

Chapter 6. Departmental Standards and Criteria

Under the *Faculty Rules and Regulations*, all untenured faculty have a right to a written statement of their department's, program's, or division's criteria for recommending renewal of an appointment, a promotion, or the awarding of tenure, and of the procedures that precede such recommendations. This requirement has been extended to include the right of all faculty to a statement of departmental standards and criteria in matters of research, teaching and service that would apply when important personnel recommendations or decisions affecting their interests are made by the department. No academic unit may make an appointment to a faculty rank for which they do not have standards and criteria.

These statements must be detailed, clear, objective and manifestly fair, and they must indicate the relative importance ("weight") given to each criterion - research, teaching and service. Such statements are an essential tool in reappointment, promotion and tenure cases and are necessary in any subsequent defense of the professionalism of these evaluations. The department is responsible for providing each member of the department with a copy of its standards and criteria, especially new faculty and those who may be candidates for reappointment, promotion or tenure in the near future. A copy of each department's current written standards and criteria should also be kept on file in the offices of the appropriate Dean. These statements are periodically reviewed by the Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee (TPAC), which assesses their adequacy, and also by the Academic Priorities Committee (APC) at the time of an external review of the department.

These statements should explicitly address questions such as the following, which are illustrative only: What kinds of research are valued by the department, how much is expected, and how is it assessed? What differentiates the recommendation for a two-year renewal of an untenured Assistant Professor's initial contract from a four-year renewal? What ranks are eligible to vote for each type of faculty action? Under what conditions might the department recommend no reappointment at all? In cases where outside evaluators are used, how are these individuals selected?

If a department includes among its faculty (i) Research Faculty (ii) adjunct staff, or (iii) Assistant, Associate, and full Teaching Professors, and/or Professor of Practice it is necessary that the department's written statement explicitly address the standards and criteria the department employs in considering the reappointment or promotion of these faculty ranks.

Chapter 7. Annual and Mid-contract Reviews of Faculty

7.1 Procedures

The appropriate Dean shall annually write to all non-tenured tenure-track faculty apprising them of the requirement for a review of their performance and of the existence of written departmental standards and criteria for contract renewal and promotion. Reviews of Assistant Professors and Assistant Teaching Professors are annual; reviews of Associate Teaching Professors and full Teaching Professors must take place once in the middle of the term of appointment and cover the years since the start of the current appointment, but may take place more frequently if requested by the faculty member or deemed necessary by the department. Reviews are to be conducted early in the fall semester of each year.

Annual or mid-contract reviews of untenured faculty shall be directed by the Chair of the relevant academic unit. With these reviews in mind, the Chair of the academic unit will establish and maintain a dossier on each non-tenured faculty member containing copies of, as appropriate:

- Official appointment and salary letters
- Previous reviews of the faculty member's performance
- An annually revised *curriculum vitae* for the individual
- A statement of research, teaching, and service, prepared by the non-tenured faculty member
- Copies of their scholarly publications
- Material on teaching performance, curriculum development and advising.

The untenured faculty member together with the Chair of the academic unit will be responsible for submitting material for inclusion in the dossier, so that it contains up-to-date material on, as appropriate, teaching (including as relevant a list of courses taught, teaching material such as a syllabus or reading list, student course feedback, peer observations of teaching, and summary material on undergraduate and graduate advising), scholarly work (including a *curriculum vitae* and copies of publications), and service to the University. Please note also that annual or mid-contract reviews of non-tenured faculty members are intended to cover any periods of leave that occur during the year in question. Evidence on the use made of leave-time is relevant to the evaluation.

Some departments at the time of their annual or mid-contract review of their non-tenured members conduct thorough reviews in-house of the completed works of such individuals, and occasionally also of works-in-progress. Other departments in contrast prefer to defer detailed inquiry into the substance of the work until the later reappointment, promotion, or tenure decision, relying instead during the interim on the judgments of external

editorial boards, professional associations and grant-giving agencies for indications of the quality of the work being done. Either strategy is acceptable to the Deans and to TPAC provided that the basis for the review is made clear in the unit's written report to the non-tenured junior colleague in question.

The annual or mid-contract review of each untenured faculty member required to be reviewed will be conducted at a duly called meeting of faculty of the appropriate rank, where the contents (excluding salary information) of the individual's dossier will be reviewed and their performance evaluated in each of three areas: scholarship, teaching and service. A written description of a consensus concerning the faculty member's performance during the preceding academic year (or years, in the case of mid-contract reviews), or of the nature of the disagreement about it, if there is no consensus, will be summarized. The report shall also include explicit commentary on the individual's scholarship, teaching, and service during the preceding academic year(s), as well as guidance and suggestions for the candidate's progress. The written review should be circulated among the faculty who participated in the review to ensure the accuracy of the consensus or reports of any disagreements and the draft should be submitted to the appropriate Dean for comment before being provided to the faculty member.

After the written evaluation has been finalized and approved by the Dean, the Chair of the academic unit shall meet with the faculty member and provide them with a copy of the evaluation. This review shall also be placed in the individual's official department file, and a copy should be sent to the appropriate Dean together with a signed "Confirmation of Receipt" form verifying that the faculty member in question has read the evaluation, had an opportunity to discuss it, and to respond.

The faculty member who has thus been reviewed may submit a written comment on the review, and such comments shall also be placed in their official department file, Faculty Personnel files, and also included with the annual review when the dossier is submitted to the Tenure, Promotions, and Appointments Committee for reappointment, tenure, or promotion review. Lack of a response by such an individual shall not be construed as necessarily signifying total agreement with the final evaluation report.

Where the requirement of a periodic review of a faculty member's total performance coincides with the need for the academic unit's recommendation regarding reappointment, promotion or tenure, the two evaluations may be combined to meet the University's deadlines for these latter recommendations. Under such circumstances, the untenured faculty member must convey in writing to their Dean, with a copy to the department Chair, a request that the two reviews be combined. After a reappointment review, the department should prepare a written version of the reappointment report and provide it to the candidate in lieu of the annual review.

7.2 Teaching Evaluations

The Dean of the Faculty has primary responsibility for ensuring that all faculty evaluation procedures are reasonable and fair. The following are minimum guidelines for carrying out the Faculty Rules regarding teaching evaluation.

1. Evaluation procedures must conform to the guidance laid out in the *Faculty Rules and Regulations*. Faculty who are subject to review for reappointment, promotion, and tenure should undergo teaching evaluation on a regular basis.

Every departmentally-assigned teaching function of a junior faculty member should therefore be evaluated and departments should also have a means of measuring course preparation and pedagogical creativity.

2. In general, senior faculty in a department will ensure the evaluation of all teaching in the department by:

- Establishing departmental standards of teaching effectiveness (to be filed with the FEC and their Dean);
- making certain that these standards are known to all members of the departmental faculty; and
- preparing mechanisms and instruments for teaching evaluation, including feedback solicited from students and observations of teaching by faculty colleagues, which distinguish among various teaching functions.

3. Teaching functions not normally evaluated by departments (GISP's and Independent Studies) should be evaluated by the instructor themselves. Extra-departmental University courses will be evaluated by the Dean of the College.

4. Because teaching ability and performance serve as one factor in the setting of annual salaries, all faculty members of a department must be regularly evaluated regarding their teaching, using the department's approved teaching evaluation procedures. Chairs should also bear in mind that TPAC looks carefully at teaching evaluations and expects the relevant faculty member's teaching performance to be explicitly addressed in all dossiers it receives.

TPAC also advises that departments use multiple methods to evaluate teaching, including review of student course feedback, syllabi and course material (including online course material), and peer observations of teaching.

[Guidelines for peer observation](#) may be found the Dean of the Faculty's website.

5. The opportunity for 100% response on student course feedback forms must be provided. The University uses an online system to ensure consistent collection of student feedback. Once feedback forms open, students can access the surveys by [logging in to Canvas](#) or brown.evaluationkit.com and submitting their feedback.

6. A summary evaluation of each teaching activity will be given in the department Chair's annual review of junior members of the faculty. At the same time, reasonable opportunity should be given for such an individual to review, rebut or comment upon their own evaluation.

7. The departmental file of an untenured member of the faculty should accordingly include:

- The report or tabulation of each evaluated teaching activity;
- the department Chair's annual or periodic review letter;
- any comments or additional materials tendered by the individual concerned; and
- syllabi, course outlines, peer observations, or other such appropriate materials, unless they are being catalogued elsewhere.

7.3 Annual Reviews of Term Faculty

Department Chairs are responsible for ensuring that all term faculty employed by the University with multi-year contracts or shorter contracts that will be renewed receive regular reviews of their performance in research, teaching, and service, as appropriate to their position, with sufficient detail to ensure that they understand their progress toward reappointment or promotion. Assistant Professors on the Research, Teaching, or Clinician Scholar tracks, Assistant Professors (Research), Assistant Professors of the Practice, and Research Scientists should be reviewed and receive written feedback on their performance annually. Associate and full Professor (Research) faculty, Associate and full Professors on the Research, Teaching, or Clinician Scholar tracks, Associate and full Professors of the Practice, and Senior Research Scientists who are in their second or later contract may be reviewed less frequently, generally once per contract term, or more frequently if requested by the faculty member or deemed necessary by the department or center. The timing of these reviews within the academic year will vary depending on the practices of the School. Alternative review processes may be used for faculty who are affiliated with the University but employed by one of Brown's hospital affiliates.

In general, prior to the review the faculty member should provide their Chair or Director with an updated CV and other relevant materials, such as a statement describing their scholarship, teaching, and service activities, and/or copies of their publications. The Chair should produce a written document that includes explicit commentary on the individual's scholarship, and if appropriate their teaching and service during the preceding academic year(s), as well as guidance and suggestions for the candidate's progress. The letter should also include the timeline for the candidate's next reappointment or promotion in the review. In preparing the review, the Chair may consult with departmental faculty, mentoring committees, or faculty affairs committees as deemed necessary by the Chair, Department, School, or Dean. For faculty in professorial ranks, the draft should be reviewed by the relevant Dean who may request changes, and after those changes are made, the head of the academic unit will provide the faculty member with a copy of this written evaluation meet with them to discuss their performance. The evaluation will be kept on file in the department and in the Dean's office.

The reviewed faculty member will be asked to sign a confirmation of receipt form to verify that they received and read a copy of the annual or mid-contract review and had the opportunity to discuss the review with the department Chair. This statement will also confirm that the faculty member under review is familiar with the department's standards and criteria for reappointment and promotion. The faculty member may submit a written response to the annual or mid-contract review. This response will be kept on file with the review itself and will be submitted with the dossier at the time of reappointment or promotion review.

At least once per year, the results of the annual review process and the progress of each term faculty member in a professorial rank should be reviewed at a duly called meeting of the eligible voting faculty of the relevant unit. The faculty will review the faculty member's materials, including their CV, statement, and any other appropriate materials, such as student course feedback, class observations by peers, publications, etc.

Review of Professors of the Practice and adjunct or visiting faculty should follow the general process above, but the review, confirmation of receipt, and written response (if any) from the candidate may be maintained in the department. Similarly, research scientists and senior research scientists, and other research faculty appointments, should be reviewed regularly but the process need not be as formal as that for faculty in professorial lines. Generally, these research faculty appointments should be reviewed by the Department Chair or Center/Institute Director and the faculty PI in the area in which they work.