

# Appointment, Reappointment, Rank, and Tenure Policy

## School of Leadership and Education Sciences

### University of San Diego

Approved by SOLES Faculty May 16, 2007

#### I. THE FACULTY'S ROLE IN RANK AND TENURE DECISIONS

The University of San Diego maintains the quality of its faculty through objective and thorough appraisal by competent faculty members of each candidate for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The Rank and Tenure Committee of each school or college is given primary responsibility for this appraisal. The Committee's functions include the recognition and encouragement of each candidate's achievements (USD, 2.4.2, p. 1).

#### II. THE ARRT COMMITTEE'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- A. STRICT CONFIDENTIALITY is essential to the Committee's deliberations and recommendations. Committee members, and others with whom it is essential for the Committee to consult, must maintain confidentiality in all written and oral communications concerning the appraisal of candidates (USD, 2.4.2, p. 2).
- B. The Committee should strive for promptness and dispatch in the performance of its duties, consistent with judicious and thorough consideration of each case (USD, 2.4.2, p. 2).
- C. The Committee shall assess the evidence provided to it. If in the Committee's judgment the evidence is insufficient to permit it to make a clear recommendation to the President, the Committee's chair will request amplification from the candidate or from the recommending Department Chair or Dean (USD, 2.4.2, p. 2).
- D. Recommendations of the Committee form the basis of action by the President. The Committee's recommendation will include a statement of all significant evidence, favorable and unfavorable. Favorable recommendations require a two-thirds positive vote of Committee members present at the meeting when the vote is taken, with the additional requirement that the favorable votes constitute at least a simple majority of the possible votes of the total Committee membership (USD, 2.4.2, p. 2).
- E. The Committee will report its vote to the President. If its decision is not unanimous, the Committee's report may include separate concurring or dissenting opinions (USD, 2.4.2, p. 2).
- F. After notification of the President's decision, the Committee will send the candidate a copy of its recommendation and accompanying rationale (or summary of report) made to the President (USD, 2.4.2, p. 2).
- G. In May, the outgoing ARRT Committee Chair will review USD and SOLES policy changes from the previous year and update the SOLES appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion document as needed (SOLES 5/16/07).
- H. The Chair of the ARRT Committee will ensure that minutes of ARRT Committee meetings are recorded, approved by the Committee with any corrections noted, and maintained in the Dean's office (SOLES 5/16/07).
- I. The ARRT Committee will hold an annual meeting for tenure-track faculty members in

order to review submission procedures and guidelines, and to answer any questions related to the ARRT review process (SOLES 5/5/10).

### **III. ARRT COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

- A. The ARRT committee shall be composed of six tenured SOLES faculty members representing each of the four programs, one at-large position, and the SOLES Dean. Two elected, non-tenured faculty members will be present for policy meetings only. Tenured faculty representatives are elected to two-year staggered terms on the ARRT Committee. The at-large, Counseling, and Marital and Family Therapy representatives start their terms during academic years that begin in even-numbered years. The Leadership, and Learning and Teaching members start their terms in academic years that begin during odd-numbered years. Candidates for tenure and promotion are not eligible to serve on the committee in a year they file for tenure and/or promotion (SOLES 10/3/2000).
- B. The ARRT Committee for the following academic year will be elected at the May SOLES faculty meeting. At that time, the September ARRT meeting will be scheduled (SOLES 3/10/04).
- C. The Chair of the ARRT Committee will be elected by the members of the Committee at the May SOLES meeting. The Dean may not serve as Chair of the ARRT Committee (SOLES 3/10/04).

### **IV. ELIBILITY FOR PROMOTION**

- A. In general, an Assistant Professor is eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor no sooner than the tenure decision year. With limited exceptions, the rank of Associate Professor is conferred only upon faculty who have earned the terminal degree in their field. Faculty hired before September, 1997, may elect to be considered for promotion pursuant to the version of this paragraph in effect in the rules approved by the Board of Trustees (USD, 2.4.2, p. 4).
- B. In general, an Associate Professor is eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor after a minimum of five years of full-time service as Associate Professor, at least two years of which are spent at the University. The rank of Professor requires that significantly greater expertise and achievement be demonstrated by the faculty member and, with limited exceptions, is conferred only upon faculty who have earned the terminal degree in their field (USD, 2.4.2, p. 4).
- C. Exceptional performance or extraordinary conditions may warrant accelerated promotion (USD, 2.4.2, p. 5).
- D. In an exceptional case the ARRT Committee may initiate a recommendation for promotion (USD, 2.4.2, p. 5).
- E. A recommendation for promotion is based on positive evidence of professional performance and achievement. It is not justified by longevity or lack of negative indications. Therefore, promotion from one rank to another is not to be considered automatic (USD, 2.4.2, p. 5).
- F. Petition for Review of Non-Promotion. Appeals from decisions not to promote are governed by "Appeals from ARRT Decisions", with the following restriction: Negative decisions regarding promotion will be reviewed on appeal only in exceptional cases, since the normal recourse is to reapply (USD, 2.4.2, p. 5).

**V. ELIGIBILITY FOR TENURE**

- A. Tenure is permanence of appointment until retirement. A grant of tenure affirms that the candidate has contributed to the University throughout his or her probationary period and is valued as a permanent member of the University community (USD, 2.4.2, p. 5).
- B. Tenure must be granted after a probationary period of seven years of full-time service at the University. The faculty member shall be notified of the decision on tenure not later than the end of the sixth year of service (USD, 2.4.2, p. 5).
- C. Up to three years of previous full-time service at another institution may be counted as part of the probationary period. The Dean will state the amount of service accepted as part of the probationary period in writing at the time of the initial appointment (USD, 2.4.2, p. 5).
- D. In all cases there will be at least two full (non-expedited) ARRT Committee reappointment reviews before the tenure review (SOLES, 3/10/04).
- E. Scholarly leave of absence without pay for one year or less will not count as part of the probationary period unless the individual and the institution agree in writing to an exception to this provision at the time the leave is granted (USD, 2.4.2, p. 5).

**VI. REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE REVIEW TIMELINE**

**Under the biennial system, ARRT reviews of non-tenured faculty take place as follows:**

- A. Candidates not awarded prior years of service at another Institution or institutions:

<u>Candidate Year</u>	<u>Term Year</u>	<u>Type of Review</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
1	Fall	Expedited	2 <sup>nd</sup> year reappointment
2	Fall	Full	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year reappointment
3	Fall	Expedited	5 <sup>th</sup> year reappointment
4	Spring	Full	6 <sup>th</sup> year reappointment
5	Fall	Expedited	7 <sup>th</sup> year reappointment
6	Spring	Full	Tenure/Promotion (Tenure begins at the start of the 8 <sup>th</sup> year of service)

Candidates in their first, third, and fifth years of service follow an expedited review process. Instead of a complete file, candidates submit to the Dean, by December 1, a list of recent and current activities in teaching, scholarship, service, and support of the mission. The Dean attaches the list to a ballot that is sent to all tenure track faculty members. The faculty members vote either to reappoint the candidate or to have a full ARRT Committee review. Full reviews are triggered when voted for by one-third or more of the eligible tenure track faculty (not counting the candidate) (SOLES 10/1/2003).

- B. Candidates awarded one year of service at another institution or institutions.

<u>Candidate Year</u>	<u>Term Year</u>	<u>Type of Review</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
1	Fall	Expedited	2 <sup>nd</sup> year reappointment
2	Fall	Full	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year reappointment
3	Spring	Full	5 <sup>th</sup> year reappointment
4	Fall	Expedited	6 <sup>th</sup> year reappointment
5	Spring	Full	Tenure (Tenure begins at the start of the 7 <sup>th</sup> year of service)

C. Candidates awarded two years of service at another institution or institutions:

<u>Candidate Year</u>	<u>Term Year</u>	<u>Type of Review</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
1	Fall	Expedited	2 <sup>nd</sup> year reappointment
2	Fall	Full	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year reappointment
<u>Candidate Year</u>	<u>Term Year</u>	<u>Type of Review</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
3	Spring	Full	5 <sup>th</sup> year reappointment
4	Spring	Full	Tenure (Tenure begins at the start of the 6 <sup>th</sup> year of service)

D. Candidates awarded three years of service at another institution or institutions:

<u>Candidate Year</u>	<u>Term Year</u>	<u>Type of Review</u>	<u>Purpose</u>
1	Spring	Full	2 <sup>nd</sup> year reappointment
2	Spring	Full	3 <sup>rd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> year reappointment
3	Spring	Full	Tenure (Tenure begins at the start of the 5 <sup>th</sup> year of service)

## VII. PROCEDURES TO TRIGGER FULL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW IN PLACE OF EXPEDITED REVIEW (SOLES 3/10/04)

A. Full reviews for candidates in expedited review years can be initiated by any of the following methods:

1. The candidate, by written request to the Dean.
2. The ARRT Committee, through majority vote.

3. The Dean, by written request to the ARRT Committee.
4. Vote of one-third of the eligible tenure-track faculty in the SOLES (not counting the candidate).
5. Within one week of the tenured faculty vote, candidates will receive a letter from the ARRT chair informing them of the overall outcome of the vote. At the request of the candidate, the ARRT chair will include the number of votes received for expedited and full review(SOLES 5/16/07).

**VIII. EXTERNAL LETTERS OF REVIEW OF A CANDIDATE'S SCHOLARSHIP  
(SOLES, 5/29/03 and 5/16/07)**

As part of the dossier for tenure and/or promotion to associate or full professor, a candidate must include written evaluations of scholarship from external reviewers. The sending of the formal external review letter and candidate documentation will be completed by October 1<sup>st</sup>. The external reviewers will be informed that the review letter must be received at least 2 weeks prior to the university date for submission of documentation for tenure and/or promotion. This date is usually in January.

- A. Criteria for selection of External Reviewers: The majority of professionals recommended to serve as an external reviewer of a candidate's scholarship must be at or above the rank for which the candidate is seeking promotion.
- B. These letters are to be written by individuals that have the scholarly achievement and/or demonstrated expertise as scholarship is defined in the SOLES Statement on Scholarship.
- C. Identification of Potential External Reviewers: The candidate will produce a list of 7 potential outside reviewers. Information about each potential external reviewer must include reviewer name, rank or position, affiliation and any special titles along with a rationale for recommending this individual. The list of potential external reviewers (along with contact information) must be submitted to the Dean by August 1<sup>st</sup> of the review year. The Dean will provide the ARRT Committee Chair with the list of external reviewers to be contacted. The ARRT Committee will review the Dean's selections for approval at its first meeting in September.
- D. Soliciting External Reviewers: The Dean will contact each potential external reviewer to ask if he or she would be willing to serve as a reviewer of the candidate's scholarship. The potential external reviewer will be informed of the expectations of the evaluation review that is included in a letter addressed to the ARRT committee.
- E. Formal External Review Procedures: The Dean will provide each external reviewer with the candidate's Curriculum Vita, a representative sample of the candidate's work, a standard letter requesting commentary about a candidate's scholarship, a copy of the criteria for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and the SOLES statement on scholarship.  
  
Each reviewer will address his or her response to the chair of the ARRT committee. The sending of the formal external review letter and candidate documentation will be completed by October 1<sup>st</sup>. The external reviewers will be informed that the review letter must be received at least 2 weeks prior to the university date for submission of documentation for tenure and/or promotion. This date is usually in January.
- F. Policies Related to External Letters of Review of Scholarship Solicited by the Dean
  1. Candidates for tenure and promotion shall have samples of their work reviewed by at least three scholars solicited by the Dean from other institutions in the candidate's field

of expertise.

2. Letters should be addressed and sent to the ARRT Committee Chair. The ARRT Chair will provide the Dean with a copy of each letter.
3. Letters are confidential and available only to members of USD who are part of the ARRT process.

- G. Policies Related to Optional Letters of Review of Scholarship Solicited by Candidates:  
Candidates may solicit non-confidential reviews in addition to those solicited by the Dean. Candidate-solicited reviews will be kept separately from reviews solicited by the Dean and be identified specifically as candidate-solicited for the ARRT Committee.

## **IX. PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

### **A. General Procedures**

1. Prior to his or her appointment, each faculty member will have been given a copy of this Policy. Expectations and/or emphases not explicitly stated in this Policy (see Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion) will also have been brought to his or her attention in writing. These expectations and/or emphases should be brought to the attention of the Committee no later than the time the faculty member first becomes a candidate for review. (USD 2.4.2, p. 1)

Status with respect to rank and tenure is not altered by a faculty member's transfer between departments or schools within the university. (USD, 2.4.2, p. 1).

2. The process of evaluation for reappointment, promotion, or tenure is initiated and conducted by the relevant department or school [School of Leadership and Education Sciences] (USD, 2.4.2, p. 1).
3. The Committee reviews and makes recommendations to the President in all matters concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty candidates (USD, 2.4.2, p. 1).
4. The Dean will maintain a confidential archival file for all candidates evaluated by the ARRT Committee. After each review, copies of the ARRT Committee's letter to the President, the letter from the Dean to the ARRT Committee, confidential faculty letters to the ARRT Committee, confidential external review letters, and the ARRT Committee's letter to the candidate, will be placed in the candidate's ARRT file by the Dean. The Dean is responsible for bringing each candidate's archival file (if any) to the meeting at which he or she will be reviewed (SOLES. 3/10/04).
5. The President grants reappointment and promotion to faculty members. After notification to the Board of Trustees, the President grants tenure to faculty members (USD, 2.4.2, p. 1).

### **B. Initial Steps**

1. Each Dean and/or Department Chair is required to establish written procedures for the preparation of candidates' files, including recommendations and relevant supporting data (USD, 2.4.2, p. 2). Candidates should follow the written policies in preparing their materials for submission (SOLES, 5/16/07).
2. At the beginning of the academic year, each [the] Dean [in cooperation with the ARRT Committee Chair] will prepare a list of names of faculty eligible for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure [in SOLES] (USD, 2.4.2, p. 2, SOLES parenthetical insertions, 5/16/07). Once approved by the ARRT Committee, the list will be distributed to all tenure track faculty by the October faculty meeting for review and

correction, if necessary (SOLES 5/16/07).

3. A recommendation regarding reappointment, promotion, and tenure normally originates with the Department Chair or Dean. The recommendation should include a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's qualifications; evidence in support of that assessment; and the recommender's report of his or her consultation with faculty members of the candidate's department or academic unit, including any dissenting opinions (USD 2.4.2, p. 2).
4. Any faculty member who wishes to be considered for early tenure or full professor will notify the dean in writing by May 31<sup>st</sup> of the academic year prior to the anticipated review (SOLES 2/3/10).
5. Faculty members shall be given timely notice of when decisions affecting their reappointment, promotion, or tenure will be made, so that they will have adequate opportunity to prepare their file (USD, 2.4.2, p. 2). The ARRT Committee Chair will send a letter by the end of September to each candidate notifying them of their current status and file due dates (SOLES 5/16/07).
6. At a minimum, each candidate should provide a summary of course evaluations dating back to the previous promotion or date of hire (SOLES, 10/3/2000). The candidate should also include collegial evaluations of teaching that were conducted in the period since the last ARRT review. Collegial evaluation might take many forms, including peer observation of teaching, peer evaluation of course materials, evaluation of instructional contributions including the development of new courses and other program development activities, evaluation of student work artifacts, or other items (SOLES, 2/2/05).
7. At a minimum, each applicant should submit all publications since the date of his/her promotion or date of hire (SOLES, 10/3/00). [note: To abide by the tenure and promotion page limit, candidates may place publications in a separate binder. However, separate binders will not be forwarded to the President].
8. As part of the dossier for tenure and/or promotion to associate or full professor a candidate must include written evaluations of scholarship from external reviewers. The sending of the formal external review letter and candidate documentation will be completed by October 1<sup>st</sup>. The external reviewers will be informed that the review letter must be received at least 2 weeks prior to the university date for submission of documentation for tenure and/or promotion. This date is usually in January (SOLES, 5/29/03).
9. Candidate files will not contain letters from current students, whether solicited or unsolicited (SOLES, 5/5/04).
10. Whatever materials a candidate has turned in by the stated deadline for candidate submission of promotion and tenure materials shall be the content made available to faculty for their consideration. No materials are to be added to faculty-review materials after the candidate's submission deadline. However, candidates may submit supplementary material to the Dean's office after the deadline, with the understanding that these materials will be kept in an ARRT Committee notebook that will be utilized only by the ARRT Committee (SOLES, 12/7/07).
11. Recommendations concerning a candidate from Department Chairs, Program Directors, and/or the Dean in their capacities as such must be submitted to the Committee prior to the conclusion of their deliberations. These recommendations, including any amendments or additions to them by the recommender, must be included as part of the evidence provided by the Committee to the President. These recommendations should include a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's qualifications; evidence in support of that assessment; and the recommender's report of his or her consultation

with faculty members of the candidate's department or academic unit, including any dissenting opinions (USD, 2.4.2, p. 2).

12. The Dean shall write a letter regarding the candidate's performance, and forward it to the chair of the ARRT committee at least one week prior to the ARRT meeting. The Dean will outline his or her evaluation of the candidate's performance in each of the four areas (teaching, scholarship, service, and support of mission/values of the University), and whether or not they support the candidate's request for reappointment, rank, or tenure (SOLES, 2/28/01).

### C. Candidate Review Process

1. One week before candidates' files are due, the chair of the ARRT Committee will invite tenure track faculty in SOLES to submit evaluative letters for its review. The notice will include the date that the files will be available for viewing and the last day on which faculty letters may be submitted. The deadline for receipt of letters shall be one week before the meeting of the ARRT Committee. This will allow the faculty two weeks for reviewing the file and submitting letters. Letters should focus on the four ARRT criteria. The letters are confidential and for the ARRT Committee only. Information from the confidential letters, but not the letters themselves, can be included in the ARRT letter to the candidate. If information from confidential letters is included in the letter to the candidate, it must be done in such a way as to protect the identity of the writer. Confidential letters are not normally forwarded in the candidate's dossier to the President unless the President requests it. However, pertinent information may be shared, without identifying attributes, in the letter to the President. The letters are maintained in the Dean's office in a confidential file until two years after the candidate terminates her or his employment at USD (SOLES, 5/5/04).
2. Letters of Support Attesting to a Candidate's Areas of Contribution: In situations where a candidate has made a contribution in areas such as public policy, school governance, professional organization leadership, etc., he or she can solicit non-confidential letters from references that describe these contributions. All such letters should be addressed to the chair of the ARRT committee (SOLES 5/29/03, revised 5/16/07).
3. At least five members of the ARRT Committee must be present to constitute a quorum at the meeting (SOLES, 3/10/04).
4. ARRT members will review the candidate's materials and the Dean's letter prior to the ARRT meeting. The ARRT members will also review the University ARRT Guidelines and the SOLES ARRT Guidelines prior to attending the ARRT meeting (SOLES, 2/28/01).
5. The chair of the ARRT committee will run the ARRT meetings (SOLES, 2/28/01).
6. ARRT committee members will discuss the candidate's qualifications in the four areas. Discussion of the candidates will be confidential, and no part of the discussion will be shared with anyone outside of the ARRT meeting (SOLES, 2/28/01).
7. After the discussion of the candidate, ARRT members will vote on whether they will approve, disapprove, or abstain regarding the request by the candidate for reappointment, rank, or tenure. If the candidate is going forward for both rank and tenure, separate votes will be recorded for rank and tenure decisions (SOLES, 2/28/01).
8. Favorable recommendations require a two-thirds positive vote of Committee members present at the meeting when the vote is taken with the additional requirement that the favorable votes constitute at least a simple majority of the possible votes of the total Committee membership. A minimum of 4 votes is required to communicate a decision (SOLES, 3/10/04).



9. The ARRT committee will write a report to the President indicating whether or not they support the candidate's request for reappointment, rank, or tenure, and their reasons for their position. The memo will include the vote(s) for reappointment, rank, or tenure. The Dean's letter will be forwarded with the ARRT report to the President (SOLES, 2/28/01).
10. In addition to an overall vote for reappointment, rank, and tenure, ARRT members will be asked to vote on the level of performance of the candidate in each of the four areas (teaching, scholarship, service, and support of mission/values of the University). ARRT members will be asked to vote if the candidate's performance: 1) Exceeds expectations, 2) meets expectations, or 3) is below expectations. ARRT members may also abstain if they feel they cannot properly evaluate a candidate's performance in a particular area. A vote of "exceeds expectations" means the ARRT member believes the candidate's performance is especially meritorious and should get special recognition. A vote of "meets expectations" means the candidate's performance is solid. A vote of "below expectations" means the ARRT member has significant concerns about the candidate's level of performance, and that special attention should be paid in developing this area on the part of the candidate. Judgments as to whether or not the candidate meets, exceeds, or falls below expectations should take into consideration the candidate's level of experience (SOLES, 2/28/01).
11. The ARRT Committee will continue to send the *below, meets, exceeds* ratings to the candidates, but the ratings will not be reported to the President (SOLES, 3/10/04).
12. After notification of the President's decision, the Committee will send the candidate a copy of its recommendation and accompanying rationale (or summary of report) made to the President (USD 2.4.2, p. 3). The letter from the ARRT committee will include the following: 1) the frequency distribution of votes in each of the four areas; 2) whether or not the ARRT committee approved the request for reappointment, rank, or tenure; and 3) any written comments or feedback the ARRT committee believes are important for the candidate to know such as areas of strength or areas that need attention or development (SOLES, 2/28/01).
13. The Dean will provide the candidate a copy of his or her letter sent to the ARRT committee, or provide feedback to the candidate in some other form acceptable to the Dean and candidate (SOLES, 2/28/01).

#### **X. ADVERSE RANK AND TENURE DECISION**

- A. The appropriate administrative officer will give the candidate a written explanation of the reasons for denial of reappointment, promotion, or tenure (USD, 2.4.2, p. 3).
- B. A candidate may appeal the President's decision not to recommend reappointment, promotion, or tenure. Appeals are governed by "Appeals from ARRT Decisions" in section 2.4.6 of USD Policy (USD, 2.4.2, p. 3).

#### **XI. ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR REAPPOINTMENT DECISIONS**

- A. Reappointments may be for one year or other stated periods, subject to renewal. When the Committee has identified special concerns that may jeopardize future reappointment, the candidate should be informed in writing of those concerns at the time of reappointment (USD, 2.4.2, p. 3).
- B. Standards for Notice. Because a probationary appointment carries an expectation of renewal, notice of non-reappointment, or of intention not to recommend reappointment, will be given in writing according to the following (USD, 2.4.2, p. 4):

1. Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its termination.
2. Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if an initial two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, at least six months in advance of its termination.
3. At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years at the University.

## **XII. CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

The following criteria apply to the evaluation of faculty candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. They are meant to govern the evaluative processes of rank and tenure committee, and to give faculty candidates and understanding of University expectations with respect to these processes.

In the context of the employment decision for which they are being considered, candidates shall be judged on the basis of their performance in 1) teaching; 2) research, creative work and professional activity; 3) university and public service; and 4) support of the University of San Diego (USD 2.4.2, p. 6).

### **A. Teaching (USD 2.4.2, pp. 6-7).**

1. Effective teaching is an essential criterion of reappointment, promotion, and the granting of tenure. Evaluation of the effectiveness of teaching shall be based upon the candidate's total performance. This evaluation should include considerations such as command of the subject; continuous growth in the field; ability to organize and present materials; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; a spirit of enthusiasm which vitalizes teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students and to stimulate advanced students; fairness in grading, through both subjective and objective considerations; participation in the guidance and advising of students.
2. Consideration shall be given to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels.
3. The Committee will clearly indicate the evidence upon which the appraisal of teaching effectiveness has been based. The following evidence of teaching effectiveness is required:
  - a. colleague evaluation
  - b. student evaluation
  - c. self-evaluation

Other types of evidence may also be submitted as supporting teaching effectiveness. Examples of these types of evidence are the following:

- a. participation as a guest or public lecturer
- b. participation in team teaching
- c. development of new and effective means of instruction
- d. development of course materials.

### **B. Research, Creative Work and Professional Activity: In evaluating the candidate's publications**

or recognized artistic productions, the Committee should seek evidence of a productive and creative mind; and the candidate's professional activities should be examined for evidence of achievement and/or leadership in the field. Evidence of research, creative work, or professional activity is not limited to publications or presentations at meetings of professional associations. Contributions by the candidate in the form of publications and presentations for the advancement of scientific or other critical inquiry, professional practice, or education shall be judged research, creative work, and professional activity when (1) they develop new ideas, add to the knowledge of an academic discipline, or incorporate scholarly research, and (2) they are disseminated in academic or professional communities.

Publications and other creative accomplishments should be evaluated, not merely enumerated. Work in progress should be assessed whenever possible. When jointly authored work is presented as evidence, the Department Chair or Dean must establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in that joint effort. It should be recognized that special cases of collaboration occur in the performing arts and that the contribution of a particular collaborator may not be readily discernible by those viewing the finished work. When the candidate is such a collaborator, the Department Chair and Dean should evaluate the candidate's contribution and should provide outside opinions based on observations of the work while in progress (USD 2.4.2, pp. 7-8).

- C. Statement on Scholarship for the School of Leadership and Education Sciences (SOLES, 5/04/05)
- i. Values Statement Regarding Scholarship: Although pursuing scholarship may provide benefits to the individual (e.g., satisfy intellectual curiosity, help in achieving rank and tenure), we recognize that scholarship's primary value lies in its ability to advance the public good and one's profession. Therefore, candidates for promotion and tenure should be able to clearly articulate the foci and goals of their programs of scholarship as they relate to advancing the public good in the specific areas outlined below (knowledge base, teaching, practice, and policy). Further, we recognize that scholarship does not occur in a vacuum, and candidates should consider how their programs of scholarship work synergistically with the other criteria for promotion and tenure at USD (teaching, service, support for the mission and values).
  - ii. Definition: Scholarship is the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. Scholarship must reflect new knowledge, rather than a simple restatement of preexisting knowledge. New knowledge, however, can be created through synthesizing or integrating pre-existing knowledge in new or innovative ways. Scholarship should advance the knowledge base, teaching, practice, or policy within a profession or the public domain. Peer review is also an essential part of scholarship. Through peer review, others who are knowledgeable can help us (and the field) assess the extent to which a piece of work adds to the body of knowledge and is of potential value to the field.
    - a. Advancing the knowledge base – Scholarship that advances the knowledge base could take multiple forms including: empirical research, historical research, theory development and testing, methodological studies, synthesizing knowledge through literature reviews, or philosophical inquiry and analysis. Applying or integrating concepts and research from other disciplines can be another means of advancing the knowledge base of the profession.
    - b. Advancing Teaching – Scholarship can advance the way in which knowledge is taught or learned. Scholarship in this area would include: developing new or improved textbooks, developing new or innovative

approaches to teaching, assessment of new or current teaching practices, or studying the processes by which information is learned.

- c. Advancing Practice – Scholarship can advance the practice of a profession. Scholarship in this area can include: developing practice implications from research, developing new or innovative approaches to practice, developing new or improved methods of assessment, revising or developing new theories for practice, evaluating current or new practices, or advancing the ethical standards of practice within the profession.
- d. Advancing Policy – Scholarship can also advance policy within a discipline or the public domain. Scholarship in this area may include: critiquing an existing policy, evaluating the effectiveness of a current policy, or developing policy implications from research, theory, or historical analysis.

To qualify as scholarship, there must also be dissemination of the knowledge to the public and/or individual's profession. Dissemination could potentially take different forms, including:

- 1) Journal articles or monographs
  - 2) Books
  - 3) Presentations
  - 4) Assessment instruments
  - 5) Internet or websites (e.g., electronic journals, etc.)
  - 6) Policy papers
  - 7) Final public grant reports
- iii. Criteria for Assessment: It can be helpful to distinguish between the criteria for evaluating scholarship from the actual methods that we use to evaluate scholarship. No single criterion is adequate to measure scholarship, and some criteria may not apply in all cases. These criteria, to some extent, may overlap with one another. They include:
    - a. Is the information new or innovative? In other words, does it add to the field's body of knowledge? A literature review in an article, for example, should make the case that the article offers something new (and of potential value) to the body of knowledge.
    - b. What is the quality of the process through which the new information was derived? For an empirical study, this would likely be the methodological rigor of the study. For a non-empirical piece, does the author use other compelling logic or evidence to support his or her argument? The quality of the work is important because it can impact the credibility of the author's conclusions.
    - c. What was the quality of the review process? Did an informed and critical audience evaluate the work prior to the work being disseminated?
    - d. Does the new knowledge have potential value to others? In other words, what will be the impact of the work? Although this can be very difficult to predict in most cases, it is still a worthwhile question to ask regarding our scholarship. Will others benefit from this new bit of knowledge, or is it simply a trivial fact with little relevance?
    - e. How broadly will the information be disseminated? As a general rule, the broader the dissemination, the greater the potential the resulting work will have an impact. It may be possible to argue in some cases, however, that dissemination of a work to a smaller but influential target audience can produce greater impact.

- iv. Method of Assessment: The above criteria are difficult to measure. Efforts to assess scholarship can parallel the challenges that researchers face trying to define and operationalize constructs. No instrument is a perfect measure of the construct. These indicators, particularly in isolation, are not infallible. The faculty members under review should use the items listed below as a guideline for developing a case that they have met expectations in the area of scholarship.
  - a. Peer Review – It is important to assess whether or not a piece of work was peer reviewed, and the quality of that review process. Assessing the quality of review may mean looking at several questions. How many individuals reviewed the work? Was the work reviewed on a local, regional, national, or international level? To what extent is there evidence that the reviewers are recognized for their knowledge in the area? What is the acceptance rate of the journal or conference (where applicable)?
  - b. Selectivity of Publisher or Journal – The selectivity of a publisher or journal can be an indicator of quality. Since more prestigious journals generally receive a higher volume of submissions, they can usually be more selective in what they publish. Thus, the acceptance rate of a journal or publisher can be an indicator of the quality of scholarship.
  - c. Evidence of Impact through Breadth of Dissemination – In general, scholarship that reaches a broader audience has the potential to make a greater impact. The greater the exposure, the more opportunity there will be for individuals to use or apply the ideas from the scholarship to make an impact. Breadth of dissemination could be measured in different ways. The number of books sold or the circulation of a journal could be used to measure breadth of dissemination for books and journals. Other measures may be appropriate for less traditional forms of scholarship (e.g., number of hits for a website that qualifies as scholarship).
  - d. Number of Citations – Another potential measure of impact may be the number of times a work is cited by others. Since few pieces of work are widely cited, this may be a rather high standard to hold. Yet, those pieces of work that are widely cited can be clearly recognized as having an impact.
  - e. Other Measures of Impact – In some cases, other means of measuring impact may be appropriate beyond those stated above. It may be possible, for example, for an individual to document how his or her scholarship has influenced teaching or practice within a discipline. Or, an individual might be able to document how his or her scholarship has influenced legislation or policy.
- v. Scholarship's Relationship to the Other Criteria
  - a. Relationship to Teaching – The Teacher-Scholar model implies that scholarship is both distinct and an integral part of teaching. To best prepare our students for their professions, we need to educate them on the most recent knowledge in the field. Being active scholars helps us infuse the most recent knowledge and practices into our teaching. Insights gained from teaching, similarly, can become the impetus for scholarship, particularly in advancing the scholarship of teaching.
  - b. Relationship to Service – Although scholarship is a criterion for achieving rank and tenure, we believe its primary value is in its ability to advance one's profession or the public good. If scholarship is pursued in this spirit, then scholarship can be viewed as a means of providing service to others.

- c. Relationship to Mission & Values – We recognize that scholarship is a value-based endeavor. We believe that the Mission and Values of the University of San Diego should inform our scholarship. Our scholarship should also be informed by the ethical and professional standards within our particular fields. We will also strive to respect the dignity and rights of those involved in our scholarship (e.g., research participants, students, co-authors, or others).

- D. University and Public Service: The faculty plays an important role in formulating and administering the policies of the University. Recognition should therefore be given to scholars who prove themselves to be able administrators and who participate effectively in faculty government and the formulation of departmental, school or college, and university policies. Services by members of the faculty to the University, community, state, and nation, both in their special capacities as scholars and in areas beyond those special capacities, should likewise be recognized.

Similarly, the following should be given recognition: contributions to student welfare through service on student-faculty committees and as advisor to student organizations; extraordinary recruiting or fundraising activity; special lectures; public relations activities; other services to the university community, such as arranging cultural, social, and educational events for faculty and students (USD 2.4.2, p. 8).

- E. Support of the University of San Diego: Faculty members support the spiritual and moral orientation of the University of San Diego through their respect for Catholic Christianity and their recognition that the spiritual and moral aspects of the students' lives are significant. They have a sense of responsibility and concern towards the entire University community. (USD 2.4. 2, p. 9).

### **XIII. TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT** (USD, 2.4.2, pp. 9-11)

- A. Termination by a Faculty Member: Faculty members may terminate their appointments effective at the end of an academic year, provided that they give notice in writing of their intention to resign or of negotiations that may lead to their resignation. Notice should be given at the earliest possible opportunity, in no event by the later of (1) May 15 or (2) thirty days after receiving notification of the terms of the appointment for the coming year. The University will attempt to accommodate requests for waiver of the notice requirement in cases of hardship or of substantial professional advancement or other opportunity; its faculty members, however, should abide by the University's decision.
- B. Termination by the Institution: The University may terminate a faculty member for reasons of retrenchment, medical or disability reasons, or serious cause.
  1. Retrenchment. The University may terminate a faculty member because of retrenchment: a reduction of faculty due to financial exigency or to discontinuance of a department or program for reasons of non-financial exigency. Retrenchment terminations (including appeal procedures) are covered in detail in the Faculty/Administrator Handbook.
  2. Medical or Disability Reasons. Consistent with applicable laws, the University may terminate a faculty member because of a medical or disability condition that substantially precludes the faculty member from fulfilling the terms of his or her appointment.

Termination of an appointment with tenure, or of a probationary or special appointment before the end of the period of appointment, for medical or disability reasons will be based on clear and convincing evidence that the faculty member cannot

continue to fulfill the terms and conditions of his or her appointment in whole or in significant part. The University's decision to terminate will be reached only after:

- a. Any medical leave has been exhausted; and
- b. The University and faculty member have made efforts, appropriate to the faculty member's medical problem or disability, to explore alternatives to termination (such as retirement, transfer from full-time to part-time teaching, etc.) and to accommodate the faculty member's medical problem or disability.

The faculty member, or the representative or conservator of the faculty member, must be informed of the basis of the proposed termination and must be afforded the opportunity to present the faculty member's position and to respond to the evidence on which the University bases the proposed termination.

If the faculty member so requests, the decision to terminate for medical reasons may be appealed in accordance with the procedures established for appeals of other matters in this Policy. (See Section II.D in USD policy)

3. Serious Cause. The University may dismiss a faculty member for violation of professional ethics as described in the 1987 AAUP Statement on Professional Ethics [addendum 1 to this Policy]. Examples of such violations include gross professional incompetence, continued neglect of academic duties or responsibilities, exploitation of students for private advantage, dishonesty in scholarship, and conviction of a felony.

Dismissal for serious cause (including appeal procedures) is covered in detail in this document. Dismissal for serious cause will not be used to restrain faculty members in their exercise of academic freedom.

#### C. Severance Pay or Termination Notice

- i. If the appointment is terminated, the faculty member will receive severance pay or termination notice in accordance with the following schedule:
  - a. At least three months if the final decision is reached by March 1 (or three months prior to the expiration) of the first year of probationary service;
  - b. At least six months if the decision is reached by December 15 of the second year (or after nine months but prior to the expiration of eighteen months) of probationary service;
  - c. At least one year if the decision is reached after eighteen months of probationary service or after the faculty member has tenure.

This provision for severance pay or termination notice need not apply in the event that there has been a finding that the conduct which justified dismissal involved moral turpitude as described in paragraph 3 of Section 9, 1970 Interpretive Comments on the AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

- ii. In accordance with the appeals procedure (see Section II.D) and/or on the recommendation of the President, the Board of Trustees may take into account the length and quality of service of the faculty member in determining what, if any, payments will be made beyond the effective date of dismissal.