3. Faculty

3.1 Appointments

3.1.1 Tenure and Tenure-Track
Tenure is an attainment by those who have demonstrated the qualifications required for acceptance as permanent faculty member. It is a significant career recognition extended by the University. The quality of universities and their programs is inextricably linked with their tenure decisions. Since the awarding of tenure requires an assessment balancing the quantitative and qualitative efforts of the candidate, no formula defining a set number of publications, amount of service, or other objective measures has been established by the College.

3.1.2 Consecutive Term
Consecutive term appointments are not intended to fulfill departmental needs that require the permanence of a full-time, tenure-track faculty member. They are meant to serve short-to-mid-term needs brought about by special circumstances, for example, hybrid teaching-staff positions, or the replacement of a tenured faculty member who has been called to serve in the administration, but who retains his or her place as a tenured member of a department, and who could return to that position.

Unless otherwise stated in this Handbook, Consecutive Term Faculty have the same rights and responsibilities as tenure-track/probationary faculty. They vote in Department, College, and University elections, serve on committees, and teach a course load equivalent to tenure-track faculty. In addition, they are eligible for the same travel support and grant consideration as tenure-track faculty, as well as promotion and sabbatical. Like all fully credentialed faculty, they are also part of the salary pool and eligible for raises at the same scale as tenure-track faculty. Thus, the only difference between tenure-track faculty and consecutive term faculty is that consecutive term faculty cannot be granted tenure, though the position may be converted to tenure-track with approval through appropriate channels.

3.1.3 Probationary Appointments

3.1.3.1 Initial Tenure-Track Appointments
Initial tenure-track faculty appointments will generally be made on a probationary basis, subject to annual evaluation to determine whether reappointment is warranted. Reappointment decisions will be made under the review procedures set forth in Sections 3.3.2 and 3.3.3, and based on the Criteria for Review of Faculty Performance set forth in Section 3.4.

To ensure an adequate and fair review, tenure-track faculty members shall be noticed of the procedures to be followed and the criteria to be applied in the annual review/promotion process. To the extent a Department adopts departmental-level review or assessment policies, procedures, or criteria applicable to annual, promotion, or tenure reviews, they must be readily available and drawn to the attention of the tenure-track faculty member. Notice of such review procedures and criteria will be satisfied by providing a copy or URL link of the College Handbook and any Departmental procedures to the tenure-track faculty member at or around the time of initial appointment.

A tenure-track faculty member’s probationary period may not exceed seven full-time years of service, at Drake University or otherwise. Up to three years of “credit” on the probationary track may be granted for full-time service with the rank of instructor or higher in university-level appointments in other institutions, provided that the amount of credit for previous service is established at the time of initial appointment and specified in the written initial appointment...
letter. Four years of service at Drake is required prior to granting tenure, except with the special approval of the Board of Trustees.

Tenure-track faculty members are eligible, when experiencing a life event as defined by the Academic Charter, to request one or more one-year extensions of their probationary period as set forth in the University Academic Charter.

Annual renewal of an appointment during the probationary period is not, in and of itself, an assurance of an eventual award of tenure. At the end of the probationary period of service, the faculty member will be notified that he/she will be awarded either tenure or a one-year terminal contract.

3.1.32. Initial Consecutive Term Appointments
Initial consecutive term appointments (non-tenure) track are renewable on an annual basis. A consecutive term appointment may continue as long as the annual contract is renewed by the College. The Dean will have the authority to negotiate, within existing University policy, the level of the initial appointment for faculty with prior non-tenure or other relevant experience. The initial letter of appointment should specify the years of previous promotion-relevant experience being credited to the faculty member in regards to promotion.

To ensure an adequate and fair review, consecutive term faculty members shall be notified of the procedures to be followed and the criteria to be applied in the annual review/promotion process. To the extent a Department adopts departmental-level review or assessment policies applicable to annual, promotion, or tenure reviews, procedures, or criteria, they must be readily available and drawn to the attention of the consecutive term faculty member. Notice of such review procedures and criteria will be satisfied by providing a copy or URL link of the College Handbook and any Departmental procedures to the consecutive term faculty member at or around the time of initial appointment.

3.2 Promotion in Rank
Faculty members in the College have eligibility for promotion as follows:

- From Instructor to Assistant Professor: Upon the Dean’s receipt of official notice that all requirements of the degree in the specific program have been satisfied.
- From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: Six Years
- From Associate Professor to Professor: Six Years

At the beginning of each academic year, the dean of the college, in consultation with the Provost and department chairs as appropriate, shall provide department chairs with the names of faculty members whose years of service in rank qualify them for consideration for promotion. Tenure-track faculty may request from the dean a one-year exception to the six-year requirement for eligibility for promotion, based on unusual circumstances.

Credit towards promotion may be granted for full-time service in rank in another institution; however, such credit should be specified in the initial appointment letter.

3.3 Annual Review, Tenure, and Promotion Procedures

3.3.1. Review Committees
3.3.11. Department Review Committee(s)
All available tenured members of a department/program shall constitute the Department Review Committee of candidates for tenure. Departments/programs with two or fewer tenured faculty members shall add tenured faculty members from outside the department so that the review committee shall have at least three members.

In the case of review for promotion, the department shall determine who serves on the Department Review Committee. However:

- When considering promotion to associate professor, the Department Review Committee shall consist of at least three tenured members of the department. If this is not possible, the chair of the department must work with the Dean to find tenured faculty from other departments within Arts and Sciences to serve on the candidate’s committee. If a candidate’s position is spread among multiple department or programs, the composition of the Department Review Committee must reflect the conditions of appointment, and will be worked out in consultation with (and approved by) the dean.

- When considering a promotion to professor, at least three faculty at the rank of professor, drawing such faculty from outside the department and from a related field if necessary, must be on the Department Review Committee.

3.3.11. Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee
The purpose of the College of Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee (herein “P&T Committee”) is to formally review all departmental-level recommendations for or against tenure or promotion and make recommendations to the Dean consistent with the procedures set forth herein.

Each academic year, the Dean shall call an initial meeting of the P&T Committee to elect a committee chair, to review procedures, and to outline the committee’s workload. The dean shall be present as an observer at the subsequent meetings of the committee.

3.3.1. Requirements for All Reviews and Evaluations

3.3.21 University Policies. All evaluation procedures and practices must comply with the established equal employment policy of the University and with the university bylaws, academic charter, and faculty manual. The term “department” in this handbook also refers to programs that have their own chair or director.

3.3.22 Department Standards/Procedures In order to ensure adequate and fair reviews following initial appointment, the College shall maintain an up-to-date copy of this Handbook on the College’s website, and for ready access by all faculty members. To the extent any Department adopts departmental-level review or assessment policies, procedures, or criteria applicable to annual, promotion, or tenure reviews, the Department must:

a) obtain the approval of the College Dean before adoption;
b) make the procedures readily available to new and continuing faculty, with such requirement being met by providing a copy or URL link of the procedures document to each department faculty member; and
c) reasonably and promptly noticing all departmental faculty of any revisions to the procedures.
3.3.23. Faculty Responsibility. Faculty are responsible for knowing the Criteria for Review of Faculty Performance (see Section 3.4 below) and for presenting a record of achievement within these criteria during the applicable review or evaluation. Any exceptions to or exemptions from the criteria and standards shall be recorded in writing.

3.3.3. Annual Review of Probationary (Tenure-Track) and Consecutive Term Faculty

3.3.31. Procedures
Review of probationary (i.e. tenure-track) and consecutive term faculty leading to recommendations for reappointment or non-reappointment will occur each year of the probationary period.

The annual review commences with the faculty member submitting a written record of their activities and accomplishments to the department, consistent with the evaluative criteria set forth under Section 3.6. In order to do so, the faculty member shall use the College’s Professional Activities Record (PAR) form to submit this written record, which shall be available from all administrative assistants or otherwise upon request. Faculty must submit the PAR to his/her department chair by January 15, with the exception of second-year faculty, who must submit the PAR to his/her department chair by November 1.

Initial responsibility for evaluation of the performance of the faculty members rests with the department chair; however, all tenured faculty in the department must participate in the annual review, allowing those who are on sabbatical or other leaves of absence and those in their final year before retirement to be excused. The department must consider evaluations of teaching performance by students and peers conducted consistent with Section 4.7 of this Handbook, as well as the faculty member’s PAR.

The chair, or another faculty member specified by the department, must then write an evaluative memorandum recommending reappointment or non-reappointment of the tenure-track faculty member. This memo should provide thorough comments evaluating teaching, scholarship and service. (Note: The purpose for the annual evaluation is to guide the candidate towards tenure; the department will carefully and critically analyze the candidate’s teaching, mentoring, research and service activities, and will comment upon the candidate’s progress towards tenure. While it is important to describe the positive progress of the candidate towards tenure, it is crucial that the department also explicitly point out areas for improvement.) The department shall use the Professional Activities Evaluation form (PAE) in preparing its memo. The PAE presenting the recommendation to the Dean should record who participated in making the recommendation, and the recommendation should be signed by all tenured faculty (person on sabbatical or other leaves of absence may be excused).

The PAE shall be provided to the faculty member and the Dean of the College by no later than February 15, or by November 15 for second-year faculty.

- In the event of a recommendation not to reappoint, the department shall give the faculty member the option to request reconsideration of its decision. The faculty member must submit the request for reconsideration within five calendar days of receiving the department’s negative recommendation, and the department shall make a decision on the request for reconsideration within five calendar days of receipt of the reconsideration request. The department’s decision on the request for reconsideration shall be in writing, signed by all those who participated in the reconsideration decision, and provided to the faculty member and the Dean of the College.
• In all annual reviews, the Dean of the College shall review (1) the PAR and PAE, and (2) the reconsideration request and decision, if applicable, and issue a written decision to the faculty member and department affirming or rejecting the department’s recommendation for reappointment by no later than March 1, or by December 15 for second year faculty. The Dean has the discretion, but not the obligation, to request additional information or materials from the department and/or faculty member in reaching his/her decision. Conferences between the Dean and the department chair about recommendations regarding reappointment or non-reappointment is desirable in all instances.

Recommendations affecting third-year faculty are regarded as particularly critical. Persons for whom the eventual attainment of tenure and/or promotion is regarded as at all problematical should not be recommended for reappointment at any stage, but particularly not at this time.

Note: Section 3.3.31 does not apply to tenure-track faculty in the year in of mandatory tenure review, typically the sixth year in the tenure track. Such faculty members’ review will be conducted under the procedures for tenure review set forth under Section 3.3.41.

3.3.32. Expectations of Probationary (Tenure-Track) in Annual Reviews
Throughout the probationary period, the faculty member should build a case for tenure in terms of the evaluative criteria set forth in Section 3.4, and the College should provide feedback at each evaluation period. Note that since growth as a teacher, scholar, and collegial contributor is expected, a performance judged to be excellent in the first year and second year will not necessarily satisfy expectations in later years.

The First Year: In the first year, evaluation focuses principally on teaching performance. If problems are apparent or difficulties are encountered but are judged to be correctable, then the faculty person is advised to find ways of improving teaching effectiveness. Student assessments of teaching effectiveness are required, and the counsel of colleagues in the department should be sought. Grant proposals for support of scholarly or artistic work should be initiated if appropriate. Service beyond departmental involvement and participation in basic College activities is generally not expected.

The Second Year: Teaching effectiveness remains a major focus of concern. There should be clear progress toward overcoming previous difficulties and continued good performance overall. In the second year, probationary faculty should show some progress in establishing a record of productive scholarship and creative activity. The beginnings of a service record should also be indicated, including student advising.

The Third Year: A balance in the teacher/scholar or teacher/artist role should be well established. Any teaching problems should now be largely overcome and there must be little doubt about solid teaching effectiveness. There can be no grounds for reservations about the performance and promise of the individual as a contributing teacher/scholar or teacher/artist in the College community. The role of the faculty member in the department and the College is an important part of the evaluation process because each faculty member is expected to be an active teacher/scholar or teacher/artist involved in service to the College and University communities.

The Fourth and Fifth Years: These reviews are considered “pretenure” reviews. In both quantitative and qualitative terms, the faculty member must present a close approximation of fitness for tenure. He or she must provide clear evidence that a high level of performance has been attained. Any teaching deficiencies or weaknesses must have been overcome. Actual
scholarly or artistic accomplishment should replace the indications of promise that were acceptable at earlier stages. The faculty member should also be building a record of service. Probationary faculty members should be aware that in the initial years in the tenure track their annual reviews are largely, though not exclusively, formative in character. The principal purpose of the reviews is to provide guidance and direction. Through the years in probationary status, the reviews incorporate a greater measure of summative considerations, as increasing attention is given each year to assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the person being reviewed, with the purpose of providing advice on the prospects of eventual tenurability. These probationary reviews, however, do not prejudge the recommendations of the department, Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee, or the Dean of Arts and Sciences in the reviews taking place in the final tenure year.

Note: This Section 3.3.32 is intended to provide guidance on expectations for the benefit of educating new faculty. It is not binding in the case of any annual review and circumstances may warrant different considerations.

3.3.4. Promotion and Tenure Review

3.3.41 Tenure Review Procedures
The tenure review occurs in the mandatory year of tenure review set forth in the faculty member’s appointment letter, typically the sixth year in the tenure-track. Tenure (and/or promotion) can be awarded only when a clear and convincing case supports such a decision.

Departmental Level Review and Recommendation
For each tenure candidate, the Dean will establish a timetable for the tenure review. Ordinarily, the department’s review and recommendation will be completed by October 1.

The tenure review commences with the submission of a set of credentials to the department chair by the faculty member, consistent with Section 3.3.42. The department chair shall provide the candidate's credentials to the chair of the Department Review Committee and shall convene that Committee to discuss those credentials. The faculty member being reviewed for tenure shall also be invited to appear before the Department Review Committee.

In its deliberations, the Department Review Committee must consider:

- The criteria to be used for tenure review are the evaluative criteria set forth in Section 3.4, as supplemented by the department’s own statements and standards;
- Evaluations of teaching performance by students and peers consistent with Section 4.7 of this Handbook;
- The faculty member’s submitted credentials consistent with Section 3.3.43; and
- Three or four letters of review from persons outside the University who are in a position to speak about the significance and promise of the candidate’s work on scholarship/creative activity, and who have a personal relationship with the candidate of such a nature that the external reviewer can be expected and assumed to provide an objective review of the candidate’s work. The letters shall be obtained as follows:
Both the department and candidate can suggest persons to serve as reviewers. The department, in consultation with the candidate, shall develop the final list of reviewers.

The candidate for tenure must be required to submit a statement in which the candidate briefly explains and discloses his/her personal and/or professional relationship with each prospective reviewer.

Reviewers shall not include those who served as dissertation director, thesis director, major advisor for post-doctoral research, a close acquaintance, or direct collaborator of the candidate.

Persons solicited for these reviews of scholarly/creative work should be provided with the necessary materials and the time to complete such reviews before the Department Review Committee begins its consideration of the candidate.

Correspondence with reviewers should urge that the candidate's scholarly or creative work be considered in the context of the primary emphasis Drake places upon teaching. A copy of the department’s letter soliciting the review should be included with the materials submitted along with a copy of the vita of the reviewer.

All persons so solicited should be made aware that the candidate may see these letters when they are included in the file, unless he or she has waived the right to see them.

In the event of a positive recommendation by the Department Review Committee for tenure, its recommendation and all documentation considered by the Department Review Committee in reaching its recommendation (including the external review letters), shall be forwarded to the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee.

In the event of a negative recommendation, the chair of the Department Review Committee shall write to the faculty member stating (1) the faculty member is not being recommended for tenure, and (2) the Department Review Committee's reasons for the negative recommendation.

- Reconsideration. Within ten business days of receiving the negative recommendation, the faculty member may request a reconsideration. If so, the Department Review Committee shall reconsider its recommendation, including scheduling a time for the faculty member to appear before the Department Review Committee to provide his or her perspective on the initial negative recommendation. The Department Review Committee shall make a decision on the request for reconsideration within ten business days of receipt of the request for reconsideration.

- College-Level Submissions. Should the negative recommendation of the Department Review Committee stand, the faculty member may submit an additional written statement to the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee, putting forth grounds for a positive recommendation for tenure. The Department Review Committee shall also then submit to the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee a detailed account of its proceedings, including
an anonymous tally of the vote, and a statement of its reasons for the negative decision. The Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee shall then consider all such materials in its review and recommendation of the faculty member for tenure.

Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee Review and Recommendation

The Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee (herein “P&T Committee”) shall review the recommendation, credentials, and other applicable relevant materials of each candidate for tenure as follows:

1. For each meeting to review candidates, the P&T Committee shall maintain minutes of its proceedings, showing all motions, recording all votes (which are registered by secret ballot), and noting the principal areas discussed regarding each candidacy. Verbatim minutes are not required.

2. P&T Committee members who have participated in annual reviews of a candidate who is before the P&T Committee shall absent themselves from discussion and debate when that candidate is under consideration and shall not participate in those discussions in any way, including the final vote. Associate professors may not serve on the P&T Committee during the year they apply for promotion.

3. Unless otherwise excepted, attendance will be required of all members at all meetings in which candidacies are considered. Phone or computer-aided attendance may be occasionally permitted by the P&T Committee Chair in rare situations. Only in extraordinary circumstances will a member be excused, such as a member’s extended illness occurring too late in the process to select a substitute, or agreement by the P&T Committee that a conflict of interest exists for a member involving a case under consideration. In such cases, this absence must be approved by the Chair and must be indicated in the P&T Committee’s minutes.

4. Prior to the consideration of each candidate, the Dean or designee will provide the members of the P&T Committee with access to: (1) any departmental statement of criteria and procedures consistent with Section 3.3.22; (2) the candidate’s initial letter of appointment; (3) the candidate’s PAEs; (4) the candidate’s submitted credentials; (5) the Department Review Committee’s recommendation, including any record of proceedings as applicable for negative recommendations; and (6) any response to the Department Review Committee’s recommendations as permitted by these procedures.

5. The deliberation of the P&T Committee regarding a candidate shall be conducted as follows:

   i. A secretary pro tem shall be designated for each candidate. The secretary maintains an informal record of the issues. This will include a log of questions the P&T Committee may wish to ask of the candidate’s chair.

   ii. All members of the P&T Committee read and review the teaching, scholarship, and service record of the candidate, as reflected in the materials submitted to the P&T Committee.

   iii. The P&T Committee will not compare candidates, except for consistency in writing the final letters.
iv. The P&T Committee may request a meeting with the candidate’s chair to answer questions the P&T Committee has generated during its discussions of the candidate. A copy of the questions should be sent to the chair in advance of the meeting. If the P&T Committee has no questions for the department, the chair will be given the option not to meet with the committee. The meeting with the chair generally will occur after initial review and discussion of the individual’s candidacy.

v. The P&T Committee may request from the candidate or the candidate’s chair any materials it has not received. It may also request other materials it deems relevant to its discussion with the candidate’s chair, including the candidate’s course evaluations from her/his first or second year.

   a. If materials are not supplied or if the department does not appear to be adhering to departmental or college review procedures, a candidate’s file review may be postponed to a subsequent year. This decision shall only be made in consultation with, and with approval of, the Dean.

vi. Following full discussion of the materials and after meeting with the candidate’s department chair if needed, a preliminary, non-binding vote is taken regarding the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion. The secretary pro tem then drafts a clear, formal statement of the P&T Committee’s preliminary recommendation and rationale on the candidate, and the draft statement will be edited and refined by P&T Committee members in a group session.

6. After considering all candidates, the P&T Committee will review its preliminary recommendations and affirm or amend them with a final vote. In other words, all actions until the final vote is taken are tentative. The P&T Committee’s work is not completed until the Chair and all its members review the recommendations on all the candidates and attest to their accuracy by signing the appropriate recommendation form. In the event of a tie vote of the Committee, the recommendation is negative.

7. The Dean will be present at all meetings of the P&T Committee as an observer rather than a participant. The Dean may, however, be invited to provide information concerning the candidates.

8. All aspects of the P&T Committee’s work—the discussions, debates, votes, preliminary recommendations/rationales, and materials reviewed—are confidential.

The P&T Committee’s final recommendation/rationale on each candidate shall be sent to the Dean, along with the numerical vote for the P&T Committee’s recommendation. The same recommendation rationale, minus the numerical vote on the P&T Committee’s decision, shall also be sent to the candidate via email and within four business days of the date it is delivered to the Dean. The faculty member may submit a response to the recommendation/rationale within two weeks of receipt. If a response is submitted, the Dean must consider it and retain a copy in the tenure materials accompanying the Dean’s recommendations to the Provost.

Dean Recommendation
The Dean, upon receiving the recommendations from the P&T Committee, shall consider them in the light of her or his own review of each candidate’s credentials and record of performance. The Dean may be given an opportunity to question the P&T Committee concerning its recommendations, after they have been presented, in order to gain information to be used in forming her or his independent judgment on the strengths of the candidates.
The Dean shall submit to the Provost his or her recommendations for action on each candidate. Each recommendation must include (1) a copy of the P&T Committee’s recommendation/rationale, with notes on whether the Dean concurs or differs from the recommendation/rationale of the P&T Committee, and (2) any response to the recommendation/rationale timely submitted by the faculty member. The Provost may meet with the P&T Committee to discuss any recommendation/rationale about which the Provost may have questions.

If the Dean determines that the candidate does not merit tenure, the Dean must specifically inform the candidate of that determination. The candidate may appeal the Dean’s negative tenure decision to the Provost within two weeks of the notification of the decision of the Dean. The Provost’s review will be carried out in line with the University Academic Charter and other applicable policies and procedures.

**University Decision**

Positive recommendations from the dean must be approved by the Provost and sent to the President who submits it to the Board of Trustees for approval. If the University grants tenure, the faculty member shall be afforded the full rights and privileges of tenured faculty. If the University does not grant tenure, the faculty member shall be given a terminal contract. If the candidate chooses to appeal the University decision, the appeal will be carried out in line with the University Academic Charter, Section VIII.

**3.3.42 Promotion Review Procedures**

The procedures for promotion shall be the same as those for tenure, set forth above in Section 3.3.41, with the following exceptions and/or additions:

1. If a candidate is not recommended for promotion by both the P&T Committee and the Dean, the recommendation shall not be submitted to the Provost. Instead, the faculty member shall not be granted promotion, and is eligible to re-apply for promotion the next academic year, or any year thereafter.

2. If the University does not grant promotion, the candidate is eligible to re-apply for promotion the next academic year, or any year thereafter.

3. Promotion to the Rank of Professor:
   a. The candidate will notify the department/program chair of intent to seek promotion to professor by October 1 of the year before submitting materials.
   b. The Departmental Review Committee should arrange to carry out observations of classroom teaching, as well as review student evaluation forms, for all courses taught in each of the two semesters prior to consideration for promotion. If the department/program has accumulated systematic data on teaching effectiveness equal to these requirements, that may be used instead of observations.
   c. The external evaluative review letters must hold an academic or professional rank equal to that to which the candidate aspires.

**3.3.43 Faculty Credentials**

A faculty member being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion shall prepare a set of credentials supporting the faculty member’s candidacy. The credentials shall include a self-reflective
statement (see Appendix A for guidelines for preparation) in which the candidate discusses her/his record and indicates plans for future development, supported by evidence including:

a. A current vitae. The vitae should list the candidate’s educational attainments and professional positions held, giving status and rank as appropriate. It should also present the record of achievement of the candidate in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service.

b. Student evaluations for every course taught, including summer and J-term, and all reports prepared by peer observers. Student evaluations from the three years preceding the tenure review must be submitted. These must be submitted in their entirety rather than in the aggregate, since aggregate results do not allow the reading of positive and negative comments within context.

c. Attachments showing evidence of scholarship or creative work appropriate to the faculty member’s discipline or interdisciplinary areas. These may include products of the faculty member’s work and any critiques or evaluations provided by reviewers of that scholarly work or creative activity (for example, book reviews, critiques by article reviewers, observer reports, etc.).

d. Attachments showing evidence of effectiveness in service to students, the university, one’s profession, and the community.

e. Attachments showing evidence of effectiveness in advising and mentoring.

f. Letters of support or recommendation, which will be attached to the candidate's application file or sent directly to the department chair for inclusion with the candidate’s credentials.

g. All other evidence the candidate wishes to submit with respect to his or her achievements concerning the established criteria.

3.3.44 Post-Tenure Evaluation
After grant of tenure, faculty members will be evaluated annually. Tenured faculty shall submit a PAR to their department chair every three years. Any PAR due in January is to address the previous calendar year. In non-PAR years, tenured faculty use the Professional Activities Highlights and Evaluation (PAHE) form, summarizing the most important accomplishments of the year, and submit the PAHE to the Department Chair. Either a PAR or PAHE may be appended with a CV. Upon receipt of the PAR or PAHE, the Department Chair shall evaluate the faculty member, preparing a PAE. The PAE, accompanied by the PAR or the PAHE, are to be submitted to the Dean by February 15.

3.3.45 Evaluation of Department Chairs. Evaluation of the performance of department chairs follows the procedures of Section 3.3.44, except the Dean does the evaluation.

3.4 Criteria for the Review of Faculty Performance

Fundamental to Drake’s stated mission “to provide an exceptional learning environment” for students is the intellectual vibrancy of its faculty. This primary goal of promoting learning and intellectual growth among our students is achieved through faculty who: continually develop and revise their teaching practices based on engagement with current pedagogical approaches in their discipline; are active scholars who reflect thoughtfully about the relationship between their scholarship and their teaching; and are committed
institutional citizens who perform strategic service to the University and the profession in ways that draw on and contribute to their teaching and scholarship.

What does this mean in terms of the criteria for the review of faculty? Drake seeks to encourage its faculty members to develop, ideally, a balanced approach to the demands of university life. Teaching becomes more effective if fully informed by disciplinary best practices and if continually refreshed by the current knowledge of the practicing scholar. An active scholarly life renews the intellectual energy and drive of the scholar/teacher and grants students participatory access to the most recent advances in disciplinary knowledge and development.

Service, whether faculty governance, curriculum development and oversight, the advising of students, service to the profession, or any number of other commitments to the maintenance of college life, also deeply involves faculty in creating the environment within which good teaching and scholarship can flourish. Tenure or promotion will be earned through substantive and high quality activity in all three areas.

At Drake, the bedrock of all such development is necessarily teaching. Fulfilling our responsibilities to instruct our students is core to our mission. Excellent scholarship or a fine service record or both cannot compensate for lack of success in teaching.

The College recognizes that assessment of performance is complex. Different disciplines have understandably different practices in both teaching and scholarship; many service responsibilities are collaborative in nature, making an individual’s contribution sometimes difficult to document. Departments have autonomy to set the explicit guidelines for teaching, scholarship, and service in their disciplines. Departments are not required to adopt their own guidelines, but doing so creates the obligation to inform candidates of and adhere carefully to such guidelines.

What follows are specific College-level requirements for each area of faculty performance. Each section includes suggestions for assessment at the departmental level.

### 3.4.1 Teaching

Effective teaching is essential to the University mission. At the core of effective teaching is reflection and revision. The College recognizes that effective teaching is an ongoing process rather than a single “achievement,” that methods and activities may be revised based on developments within a faculty member’s discipline, or based on experimental pedagogies. The development of a teacher’s own scholarship may factor into course revisions. New understandings of students’ patterns of cognitive growth and/or social adjustment may occasion a shift in emphasis or teacher responses within a course. Thus, the progress of a faculty member’s teaching over time will reflect continual attention to and development of the following qualities:

Expertise in the discipline or interdisciplinary areas and mastery of the subject matter one teaches.

- Expertise in the discipline or interdisciplinary areas and mastery of the subject matter one teaches.

- A commitment to student learning which includes the ability to: articulate learning outcomes and define instructional objectives; develop students’ skills consistent with course objectives; provide students with explanatory course statements, assignments and other materials; give timely and useful feedback; respond to student communications outside of class in a timely fashion; give clear grading guidelines; and generally foster a respectful atmosphere which engages students’ minds and motivates students to perform to the best of their ability.

In addition, effective teaching activities may include:
c. Mentoring, which encompasses activities similar to apprenticeship—preparation for entry into a profession or career. Mentoring activities typically occur outside the classroom and may include assisting students on choosing graduate or professional schools; preparing letters of recommendation for graduate scholarships, graduate studies, or employment; discussing career options; directing independent studies and undergraduate research, and assisting students in identifying and obtaining internships and/or professional experiences.

d. The development of models, equipment, inventions, printed or computer-based instructional materials, or audiovisual materials that further the teaching of a discipline.

e. Other activities the candidate’s department identifies and justifies as meriting consideration as directly related to teaching performance, such as developing service learning or study abroad experiences. Departments are expected to recognize teaching done in interdisciplinary areas, including team-taught, cross-disciplinary courses, and to consult with the director of applicable programs in conducting the evaluation.

Department Assessment: To the extent necessary, each Department may develop its own practices to assess instructional skills and accomplishments as they apply to effectiveness in teaching in its disciplines. For instance, a Department may develop a statement which describes:

i. any special requirements not described above, if any, or unique standards of teaching effectiveness and performance expected within its disciplines;

ii. any specific mentoring practices the department has in place for tenure-track faculty, and what these may require of the untenured faculty member.

3.4.2 Scholarship/Creative Activity

The evaluation process of scholarship/creative activity focuses on the trajectory of a faculty member’s scholarship over time. In general, all departments look for a record of scholarly and creative achievement that demonstrates a commitment to continued growth and accomplishment, and offers the promise of future contributions to their field. Scholarship and creative activities may be demonstrated in a variety of ways; they show a candidate’s mind at work and his or her skills in practice in the appropriate field(s) of endeavor. They help to ensure that those responsible for teaching and learning remain current in their disciplines, particularly when their fields are among those whose protocols, norms, methods, and tenets change relatively rapidly.

Often these activities not only advance knowledge and understanding, they may also contribute to high quality teaching. That is, they connect faculty to the daily lives of students, whom we all expect to contend with difficult ideas, engage with new concepts, and take part responsibly in the production of knowledge. An active creative or research agenda, then, maintains faculty credibility to assign and evaluate student work. Our own engagement in scholarship and creative activity is one way we continually “earn” the privilege, in other words, of passing judgment on our students’ work.

Scholarly and creative activity enhances the academic reputation of the University and demonstrates the quality of its faculty as measured by terms set outside the University itself. Ideally, the public dissemination of such work models a courageous and receptive attitude toward critique, dialogue, and dissent, and provides opportunities for us to think deeply about, and even rethink, our disciplinary and professional assumptions. Thus, scholarly and creative work may contribute to public conversations and policy change as well as to a professional discourse.

There are many ways to demonstrate engagement in scholarly and creative activities, however, for the
purposes of faculty performance, these activities must be public—that is, they must be presented in a
form that allows others to enjoy, critique, and evaluate them according to the standards of their field. An
idea, product, or performance which cannot be subjected to some form of critical examination by peers is
not scholarship or creative activity as here defined.

The record submitted for review may include elements in the following list. This list is suggestive rather
than fully inclusive, but in all cases, refers to work that exists in some public form or forum, and that can
be evaluated by peers. Given the undoubted difference across disciplines in considering what “counts” as
important to publication in the field, the items in the lists below are given in alphabetical order rather
than in order of importance.

a. Artistic activities that are subject to critical evaluation, where practicable, including musical
recitals and/or concert performances, publication or performance of original musical composi-
tions, exhibitions of art work in individual or group displays, involvement in creative aspects of
theatrical productions (i.e., stage/costume/lighting design, direction or choreography, acting or
play writing), public readings of one's own creative work in prose and/or poetry, or other appro-
priate evidences of artistic activity;

b. Community-based and community-engaged scholarly and creative activities that have some
public dimension—presentations or publication locally or nationally;

c. Editorial work in the production of an edited volume or the editing of a journal;

d. Grants and awards applied for and those received for scholarly and creative activity;

e. Interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary work published in venues outside the candidate’s discipline;

f. Invited publications (books, articles, book chapters, book reviews, etc.);

g. Peer-reviewed articles, books, book chapters;

h. Presentations at conferences, public lectures, peer-reviewed or invited;

i. Scholarly and creative activity translated for public or policy audiences, such as op-eds, position
papers, policy analysis, websites, open-source technology;

j. Scholarship and creative activity that involves students in significant ways;

k. Scholarship undertaken for the purpose of allowing undergraduate research, that is, research a
faculty member may have undertaken in addition to his/her primary research, so that students
could participate;

l. Textbooks, learning materials, computer-based instructional materials that are published or
otherwise evaluated and distributed by appropriate organizations and groups;

m. The scholarship of teaching and learning, including evaluation of pedagogical strategies or
research designed to broaden or improve course offering.

The College recognizes there is a significant distinction between scholarship that can be satisfactorily
demonstrated by reporting on results of a particular idea that has not been explored before, and
scholarship which involves long periods of gestation during which major ideas are worked and re-worked
in ways that do not admit of intermittent publication or other demonstrable critical examination by peers.
There is good reason to provide time for such reflection rather than requiring premature publication as a
criterion for scholarship. Faculty review is meant to understand the development of the scholar and
teacher and to understand that moments of design, research, reflection, and writing all deserve ample
time in which to develop. At the same time, there must be strong indicators that any delay in making
research public is not merely procrastination.

Thus, activities for consideration may include unpublished research—papers or manuscripts that have not
been published or presented in a public forum but are in process, existing at a stage where critical review
by peers from off-campus is feasible; printed material, judged by peers to demonstrate scholarship,
prepared for classroom use; awards and citations for excellence or for contributions in a discipline. If
much of a candidate's research is published in non-traditional ways, that person would need to provide
some assurance of the work's quality. In year three and following, it would be in the candidate’s interest
to demonstrate the quality of their research by whatever means available, including published reviews, responses to online blogs, evaluator comments from other scholars working in similar venues, etc.

Department Assessment: Since the recognition of scholarship varies among departments and disciplines, each department should develop its own practices to assess scholarly and artistic achievement as they apply to its disciplines. If a department has special or unique standards of scholarly or artistic achievement within its disciplines, it shall adopt a statement describing them consistent with Section 3.3.22.

3.4.3 Service

Service is a vital and valued component of academic life and is integral to the healthy functioning of the College and University. The nature of service at the College and University level provides many opportunities for faculty members to participate in various types of service appropriate to individual interests and talents and at different points in an academic career. In order for faculty to have a voice in the development of departmental, college, and university goals and policies, each member must play a part over the course of his or her career in appropriate committees and in the deliberative and governing bodies of the University.

The College of Arts and Sciences emphasizes that all faculty must participate in service but makes clear that service, however extensive and noteworthy, within the University or professional service outside the University, cannot substitute for strong, effective teaching and sustained scholarly/creative activity. Nevertheless, service is required for the awarding of tenure and promotion; thus a candidate with no or negligible service may be denied tenure or promotion.

In general, service includes constructive work in the activities named below. This list is illustrative, and may not include all possible service activities in all disciplines. Moreover, there are often service duties that are particular to an individual faculty member. For example, faculty from a historically underrepresented group, may be sought out for advising by students who identify with them and seek their guidance.

The categories listed are intended to make clear the different levels (or types) of service, but "level" does not imply that one sort of service is better than another. "Level" simply refers to whether the candidate is serving on committees or in a leadership role within the department, the College, or the University. When service obligations overlap significantly with teaching or scholarship or both, it is best to make that overlap clear and describe significant connections among service, scholarship and teaching.

a. Service in support of the department or program:
   i. Administration
   ii. Department committees for policies, procedures, hiring, etc.
   iii. Operations (e.g. labs, shops, studios)
   iv. Accreditation
   v. Curriculum development
   vi. Alumni relations and external communications
   vii. Program management

b. Service in support of the College or the University:
   i. Administration
   ii. Governance committees
iii. Task-oriented groups (ad hoc, subcommittees, task forces)
iv. Search committees
v. Directing a program or interdisciplinary unit outside of the department.
vi. Promoting collegiality and university goals through attending and participating in university activities
vii. Serving as a representative of the department, college or university by designation of the President, the Provost, or the dean of the college
viii. Admissions and recruitment.

c. Service in support of students:

a. Academic advising responsibilities including discussion of course selection and scheduling, future career goals and professional planning, internship opportunities, adjustment to college, study abroad, reference to available campus resources as needed, and personal circumstances that may affect academic performance.
b. Advising student organizations or publications.
c. Adjudication of student events and competitions, both for present students and adjudications connected to recruitment and admissions.
d. Encouraging student research, publication, conference presentation
e. Writing letters of recommendation and support.

d. Service in support of the candidate’s field of study, profession:

i. Leadership roles in professional organizations or at conferences.
ii. Serving on local, state, or national boards, commissions, or advisory groups or as an officer or board or committee member within a professional organization.
iii. Editing a professional newsletter or working as a peer reviewer for funding agencies, journals or academic publishing houses.
iv. Contributing professional expertise, advice or commentary to a newspaper, radio show, TV show or other media outlet.
v. Lecturing or otherwise contributing professionally to community groups and organizations.
vi. Involvement in P&T reviews for other Universities.
vii. Program review and accreditation work for other Universities.
viii. Consulting work, paid or unpaid
ix. Journal editing and other significant forms of editing, if scholarly in nature, should be considered in the scholarship section.

Department Assessment: Departments are encouraged to assess the quality and quantity of service, expectations of evidence from candidates (e.g. a full description of their specific contributions to committees, letters from committee chairs, or from members of a committee that a candidate has led, documents produced for conferences or community events, etc.), and special or unique standards of the department relating to service, and develop guidelines or procedures consistent with Section 3.3.22. If a particular service is required within a department, (e.g. adjudication, student recruitment) that requirement, and all assessment practices associated with it, must be described clearly and in a timely manner to all faculty, especially tenure-track faculty undergoing yearly reviews leading to tenure. In the case of faculty members directing interdisciplinary programs, the department must make clear what its assessment practices and expectations are with regard to that work.

Departments are also encouraged to mentor new faculty appropriately to help them achieve a balanced program in the years leading up to the tenure.