teaching portfolio should be supported by empirical and qualitative evidence. Materials in the portfolio provide administrators and promotion and tenure committees with access to numerous indices of teaching effectiveness, reaching far beyond the cursory information provided in students' quantitative evaluations of teaching effectiveness. For this reason, candidates are well advised to devote the attention, care, and time necessary to prepare a portfolio that represents their expertise in this area.

The three interrelated components of teaching are process, content, and outcome. Process refers to how one teaches, including the use of contemporary teaching pedagogues. Content is the body of information one teaches. Finally, outcome refers to the effects of teaching in terms of what and how effectively students learn, and what they are able to do as a result of being taught.

The portfolio should include information on all three components of teaching (i.e., process, content, and outcomes). This may include both qualitative and quantitative data, as well as the candidate's analysis of that data relative to teaching effectiveness. Examples of information to include in the portfolio are included in this section of this document. Candidates are neither required nor expected to furnish all of these materials. However, they should provide sufficient evidence for others to evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching relative to process, content, and outcome.

B. Materials that should be provided by candidate in teaching portfolio

The following list is composed of items a candidate should include in a teaching portfolio (unless circumstances dictate otherwise) as well as additional items candidates are encouraged to provide when relevant to their teaching. Whatever is included, it should be kept in mind that the purpose of the teaching portfolio is to present a careful, thoughtful compilation of documents and

materials related to the candidate's teaching effectiveness. Items are categorized under the three components of teaching: process, content, and outcome.

1. Process

(a) Items that should be included in the teaching portfolio, unless circumstances dictate otherwise:

- i. Statement of teaching responsibilities, including specific courses and a brief description of the way each course was taught. Include a list of courses taught the past five years, including continuing education courses and number of students enrolled in each class.
- ii. A reflective statement by the candidate describing personal teaching philosophy, strategies, and objectives. This statement may apply to courses and teaching/supervising individual students in research, laboratories, or field settings. Candidates should include a statement about their philosophy of teaching addressing what they do as a teacher and why they teach in this manner. Candidates should also be certain to comment on the centrality of their teaching to the department and its programmatic direction.
- iii. Numbers of undergraduate, masters, and doctoral students advised or supervised in each of the previous five years. This applies to academic advising as well as supervision of student research and fieldwork experiences.
- iv. Evidence of mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students in conjunction with the honors program, senior honors theses, independent studies, master's theses, or dissertations. Describe levels of involvement in all thesis and dissertation committees on which candidate served.
- v. Evidence (e.g., students' course evaluations and peer review) of using innovative teaching methods successfully.
- vi. Scope of teaching activities such as size and level of teaching load, and any exceptional responsibilities undertaken. For example, faculty may wish to inform P&T committee members about semesters in which their teaching loads exceeded the usual 5 units in an academic year (e.g., faculty may have volunteered to do so, they have been asked to fill in for colleagues on sabbatical leave, teach courses assigned to colleagues who had recently resigned, cover Department courses in situations where positions had not yet been filled).
- vii. Discussion about various aspects of their teaching style, including uses of technology and current/innovative practices associated with effective teaching.
- viii. Additional information about direction/supervision of student honors papers, theses, dissertations, laboratory work, fieldwork, or other forms of individual teaching.
- ix. Self-evaluation of the effectiveness of one's teaching. This would include a personal assessment of teaching related activities and an explanation of any contradictory or unclear documents or materials in the teaching portfolio.

- x. Statements from colleagues who have observed the candidate in the classroom as members of a teaching team or independent observer.
- (b) Additional items suggested for inclusion in the teaching portfolio. (Note: candidates are encouraged to provide these materials if relevant to their case):
 - i. A personal statement by the candidate describing teaching goals for the next five years.
 - ii. Documentation and description of departmental and interdepartmental activities involving curriculum and program development.
 - iii. Contributions to or editing for a professional journal on teaching in the candidate's discipline.
 - iv. Evidence of occurrences and effectiveness in mentoring junior faculty on their teaching.
 - v. Description of steps taken to evaluate and improve one's teaching. This might include changes resulting from self-evaluation, time spent reading articles or books on improving teaching, participation in seminars, workshops and other professional activities associated with improving teaching.
 - vi. Description of curricular revisions, or revisions in other forms of teaching. This may include new course projects, materials, class assignments, or other activities.
 - vii. Statements from colleagues who have systematically reviewed the candidate's out-of-class teaching activities (e.g., student advising, supervising students in laboratory or field settings, chairing theses or dissertation).
 - viii. A professional exchange with colleagues inside or outside the university. The exchange might focus on course materials or methods of teaching particular topics, or helping colleagues improve their teaching.
 - ix. Participation in local, regional, state or national activities related to teaching courses in the candidate's discipline. This could also include attendance at continuing education programs or conferences on teaching/pedagogy.
 - x. Documentation of teaching improvement or development through UNH's Teaching Excellence Program.
 - xi. Involvement in research or practice contributing directly to teaching.
2. Content
 - (a) Items that should be included in the teaching portfolio unless circumstances dictate otherwise:
 - i. Evidence that teaching methods and course content are peer-reviewed periodically. Peer review may be conducted by CHHS senior faculty and/or outside experts, including faculty or staff who are associated with the UNH Teaching Excellence

Program. Peer review may include summaries of classroom visitations, written reviews of course syllabi and other course materials, and evaluation of the candidate's analysis and responsiveness to students' evaluations of teaching.

ii. Statements from colleagues who have systematically reviewed the candidate's classroom materials, course syllabi, assignments, testing and grading practices, text selection, and reading lists.

(b) Additional items suggested for inclusion in the teaching portfolio. (Note: candidates are encouraged to provide these materials if relevant to their case):

i. Evidence of command of subject matter. This may include syllabi and readings referring to recent research and developments in areas of teaching.

ii. Evidence that course syllabi have been modified regularly to reflect changes in that area of study.

iii. An audio or visual tape of the candidate teaching a typical class.

3. Outcomes

(a) Items that should be included in the teaching portfolio unless circumstances dictate otherwise:

i. Students' evaluations of courses taught and an analysis of those evaluations, highlighting items corresponding to teaching effectiveness. Include a summary statement indicating how these students' evaluations compare to those received by other faculty in the same department, College, and university.

(b) Additional items suggested for inclusion in the teaching portfolio: (Note: candidates are encouraged to provide these materials if relevant to their case):

i. Documentation of awards and other forms of special recognition for excellence in teaching.

ii. Publications related to teaching that may include refereed articles, monographs, textbooks, and chapters in books.

iii. Grants to support instructional activities, including pre-service and in-service personnel preparation grants.

iv. Grants to support research activities that also have some impact on teaching (e.g., research grants that involve students, situations where new laboratory equipment is also used for teaching purposes).

v. Explanations of any special circumstances contributing to a relatively negative performance at one time or another. This may include semesters in which faculty carried an overload, taught courses for the first time, were ill, etc. The candidate may wish to document consultations with the UNH Teaching Excellence Program and discuss resulting changes in teaching.

- vi. Evidence of the impact of all forms of teaching, including classroom teaching, (supervising students in research and field experiences, academic advising, and continuing education) on the professional careers of former students, colleagues, and junior faculty. This material is often provided in the form of letters.
 - vii. Letters from employers and supervisors attesting to the preparedness and excellence of former students with whom the faculty has worked or supervised.
 - viii. Evidence of annual self-evaluation of teaching and corresponding steps taken to continually improve teaching quality.
 - ix. Evidence of contributions to teaching adopted by, or affecting, teaching programs in other institutions.
 - x. Evidence of how teaching impacts students beyond what is considered usual or normal.
 - xi. Invitations from other institutions to serve as a guest lecturer or visiting professor.
 - xii. Invitations to teach from outside agencies(including continuing education).
 - xiii. Requests to present a paper at a conference on teaching in one's discipline or on teaching in general.
 - xiv. Invitations to serve as a consultant to other institutions regarding instructional content or teaching methods.
 - xv. Student scores on faculty-made or standardized tests before and after a course, as evidence of student learning.
 - xvi. Student papers, reports, fieldwork reports, laboratory workbooks or logs, or student publications on course-related work.
 - xvii. Information about the effect of the candidate's teaching (e.g., formal courses, individual advising, and supervision) on student career choices or help given by the candidate to secure student employment.
 - xviii. Information about students who succeed in more advanced courses/degrees in the discipline.
 - xix. Statements by former students on the quality of instruction and how it affected their careers.
 - xx. Student publications or conference presentations on work supervised by the candidate.
 - xxi. Examples of graded student papers, reports, etc. showing excellent, average, and poor work along with the candidate's comments as to why they received these grades.
- C. Evaluation of Teaching

In addition to those materials furnished by the candidate in the portfolio, the Department Chair must forward her/his independent evaluation along with the Department Committee's evaluation to the CHHS Dean. The CHHS Committee and CHHS Dean will rely primarily on the following evaluation material submitted by the Department Committee and Chair to make independent, informed judgements about a candidate's past teaching excellence and likelihood of continued success and productivity in this area.

1. The Committee's and Chair's evaluations of the candidate's teaching
 - (a) Evaluate the quality of the candidate's teaching. Information for this evaluation can be derived from course evaluations and other items in the candidate's teaching portfolio.
 - (b) Include a statement assessing the candidate's teaching contribution to the department, discussing how the department plans to use the candidate as a teacher in the future.
 - (c) When reviewers' opinions are available, summarize or quote them. Include copies of these reviews in the Appendix.
 - (d) Include information about the candidate's performance as a faculty advisor. This would come primarily from students, but supplementary information might come from the department chairperson or program coordinator within the department. For instance, a program coordinator could comment on the adequacy, effectiveness, timeliness, etc. of a candidate's student advising in the program. To avoid bias, the department chairperson or other designated person should solicit student evaluations.

2. Outside letters of evaluation

The following are guidelines for soliciting outside letters of evaluation for a candidate's teaching:

- (a) Letters should be sent to a random selection of students the candidate has taught in the last five years, requesting their evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance and effectiveness. The random selection should strive to attain a pool of at least 100 students, 75% of whom had the candidate as a professor in the last two years.
- (b) Letters should be sent to a random selection of students the candidate advised in the last five years, asking them to evaluate the candidate's effectiveness in advising.
- (c) Letters should be sent to all students with whom the candidate worked on honors theses, master's theses, dissertations, or other special projects asking them about the candidate's effectiveness in working with them in these areas.
- (d) The candidate should request reviews from persons in her/his field at other, comparable institutions who are qualified to assess syllabi and course-related information for courses developed separately or in collaboration. Ideally, two such reviews should be completed. At least one external reviewer should be selected directly by the committee and the other through consensus between the candidate and Department P&T Committee

whenever possible. The CHHS P & T Committee requires the following information about persons serving as external reviewers of teaching:

- i. Identifying information including institutional affiliation (e.g., resume, CV)
- ii. Description of their professional credentials. It is important to choose outside evaluators whose opinions will be influential by virtue of their positions and reputations. It should be obvious to the CHHS P&T Committee and the Dean that the evaluators are knowledgeable about the faculty member's discipline.
- iii. Means by which the review was solicited from this individual. External reviewers must be reminded they are judging a candidate's teaching materials, and are not to offer personal opinions about whether or not they feel a candidate would be granted promotion and/or tenure at their institution or elsewhere. It is important to request the evaluation be conducted in a neutral manner and to ask the evaluator to explain the bases of the recommendation. A sample letter to external reviewers appears in Appendix B of this document.
- iv. The Department should include information about where in the P&T documents the CHHS Committee can find the letters from external reviewers. In their review, the Department Committee should also summarize the contents of these letters and provide any appropriate reaction or further comment.

D. General Expectations for Teaching at each Rank

The following information provides criteria for evaluating teaching at the time of initial Appointment and for consideration of Promotion. Criteria vary by rank, demonstrating the increasing expectations for faculty as they advance through these various levels. For example, criteria listed for Associate Professor should be demonstrated clearly by an individual wishing to be appointed to that rank, or an Assistant Professor who intends to apply for promotion to that rank. The CHHS Committee examines the evidence and judges the candidate's performance and potential relative to the criteria associated with the higher rank. Decisions on appointment and/or promotion are based on past performance and expected future performance.

Competency and achievement in teaching can be evaluated in several ways (e.g., student evaluations; faculty/peer evaluations; demonstrating appropriate responses to student, peer, and chair evaluations to improve performance; external evaluations, contributions to course development, other measures noted elsewhere in this document). A faculty member's teaching effectiveness should not be evaluated solely on the basis of student course evaluations. Multiple sources of information must be used to substantiate all evaluations of teaching.

If the university student teaching evaluation form is used as one means of evaluating faculty teaching performance, faculty are expected to receive scores on individual items, and item #14, that attest to their effectiveness in the 'classroom.' These data will be interpreted relative to those received by other faculty in the candidate's department, CHHS and the overall university. Those faculty who do not use the standard university form for evaluating teaching effectiveness should demonstrate that their teaching performance is comparable to other faculty in the department, CHHS, and the university.

Expectations of teaching effectiveness vary with rank, as indicated by the following:

1. *Instructor*

Expectation: Competent teaching

- (a) Demonstrates comprehensive, current knowledge about discipline in area of specialization.
- (b) Demonstrates independent responsibility for maintaining teaching and practical expertise.
- (c) Plans and implements practical experiences for students based on course objectives and teaching-learning principles.
- (d) Demonstrates well-developed supervision skills.
- (e) Participates in course, curriculum, and evaluation activities.

2. *Assistant Professor*

Expectation: Competent teaching

- (a) Demonstrates knowledge of course design and professional curriculum development.
- (b) Integrates research findings and scholarly applied literature into lectures and practical experiences for student learning.
- (c) Presents course material systematically, with creativity and enthusiasm for the subject.
- (d) Provides effective academic and research advisement to students.
- (e) Demonstrates a clear understanding of educational principles and standards appropriate to all levels of professional education.
- (f) Contributes to course and curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation.

3. *Associate Professor*

Expectation: Excellent teaching

- (a) Demonstrates mature levels of critical thinking and knowledge of the field in development of courses and instructional materials.
- (b) Provides leadership in development of academic and/or clinical courses, and the curriculum at the undergraduate and/or graduate level.
- (c) Develops, implements, and evaluates innovative techniques in classroom and practical instruction.

(d) Demonstrates skill as mentor for graduate students (if applicable) through supervision of research and other activities.

(e) Advises students at all levels of professional education.

4. *Professor*

Expectation: Established record of excellent teaching.

(a) Demonstrates a sustained pattern of excellent teaching abilities.

(b) Demonstrates skill as mentor to junior faculty and other instructional staff such as instructors, lecturers, and teaching assistants, to enhance their academic and clinical teaching abilities and effectiveness.

(c) Demonstrates leadership in academic and clinical courses, curriculum review and modification, and implementation of innovative teaching techniques in the classroom and practical areas.

(d) Demonstrates mentoring skills to graduate students in academic, scholarship, and professional activities.

A Professor also might be expected to demonstrate competency in the following ways:

(e) Excellent peer and student evaluations at undergraduate and graduate levels.

(f) Service as a visiting professor or consultant on professional curriculum to other academic institutions.

(g) Selection as a site visitor/consultant to evaluate effectiveness of other institutions educating their students.

(h) Superior academic record and subsequent achievement of students.

(i) Instruction-related scholarship (e.g., chapters, texts, media, and CAI funded instructional projects).

VI. SCHOLARSHIP

Faculty members are expected to make significant contributions and demonstrate excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service in order to be recommended for promotion and tenure. However, in previous years scholarship has generally been assigned the greatest weight in decisions related to promotion and tenure. Unless different conditions have been agreed upon by a candidate, the department Chairperson, and the CHHS Dean (and this arrangement has been documented thoroughly and unambiguously in writing), the typical faculty "load" in CHHS allots 25% of faculty time to scholarship. Scholarship may be demonstrated in a variety of ways. However, the benchmark criterion in CHHS over the past 10+ years, and one continuing to be used, relates to the candidate's success publishing original research in well-respected, refereed journals.

As discussed in the Introduction to this document, scholarship includes quantitative as well as qualitative investigations that often involve the systematic collection, analysis, and dissemination of information. The benchmark for evaluating scholarship is the candidate's degree of success disseminating his/her research in highly regarded, scholarly peer-reviewed publications. Scholarship usually involves the generation of new knowledge or the advancement of existing knowledge useful in solving important health and human service problems. Scholarship may occur in a variety of settings, perhaps in collaboration with health and human service agencies, organizations, institutions and/or communities to assist them in assessing health and human services problems, enhance the delivery of health and human services, or develop policies related to health and human services.

It is recognized that some types of research may, by their nature, require more time and effort than others. This may affect the trajectory of an individual's publications. Trajectory relates to the number, nature, and inter-relations between publications from one year to the next as a program of research evolves. The program of research should be dynamic enough to continue meaningfully in the years following a promotion and tenure decision.

Many areas of scholarship lend themselves to collaborative efforts. Activities such as joint-authored publications are encouraged when appropriate to the nature of an investigation and field of study. Candidates should describe their role in collaborative projects and multi-authored publications relative to their colleagues' contributions. In jointly authored articles, this is as important regardless of whether the candidate is the first, second, third, or subsequent author. Without further clarification, it is generally assumed that the order of authorship reflects the relative contributions of each investigator. Descriptions of the candidate's role and contributions in multi-authored publications should be solicited from the first author.

All tenure-track faculty are expected to develop and maintain a Scholarship portfolio each year. Faculty present this portfolio, along with their curriculum vitae and self-evaluations of teaching, scholarship, and service (described elsewhere in this document) to the Department Chair at the commencement of the promotion and tenure review process.

Evidence of competence and accomplishment in scholarship can be demonstrated by including various types of materials and information in the portfolio. However, it should be understood that the single most important index for evaluating faculty scholarship is success publishing one's work in respected, peer-reviewed journals, unless there are special circumstances and arrangements between the faculty member, Chair, and Dean.

As faculty advance in rank, it is expected that scholarship will increase, contributing to the growing stature of the faculty member in the scientific community. A faculty member's research is examined relative to several parameters (i.e., program of research, staging of publications, trajectory, quantity, and quality), each of which is described below.

Program of Research - Candidates are expected to demonstrate evidence of a sustained and programmatic focus rather than a series of seemingly unrelated activities. There should be evidence of establishing a professional identity where their work is valued and judged significant by colleagues in their discipline, area, and related areas of study.

Staging - The CHHS committee looks for evidence of staging, where the candidate possesses several published articles along with articles in press, articles in review, work in progress, and work they plan to initiate over the next few years. The work should demonstrate a pattern of continued growth in their discipline and increasing sophistication as a scholar.

Trajectory - As stated earlier, candidates are expected to demonstrate sustained and programmatic research. A candidate whose work has been conducted successfully (e.g., publications in refereed journals and presentations at professional conferences) over several years is usually judged more favorably than one who appears generally inactive and/or unsuccessful for several years and then demonstrates a spurt of activity in the year or two preceding their review for P&T.

Quantity - There is no absolute rule for specific number of publications that must be completed at time of promotion and tenure review. However a common criterion relative to quantity calls for a minimum of one highly regarded and refereed publication each year. However, if such a criterion is used it should be done so with great caution. No promotion and tenure decision is made exclusively on the basis of number of publications. Instead, this factor is examined relative to those described elsewhere in this section (i.e., program of research, staging, trajectory, importance, quality and impact) along with other indicators of successful scholarship.

Quality - The quality of one's scholarship is judged primarily by individuals who are familiar with the candidate's area of research and capable of assessing its significance within and beyond a particular discipline. For that reason, letters from external reviewers carry great weight in evaluating the quality of one's research. The College committee seeks evidence that the candidate's scholarship provides a positive contribution to the individual's discipline, is relevant, timely, innovative, well conceived, and procedurally sound.

A. Documentation of Scholarship

As is the case with teaching and service, the evaluation of scholarship begins with candidates' self-evaluation of their past, present, and future work. Candidates should include certain items in their Scholarship Portfolio, unless special circumstances dictate otherwise.

B. Materials Provided by Candidate in Scholarship Portfolio

The following list is composed of items candidates should include in the scholarship section of their document, and additional items candidates are encouraged to provide when relevant to their scholarship. Whatever is included, it should be kept in mind that the purpose of the scholarship section is to present a careful, thoughtful compilation of documents and materials that document the candidate's accomplishments in this area.

The candidate or department committee should furnish the CHHS Promotion and Tenure Committee with the following information about the candidate's research. **(Note: Although the following items are numbered, they do not represent a hierarchical order of significance in evaluating scholarship, with the exception of refereed publications, which are considered the most significant index of excellence in this area.)**

1. A clear, focused, and coherent description of the theme of the program of research and its significance. The description should include a brief review of work-to-date and future directions for research.
2. List of peer-reviewed publications. These may be databased or theoretical in nature. Specify the status of each publication as:

- (a) published
- (b) under review;
- (c) submitted; or,
- (d) in progress.

3. Reprints, or other copies, of all publications:

- (a) journal articles
- (b) book chapters
- (c) monographs based on original research and basic or applied innovations
- (d) letters to the editor
- (e) book reviews
- (f) reviews of assessment and instructional materials
- (g) other

4. Information about the scholarly reputation of journals, including:

- (a) acceptance/rejection rates,
- (b) where the candidate's work has been published,
- (c) the quality of journals, books, other publications where the work appears (e.g., the stature of the journal within the discipline, and
- (d) the peer review process used by the journal

5. Grants and contracts awarded to conduct scholarship/research. Indicate status of each grant or contract as (a) submitted; (b) funded; (c) under review; (d) in progress; or, (e) rejected. For grants that have been funded, include a copy of the grant in the Scholarship Portfolio. Include the dollar amount of the award, the name of the sponsoring agency, the duration of the grant, the goals and objectives of the research, and the outcomes of the project.

6. Documentation (e.g., conference proceedings, brochures and handouts) of invited presentations at local, state, regional, national, and international meetings, workshops, and conferences.

7. Documentation (e.g., conference proceedings, brochures, and handouts) of refereed presentations at local, state, regional, national and international meetings, workshops, and conferences.

Additional items suggested for inclusion in the scholarship section (Note: candidates are encouraged to provide these materials if relevant to their case):

- 1. Information about the scholarly reputation of the publisher of a candidate's book

and/or book chapters.

2. Others' published evaluations (e.g., letters to the editor and book reviews) and reactions to the candidate's scholarship/research.
3. List of masters and doctoral committees on which the faculty member served and their role on each committee.
4. List of publications emanating from theses and dissertations, whether sole-authored by students or co-authored with faculty. Candidate should delineate their contributions to each publication. Where appropriate, provide samples of 'Acknowledgements' from others.
5. Awards received in recognition of outstanding scholarship/research.
6. Other researchers' citations of the candidate's work in their own published research and work in progress.
7. Evidence of the candidate's scholarship stimulating the work of other researchers or providing new breakthroughs in the field.
8. Impact of the research on health and human service practices.

C. Evaluation of Scholarship

In addition to those materials furnished by the candidate described in the preceding section, the Department Chair must forward her/his independent evaluation along with the Department P & T Committee's evaluation to the CHHS Dean. The CHHS Committee and CHHS Dean rely primarily on these evaluation materials and the following criteria to make independent, informed judgements about a candidate's past scholarship and likelihood of continued success and productivity in this area.

1. Evaluate the quality of the candidate's scholarship. Published research is the primary criterion to be used in evaluating scholarship. Describe and evaluate the venues where the candidate's publications appear, including data on overall acceptance/rejection rates of these peer-reviewed journals. For books and book chapters, clearly identify the nature of the publisher and the criteria for publication.
2. When reviewers' opinions are available, summarize or quote from them. Include copies of these reviews in the Appendix.
3. For each joint-authored work (e.g., journal article, book, another form of publication), delineate the proportion and nature of the candidate's contributions relative to co-authors' work.
4. Discuss the faculty member's recognition and stature outside the University of New Hampshire. State and provide documentation on whether he/she possesses a regional, national, and international stature in regard to her/his scholarship.
5. Outside letters of evaluation

The following are guidelines for soliciting outside letters of evaluation for a candidate's scholarship:

- (a) If the candidate is being considered for promotion to associate or full professor, provide letters (in the Appendix) from faculty in the same field at other comparable institutions who are qualified to assess the candidate's scholarly contributions. Although the University guidelines call for three or more such reviews, a minimum of five (5) reviews are requested in CHHS due to the significance placed on these evaluations.
- (b) Whenever possible, at least one external reviewer should be selected directly by the committee; two or more should be determined through consensus between the candidate and Department P&T Committee; and no more than two reviewers should be selected by the candidate alone.
- (c) Depending on the body of work, Department committees may elect to send all publications to all reviewers, or they may choose to send a sample of no fewer than three publications to each reviewer. Candidates will be asked to provide input regarding which publications they prefer to be mailed to each reviewer. Reviewers will also receive a copy of the candidate's vitae and a letter explaining their role in the promotion and tenure process (A sample letter is available in the Appendix). The CHHS Committee requires the following information about external reviewers of scholarship:
 - (d) Include a description of reviewers' professional credentials. It is important to choose external evaluators whose opinions will be influential by virtue of their own positions and reputations. It should be obvious to the CHHS P&T Committee and the Dean that the evaluators are knowledgeable about the faculty member's discipline and research. External reviewers should be recognized nationally for their expertise and contributions in this or a related area of research.
 - (e) Include a discussion of the means by which the review was solicited from reviewers. External reviewers must be reminded they are judging a candidate's scholarship, and not to offer personal opinions about whether or not they feel a candidate would be granted promotion and/or tenure at their institution or elsewhere. It is important to request the evaluation be conducted in an objective manner and to ask the evaluator to explain the bases for the recommendation. A sample letter to external reviewers appears in the Appendix.
 - (f) Include information about where in the P&T documents the CHHS Committee can find the letters from external reviewers. In their review, the Department Committee should also summarize the contents of these letters and provide any appropriate reaction or further comment.
 - (g) Include an evaluation of the candidate's work with persons in other departments, centers, or groups off-campus. This may involve professional work with industries, health and human service agencies, Colleges, or other organizations. It does not include professional consulting, which is addressed in the Service section of the document.

- (h) Include the Committee's opinion of the external reviewers' comments. For example, were external letters obtained commenting on this work? If so, identify the writers and cite the locations of the letters in the Appendix. If not, briefly explain why such letters were not obtained.

D. General Expectations for Scholarship at each Rank

The following information provides criteria for evaluating scholarship at the time of initial Appointment and for consideration of Promotion. Criteria vary by rank to demonstrate the increasing expectations for faculty as they move up the various levels. For example, criteria listed for Associate Professor should be demonstrated clearly by an individual wishing to be appointed to that rank, or an Assistant Professor who is wishing to be promoted to that rank. The CHHS Committee examines the evidence and judges the candidate's potential and performance relative to expectations of faculty soon after they have attained that higher rank. (Note: decisions on appointment and/or promotion are based on past performance and expected future performance.)

1. *Instructor*

Expectation: Incorporates research into teaching and practice.

- (a) Integrates current research findings into clinical instruction and supervision.
- (b) Maintains knowledge of research and clinical literature related to the area of teaching/clinical specialization.
- (c) Participates in research projects.

2. *Assistant Professor*

Expectation: Competence in research.

- (a) Develops and conducts a research program relevant to the discipline and its priorities.
- (b) Disseminates data based manuscripts and/or theoretical papers in peer-reviewed journals.
- (c) Presents scholarly work at meetings of professional societies.

3. *Associate Professor*

Expectation: Excellence in research.

- (a) Demonstrates increased sophistication in the conceptualization, design, execution, and reporting of research. Some ways this may be demonstrated include:
 - i. principal or co-principal investigator of externally funded research grants;
 - ii. principal or co-principal investigator on an interdisciplinary research team;

- iii. external reviewers affirming the quality and significance of scholarship;
 - iv. peer-reviewed publications and national presentations;
 - v. impact on health and human services.
- (b) Maintains a focused program of scholarship having a significant impact in the field.
- (c) Demonstrates regular and sustained dissemination of scholarly work.

4. *Professor*

Expectation: Sustained record of excellent research and scholarship.

- (a) Maintains a program of scholarship that advances the science and/or practice of one or more aspects of health and human services.
- (b) Recognized by colleagues at national and/or international levels as an expert in research.
- (c) Provides research mentorship and facilitates research expertise of students and colleagues.
- (d) A sustained program of externally funded research or other creative works.
- (e) Publications in leading peer-reviewed journals.
- (f) Invited book chapters.
- (g) Frequent citations by other authors.
- (h) Research papers (including invited papers) at juried national and international meetings of professional societies, symposia, colloquia, and seminars.
- (i) Quality and outcomes of research are affirmed by outside reviewers.
- (j) Honors, awards, testimonials for scholarship and contributions to discipline and HHS.
- (k) Consultation in area of research expertise to colleagues, local and national or international agencies.

VII. SERVICE

As was pointed out in the Introduction to this document, the College of Health and Human Services values service to the university, profession and community and considers such service a valuable part of a faculty member's responsibilities.

Faculty are expected to contribute consistently to departmental service unless relieved of such responsibilities by the department chair and this decision is documented in the faculty member's evaluation. As rank increases, the quantity, quality, and scope of service are expected to increase accordingly. Competence in service and outreach can be demonstrated in many ways.

A. Documentation of Service

All tenure-track faculty members, and the non-tenure track faculty for whom service is an expected activity, are expected to develop and maintain a Service portfolio that covers at least the previous 5 years of service activities. These activities often present opportunities for collaboration with colleagues in other disciplines or academic institutions, constituencies such as consumers, service providers, and others. There may also be a research or teaching component, especially in situations in which the candidate involves students in these activities. When this is the case, the candidate should describe corresponding opportunities and outcomes of the associated research and teaching. In describing their service contributions, faculty should clearly distinguish in the portfolio those activities for which they received financial or some other form of reimbursement, and those of a voluntary nature.

As rank increases, the quantity, quality, and scope of public service and outreach activities by faculty are expected to increase accordingly. Excellence in public service and outreach can be demonstrated in many ways. As is the case with teaching and scholarship, the service portfolio should be updated annually and presented by the faculty candidate to the department chair at the time of the annual evaluations, at the third year review, and at the commencement of the promotion and tenure review process.

B. Materials Provided by Candidate in Service Portfolio

A list of items for inclusion in the portfolio for documenting service is included in this section. Note that because of the variance of service opportunities for candidates, what might be "required" or "must be included" in one candidate's service portfolio may be recommended in another candidate's portfolio, or even inappropriate in another candidate's portfolio. Because of this, examples are provided in sections outlining service to the university, service to the profession, and public service, or, outreach for inclusion in a candidate's service portfolio.

Given this, two items that must be included in a candidate's service portfolio are:

1. Present an on-going analysis or evaluation of one's contributions to the university, profession and/or community at large. Special attention should be paid to the description of the connections between service activities and the candidate's teaching and/or scholarship.
2. Description of the relevance of the service activities to the mission of the university, College and/or department.

C. Service to the Department, College, University

Service to the university refers to administrative roles in the department (and/or program option), College, university, or USNH system. All tenure-track faculty are expected to share in the work necessary to maintain the operation of the institution. Furthermore, faculty are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts aimed at improving programs and

faculties. University service usually includes membership on, and perhaps leadership of, committees, work groups, task forces, or other special efforts.

1. Descriptions of membership/leadership on committees, work groups, task forces, etc. at the department, College, university, and system levels. Describe the activities and purpose of the group and the role of the faculty member in the group.
2. Evidence of contributions to faculty governance (e.g., faculty senate).
3. List of special projects or written grants for the department, College, and university along with the role of the candidate in the project.
4. Description of administrative capacities for the department, College, or university. Examples might include service as department chair, graduate or undergraduate program director, admissions coordinator, and director of clinical services.
5. List of outreach activities, such as presentations, consultations, and student recruitment and the role of the faculty in each activity.
6. Description of teaching assignments contributing to public service and outreach or having social benefits in addition to their contributions to student learning.
7. Description of collaborative service activities in the university, between the university and community agencies or organizations, or in health and human services agencies, groups or organizations. Special attention should be paid to the nature and outcomes of the collaboration and the role of the candidate's contribution.

D. Service to the Profession

Faculty are expected to contribute to the maintenance and growth of their profession. Service to the profession refers to activities such as holding major leadership positions in professional organizations, serving on editorial boards, serving on state, national, or international boards, commissions, review panels, etc. As rank increases, there should be commensurate positive changes in the quantity and quality of service to one's profession. For example, candidates for Associate Professor may serve as reviewers for journals and be members of professional committees. They may assume leadership positions in state chapters of their professional organizations. Professors are more likely to serve on editorial boards as editors and associate editors. They may assume leadership positions at the national level of their professional organizations.

1. List of memberships and leadership positions in professional organizations.
2. List of editorial boards and duties (e.g., editor, associate editor, reviewer) performed.
3. List of professional journals and publishers for whom the faculty member serves as a reviewer.
4. Description of professional conferences for which one reviews proposals.
5. List of services as a participant or consultant to accrediting and other educational review boards.

6. List of memberships on state, national, or international committees, boards, etc., along with respective duties and contributions.
7. List of professional conferences one has organized or conducted.
8. List of elections or appointment to leadership positions in national and international organizations in recognition of outstanding scholarship accomplishments.
9. Evidence of being an editor or reviewer for publications and grant evaluations.
10. Documentation of appointments to serve on review or advisor committees based on scholarship/research accomplishments.
11. Evidence of appointments as a scholarship/research consultant.

E. Public Service and Outreach

Public service and outreach refer to serving the community at large in a professional capacity enhancing the stature of the College and university. This is especially important at a land, sea, and space grant institution such as UNH. Activities may involve working with national, state, or local agencies/ communities, or helping to solve a current health or human service problem. This may require the candidate's expertise in assessing problems, assuring the delivery of services, developing policies, and planning, implementing or evaluating the effectiveness of programs.

The following examples of documentation related to public service and outreach may be included in the service portfolio:

1. Description of activities related to health and human services. Include for each service activity the nature and duration of the project, the role played by the faculty member, and how the service contributions have had important effects on policy and/or a community, agency, etc.
2. Evidence the activities involved or resulted in the creation or development of new health and human service systems.
3. Evidence the activities have contributed to the teaching activities of the faculty member and/or department. For instance, that teaching is directed at practice issues such as assessing health and human service problems, assuring the delivery of services, or developing health and human service policies.
4. Evidence of teaching contributions linking classroom activities with health and human services agencies or needs. For example, a classroom assignment resulting in social benefit.
5. Evidence of new knowledge, methods, or policies derived from the candidate's service has diffused to other communities or health and human services agencies.
6. Evidence of new practice ideas, policies, programs, or methods having been disseminated through publications. In addition to journal articles, publication can

mean producing technical reports used by health and human service agencies and/or communities to help them assess problems, assure the delivery of services, or develop related policies.

7. List of honors or awards in recognition of outstanding contributions to health and human service practice.
8. List of invitations from other institutions or health agencies to help plan, organize, or review health and human service practice activities.
9. List of appointments to national commissions, committees, and boards that are related to health and human service practice.
10. List and description of grants and contracts received to fund health and human service practice activities.

F. Evaluation of Service

In addition to those materials furnished by the candidate, the Department Chair must forward her/his independent evaluation and that of the Department Committee. The CHHS Committee and CHHS Dean will rely primarily on the following evaluation materials (to be submitted from the Department Committee and Chair) to make an independent, informed judgement about a candidate's past service effectiveness and likelihood of continued success and productivity in this area.

1. Department P&T Committee and Department Chairperson

The following are guidelines for department P & T Committees and chairs in their evaluation of a candidate's service:

- (a) Evaluate the quality of the candidate's service to the work of the department.
- (b) Evaluate the candidate's overall service contributions to the mission of the College and university.
- (c) Evaluate the social benefit of any classroom or clinical assignments used for student learning. and contributing to any aspect of public or professional service.
- (d) Evaluate any grants, white papers, or other reports written by the candidate as part of their service activities.
- (e) Responsibilities in the department or College.
- (f) Assess the candidate's reputation locally, regionally, nationally or internationally based on participation in professional or public service activities.
- (g) Include and document any awards or honors based on service contributions the candidate received from agencies, organizations or associations.

2. Outside letters of evaluation

The following are guidelines for soliciting outside letters of evaluation for a candidate's service:

- (a) Letters should be sent to colleagues within and outside the university with whom the candidate has worked most closely on service activities requesting a description of the candidate's contributions and evaluating the quality of those contributions.
- (b) The candidate should submit the names of all those who have served as chairpersons or members of committees, task forces, boards, etc. with whom the candidate has served.
- (c) The candidate should select 3-5 persons who will receive letters requesting evaluation; the Promotion and Tenure committee should select an equal or greater number of persons to receive letters requesting evaluation.
- (d) Data from these letters should be cited in the written evaluation of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee.

G. General Expectations for Service at each Rank

As rank increases, the quantity, quality, and scope of faculty service contributions is expected to increase accordingly and reflect increased levels of involvement and responsibility. Candidates for promotion and tenure are not required to engage in all three types of service (university, professional, public service and outreach). Candidates are expected to demonstrate increasing leadership in departmental service and contributions to service in either the College or university and increasing breadth of involvement in professional or public service.

1. *Instructor*

Expectation: Supportive service

- a. Serves on department committees.
- b. Serves on professional organization committees.
- c. Reflects the department's mission to outside constituencies when appropriate.
- d. Serves as liaison between clinical agencies and department when appropriate.

2. *Assistant Professor*

Expectation: Supportive service

- a. Serves on College and university committees in addition to department committees.
- b. Chairs local or state professional organization committees.
- c. Participates in community or state organization or agency efforts.

3. *Associate Professor*

Expectation: Expert service

- a. Active participation and leadership in department and college committees.
- b. Engages in faculty governance and university committees.
- c. Elected or appointed membership in regional/national chapters of professional organizations or associations.
- d. Service to professional, governmental, health care agencies and community organizations based on their research and clinical/educational expertise.
- e. Service as manuscript or grant reviewer, member of editorial board.

4. *Professor*

Expectation: sustained record of leadership in service

- a. Leadership in college/university governance and committees.
- b. Elected/appointed leadership to the profession at national and international levels.
- c. Leadership in government, health care, clinical agencies, and community committees and boards.
- d. Substantial contribution to the scholarly community through service on editorial, peer review committees and policy making boards at national and international levels.

VIII. ADDITIONAL CRITERIA USED TO DETERMINE APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

Criteria related to teaching, scholarship/research, and service have been presented. Those making decisions pertaining to appointments and promotions also take other factors into consideration. These considerations transcend all aspects of faculty activity and are expected to be reflected in faculty portfolios and/or elsewhere. They will be considered by administrators and promotion and tenure committees at all levels of the promotion and tenure process.

A. *University programmatic considerations*

This factor merits special attention since it is identified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement and University P&T Guidelines as a separate but mutually dependent area to be evaluated like teaching, scholarship and service. The faculty Portfolio and materials should comment on the short and long-term role of the faculty member. The College Promotion and Tenure Committee should have a basis for judging the goodness of fit between the faculty member's skills and Departmental, College, and University needs and immediate and long-term expectations. These considerations cut across teaching, scholarship, and service as demonstrated by the following examples:

1. Courses taught are required in the undergraduate and/or graduate curriculum.
2. Interest from students for whom the courses are intended.

3. Letters from employers of students attesting to students' preparedness to carry out tasks requiring skills taught in specific classes.
4. Research interests lending diversity to overall expertise of department
5. Expertise permitting mentoring of students in special areas of research
6. Areas of research complementing teaching mission of department, demonstrating the centrality of the candidate's scholarly work to the mission of the Department.
7. Service contributions enhancing the operation and reputation of the Department, College and University.
8. Service activities are consistent with expectations of faculty at a land, sea, and space grant public university.
9. Demonstration of ethical behavior in all university activities.
10. Ability to work collaboratively with colleagues.
11. Rapport with students and colleagues.
12. Continuous and consistent record of valuable contributions to the candidate's field.
13. Reliability and responsibility.
14. Commitment to and interest in the well being of the department, College, and university.
15. Collaborative contributions to teaching, scholarship, and service. Documentation must include a description of the candidate's contribution to each collaborative undertaking and the value of the collaborative effort itself relative to the university's teaching, scholarship, and service missions.

IX. Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

A. Role of the Department Chair

As specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Department Chair is a nonvoting member of the departmental Committee. The department chairperson is responsible for assembling and forwarding to the dean's office all material necessary for appointment, promotion, and tenure. This includes an independent appraisal of the faculty member's contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service for annual, third year, and mandatory sixth year review (or at the time of promotion and tenure if before the sixth year).

Before initiating an independent evaluation, the Chair must invite advice from faculty who are not included in the department P&T Committee. There are few other standardized procedures across the various CHHS departments; thus, the Chair's role varies depending on each department's promotion and tenure procedures. In preparing written materials for the Dean and

CHHS Committee, the department Chair must include a copy of the department's appointment, promotion, and tenure guidelines and procedures.

B. Departmental Evaluations and Recommendations

As per the Collective Bargaining Agreement, each department faculty shall establish a Promotion and Tenure Committee and appropriate procedures for that department. The CHHS Dean must approve guidelines and procedures for establishing the Committee and its procedures. Department procedures must meet or exceed those for CHHS as described in the present document.

C. CHHS Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure

The CHHS Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure must review all appointments, re-appointments, or promotions resulting in tenure, and all appointments (tenure track as well as non-tenure track) to the rank of associate professor and above. This is a standing committee of the College, with members elected by the faculty. Only CHHS faculty members with tenure may serve on the College committee.

Committee members serve a three-year term, but may be re-elected for additional terms. Each year the committee elects a Chair, who is preferably a full professor. If a full professor has not been voted to the committee, the members will elect a Chair from among current committee members.

The committee consists of four members, three of whom are permanent members with the fourth member serving as an alternate. The alternate replaces a permanent member when the latter is from the same department as that of a faculty member being reviewed for appointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

D. CHHS Dean

The Promotion and Tenure Statement, including supporting documentation received from the department, shall be reviewed independently by the CHHS Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Graduate Dean (when the candidate is a member of the graduate faculty), and the CHHS Dean. As specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, if the College Dean's or Graduate Dean's initial judgement does not agree with the recommendation of either or both the Department or CHHS Committees, the College or Graduate Dean must meet personally with the Committee to discuss the case before submitting a recommendation.

APPENDIX A

TIME DEADLINES

It is the responsibility of the department chairperson to inform the faculty member of the time deadlines associated with the promotion and tenure process. The department chairperson and the faculty member under review will determine their own schedule to meet the following deadlines:

December 15: The chairperson transmits to the dean an independent recommendation, along with the recommendation of the department Promotion and Tenure committee. The chairperson also informs the candidate of these recommendations in writing.

January 15: The CHHS P & T Committee submits its report and recommendations to the dean. The dean's office sends this recommendation, along with the corresponding promotion and tenure documents, to the Graduate College Dean if the candidate is, or will be, a member of the Graduate Faculty.

February 10: The CHHS Dean transmits a recommendation, as well as that of the CHHS Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure and the Graduate College dean (if required) to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The candidate, department chairperson, department appointment, promotion, and tenure committee, and the CHHS Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee will be informed of these recommendations in writing. If the dean's recommendation is negative, the statement will outline the basis for that recommendation.

March/April: The provost makes a recommendation and informs the candidate's dean. At this point, the dean is responsible for assuring that each faculty member who is denied is made aware of his or her right to request a review.

May/June: The president's recommendations are forwarded to the Academic Affairs Committee of the USNH Board of Trustees.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE LETTER #1 for EXTERNAL REVIEWERS (based on guidelines from VP of Academic Affairs)

Dear:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a reviewer for the Department of XXXXXX's Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee in its consideration of XXXXXX for tenure and promotion to the rank of XXXXXX.

I have enclosed a copy of XXXX's vita, publications, and other papers that represent his/her research activities. The Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee would appreciate your assessment of these (and any other) aspects of XXXX's research:

1. The overall program of research.
2. Evidence of an evolution in research skills.
3. Its relevance to the discipline and to health and human services.
4. Quality and sophistication of conceptualization, design, execution and analysis of research findings.
5. Quality of journals in which the research appears.
6. Impact on the discipline and field of study.
7. Impact on health and human service practices.

In addition, we would welcome your comments on other aspects of the candidate's work with which you have first-hand knowledge, such as teaching or professional service. It may be helpful for you to know that, in addition to expecting faculty members to maintain an active research program, the Department has a strong commitment to teaching and service. The typical teaching load in the Department is five courses per year. XXXX's teaching load over the past three years has averaged XXXXX courses.

In writing your evaluation, please emphasize strengths of XXXXX's record as well as any areas in which you think there are weaknesses. We specifically request that you do not make a recommendation about whether you believe XXXX would be granted tenure and promoted to the rank of XXXXX at your university or elsewhere.

It is our intention to keep your response confidential, which means only those with direct responsibility for the promotion process will see your letter. However, you should understand that the University policies allow candidates to know whose evaluations were solicited during the promotion and tenure process. Additionally, under recent legal precedents we, like any other college or university, may be required to disclose your evaluation along with other peer evaluation materials in the course of certain legal proceedings.

We will need your letter by no later than XXXX. If for any reason you are unable to meet this deadline, please notify us to that effect. Thank you for your willingness to serve as a reviewer. Please do not hesitate to call or e-mail me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

=====

SAMPLE LETTER #2
TEACHING

Dear UNH Student and Alumnus:

I am writing to ask your assistance in an important matter. The University of New Hampshire is currently considering the promotion of Dr. xxxxxx to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. As you may know, decisions about tenure are among the most significant in the life of a university and its faculty.

During your education at UNH, Dr. xxxxxx was an instructor in one or more of your courses. In order to give her candidacy the fullest consideration, we would appreciate your comments about her teaching ability, particularly her ability to present course material effectively and help you attain course objectives. If you have graduated from UNH, we would also appreciate your comments on how Dr. xxxxxx's teaching helped in your professional preparation. Finally, if Dr. xxxxxx has served as your academic advisor or thesis advisor, please comment on her effectiveness in these capacities.

I hope that you will be able to assist us by sending a letter to me at the address listed below. We will need to receive your letter as soon as possible, but please respond before November 1.

Under normal circumstances, your evaluation will not be shared with the candidate. Your letter will be forwarded as part of the candidate's materials for review by the College and university promotion and tenure committees. If the candidate initiates a legal challenge, then it is possible that your evaluation will be made available to the candidate and this person's attorney.

Your candid and detailed opinion is most important to us and to Dr. xxxxxx. Thanks in advance for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Dr. xxxxxx
Associate Professor

SAMPLE LETTER #3
SCHOLARSHIP

Dr. _____
Address

Dear Dr. _____

Thank you for your willingness to take time out of your busy schedule to write a letter of review regarding Dr. xxxxxxx, who is a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in the College of Health and Human Services. As a nationally and/or internationally known leader in the candidate's field, we value your input greatly. As I indicated in our telephone conversation, letters of review/evaluations from external experts play an important role in our promotion and tenure decision process.

To assist you in providing us with a useful evaluation of Dr. xxxxxxx's work, I am appending the following materials:

1. Dr xxxx's vita.
2. Copies of selected reprints from recent publications by the candidate.
3. Pertinent sections from the University of New Hampshire's *Procedures and criteria for promotion and/or tenure*.

Please assess the candidate in terms of your expectations for a faculty member of this rank and experience. You may wish to use one or more of the following criteria:

1. Importance of the candidate's work in the field of study
2. Quality
3. National and international reputation of candidate as an independent scholar or investigator
4. Promise of growth and continued productivity
5. Originality
6. Soundness of methodology
7. Writing style

We would also appreciate a copy of your curriculum vita for the benefit of reviewers from other fields who may not be familiar with your background and accomplishments. Comments relating to a personal relationship with the candidate detract from the value of the review, as do comments about the candidate's potential for promotion at your institution.

Under normal circumstances, your evaluation will not be shared with the candidate. Your letter will be forwarded as part of the candidate's materials for review by the College and university promotion and tenure committees. However, if the candidate initiates a legal challenge, then it is possible that your evaluation will be made available to the candidate and this person's attorney.

In order to expedite our deliberations, we look forward to receiving your evaluation

by October 19th. If for any reason you will be unable to provide an evaluation or cannot evaluation Dr. xxxx within this time frame, please contact me as soon as possible.

If I can provide additional information to you or answer any question, please do not hesitate to call. Thank you again for your service to the xxxxxxx Department, the College of Health and Human Services and the University of New Hampshire.

Sincerely,

Dr. xxxxx
Title and Address

SAMPLE LETTER #4
SERVICE

Dr. _____
Address

Dear Dr. _____

Dr. xxxx is seeking promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. In accordance with department and university policy, we are now evaluating his teaching, scholarship and service. Because he listed you as someone who worked with him on a committee or project, I am writing to ask if you would send a letter addressing his work on the _____ Committee.

If you agree, please address only the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's involvement or leadership. We ask you not to comment on whether or not he deserves promotion. Under normal circumstances, your evaluation will not be shared with the candidate. Your letter will be forwarded as part of the candidate's materials for review by the College and university promotion and tenure committees. If the candidate initiates a legal challenge, then it is possible that your evaluation will be made available to the candidate and this person's attorney.

I hope that you will be able to assist us by sending a letter to me at the address listed below. We will need to receive your letter as soon as possible, but please respond before November 1. Thank you for your help in this important process.

Sincerely,

Dr. xxxxx,
Title and Address