

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MAINE
COLLEGE OF NURSING AND HEALTH PROFESSIONS
PEER REVIEW**

The College of Nursing and Health Professions Peer Review Process follows requirements stipulated in the AFUM contract agreement. That document specifically discusses:

- Personnel Files
- Appointment, Reappointment and Contract Status
- Academic Ranks
- Promotion and Tenure Evaluations

Guidelines for Peer Review of Faculty Regarding Promotion, Tenure and/or Retention

I. PURPOSE

- A. The purpose of this document is to outline the policies and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and retention in the College of Nursing and Health Professions. Decisions are determined on the basis of the criteria established by the College.

II. INTRODUCTION

- A. The role of the University of Southern Maine College of Nursing and Health Professions Peer Review Committee is to provide Peer Review recommendations related to faculty promotion, tenure and/or retention considerations.
1. Tenure track and tenured faculty under review are evaluated in the traditional three (3) component areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. Fixed-length and continuous contract faculty are evaluated in two (2) component areas: teaching and service. Faculty should have established records of achievement in each of these areas consistent with the College's established criteria.
 2. Faculty applying for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor and/or tenure should hold the highest earned degree traditional to their discipline or should have comparable qualifications. (Refer to the attached section of the Faculty Personnel Regulations; University of Southern Maine; Approved June, 1995.)
- B. Administrative responsibilities may be assigned to some faculty when various administrative positions become available or administrative tasks are delegated. For example, organizational work crucial to the development of the College is accomplished by faculty whose time is partially allocated to duties as Chairperson/Director of the academic programs within the College. In addition, periodic College services that may require sustained organizing work, for example, program reviews or accreditation reviews, are assigned as part of some faculty member's responsibilities.

In both cases recognition is given for these contributions to the growth and viability of the College, especially as these responsibilities may temporarily reduce a faculty member's teaching time and/or scholarly effort.

Such special responsibilities will be formally noted in writing by the Dean/Chair/Director and there will be written validation by the Dean/Chairperson/Director that the assignment was carried out satisfactorily. This documentation will be transmitted with the faculty's Peer Review file.

- C. The criteria and priorities applied in the review process take into account the level of the review and reflect established expectations for each level. The Peer Review Committee will consider the following: what the individual is trying to accomplish; the methods utilized to pursue these goals; the appropriateness of the individual's goals given the level of the review; the effectiveness of the individual in moving toward the stated goals; the effectiveness of the individual's interactions with colleagues, students and other professionals within and outside the University; and consistency of the individual's goals with those of the College.

III. PROMOTION, TENURE, AND RETENTION POLICIES

A. College of Nursing and Health Professions Responsibilities

1. The faculty assumes the major responsibility in defining criteria and specifying procedures to be followed in deciding whether the criteria are met.
2. In order to assure that both faculty and the University are well served, the College will maintain a Peer Review Committee which must acknowledge the special needs of the faculty of the College and be compatible with the criteria set forth by the University and the AFUM contract.
3. All aspects of the promotion, tenure, and/or retention review process will be conducted in a manner to ensure the confidentiality of the faculty's file. Confidentiality of faculty files is the responsibility of all parties authorized under these procedures to have access to the faculty's file.

B. Committee Composition

1. The Peer Review Committee shall be elected by the College faculty, according to the bylaws of the College.

C. Committee Responsibilities

The Committee shall:

1. Conduct an annual informational/orientation meeting to discuss the College policies and procedures for promotion, tenure and/or retention. This meeting will be scheduled at the beginning of the academic year.
2. Compile and distribute, at the beginning of each academic year, an annual Peer Review schedule to the Dean and to all faculty scheduled to undergo review.
3. Advise all faculty members on the types of evidence to be included in the dossier.
4. Review the dossier of the faculty seeking promotion, tenure, and/or retention and forward recommendations to the Dean.
5. Review the policies, procedures, and criteria for promotion, tenure, and retention and recommend changes to the faculty.
6. Review all applications for educational Leaves of Absence and Sabbatical Leaves and

forward recommendations to the Dean.

7. Inform faculty in a timely fashion of all Peer Review recommendations relative to the individual.
8. Review individuals for hire and make recommendations for rank/tenure to the Dean.

D. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

1. All non-tenured¹ faculty will receive from the Peer Review committee written notification of the date of their review.
 - a. All full-time non-tenured faculty must be reviewed, according to the timeline established in the AFUM contract.
 - b. Review is based on performance since appointment unless otherwise negotiated at time of hiring.
2. All tenured faculty will receive from the Peer Review Committee written notification of the date of their review.
 - a. All tenured faculty must be reviewed according to the timeline established in the AFUM contract.
3. The order in which faculty are reviewed during the academic year is:
 - a. Second year faculty
 - b. Promotion and tenure applicants
 - c. First year faculty
 - d. Continuous contract and fixed-length faculty dependent on terms of contract
 - e. All others
4. The responsibility for initiating the reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure review process lies with the faculty member. Tenure-track and tenure faculty have the right to apply for promotion and/or tenure (if applicable) at any time she/he believes she/he has met the qualifications for same.
5. The time at which tenure-track faculty must apply for promotion and tenure, if not previously granted, is at the beginning of their sixth year of service, unless they indicate in writing to the Dean their intent to resign at the end of their current appointment. Prior credit toward tenure is negotiated at the time of hire.
6. The faculty member has the right and the responsibility to be informed about all College, University, and AFUM criteria, policies, and procedures.
7. The faculty under review has the responsibility to prepare and submit a completed dossier to the Chairperson of the Peer Review Committee in accordance with the established College schedule and guidelines.
8. The faculty under review is responsible for including in the dossier the evidence, which would support a decision for promotion, tenure and/or retention. Only evidence, which represents performance after appointment to the College, is appropriate for inclusion in the dossier, except when prior experience has been applied toward tenure.

¹ Includes faculty who are tenure-track, fixed-length, and continuous contract faculty.

9. The staff member who supports the Peer Review Committee will provide the appropriate Chairperson/Director with a copy of the faculty member's BOT document (including teaching evaluations). The Chairperson/Director will use his/her experience working with the faculty member and the BOT document to prepare his/her evaluation letter. A two (2) week time period is allowed for this review. The faculty member has one (1) week to write a letter in response to the Chairperson/Director letter and submit it to the Peer Review Committee Chairperson.
10. The faculty member cannot change his/her dossier once it is submitted to the Chairperson of the Peer Review Committee (see #7) unless advised by the Peer Review Committee or Dean. Recommending changes to the dossier is not the responsibility, nor in the purview, of the Chairperson/Director.
11. The Chairperson/Director will not have access to external letters (if applicable) and/or peer reviews that are done by faculty.
12. The faculty has the sole right to advance or withdraw her/his dossier at any step in the promotion/tenure process.
13. The faculty has the right to be informed in writing of the decisions at each step of the review process. Copies of the Chairperson/Director evaluation, Peer Review Committee recommendation, and Dean recommendation will be on file in the faculty member's personal file, which includes the Peer Review file. The Dean's recommendation will be copied to the Peer Review Committee Chairperson and appropriate Chairperson/Director.

D. Promotion from Lecturer to Instructor for Full-time Continuous Contract Faculty

Unless the faculty candidate has extensive teaching experience, he/she will initially be appointed as a Lecturer. Lecturers are reviewed annually during their initial 6 years of service. After three positive reviews, the faculty member may request promotion to Instructor (with a raise as determined by the Dean). Assuming a positive review in the sixth year of service, a Lecturer who has not been promoted to Instructor will receive the AFUM raise as specified in the contract for completion of 6 years of service. The faculty member can request promotion at this point in time without an additional raise as it relates to the promotion.

After the sixth year review a Lecturer can request promotion to Instructor at any point after every two years of additional service as long as he/she has received a positive review. Per the AFUM contract, Lecturers are also eligible for a raise after 10 years of service and at 16 years of service. The Lecturer can request promotion to Instructor at his/her 10 and 16 year review without an additional raise. The following table provides a visual depiction of the above.

Years of Service as Lecturer	Automatic Raise as Lecturer per 2001-2002 AFUM Agreement	Promotion to Instructor – Once Promoted Cannot Go back to Lecturer and Instructor's are Not Provided Length in Service Raises
1st year - peer review		No
2 nd year review		No
3 rd year review		Yes if 3 + reviews, raise established by Dean in consultation Chair/Director

4 th year review		Yes if 3 + reviews, raise established by Dean in consultation Chair/Director
5 th year review		Yes if 3 + reviews, raise established by Dean in consultation Chair/Director
6 th year review	Yes: Set Amount	Yes if 3 + reviews, no additional raise for promotion
7 th year		No
8 th year review		Yes if + reviews, raise established by Dean in consultation Chair/Director
9 th year		No
10 th year review	Yes: Set Amount	Yes if + reviews, no additional raise for promotion
11 th year		No
12 th year review		Yes + reviews, raise established by Dean in consultation with chair
13 th year		No
14 th year peer review		Yes + reviews, raise established by Dean in consultation with chair
15 th year		No
16 th year review	Yes: Set Amount	Yes if + reviews, no additional raise for promotion

Once promoted to Instructor, the faculty member is not eligible for additional raises unless otherwise specified in the AFUM contract.

IV. PROMOTION, TENURE, AND RETENTION PROCEDURES

A. Dossier Preparation and Presentation

1. The faculty is strongly encouraged to consult with the Chairperson of the Peer Review Committee regarding the content and preparation of the dossier.
2. The faculty must organize the dossier according to the Board of Trustees (BOT) Faculty Presentation Outline.
3. Peer Evaluation Forms
 - a. Each faculty requests that three peers complete the CONHP peer evaluation form. It is the responsibility of the faculty member being reviewed to request one of the three reviews be completed by another faculty member, who has observed their classroom and/or clinical teaching. One of these three reviews may be external to the CONHP if the reviewers can appropriately comment on the faculty's professional responsibilities. One of these reviews must be from the faculty member's department.
 - b. All three forms should be returned to the individual being reviewed by the date indicated on the form.
 - c. One peer observation of teaching is also required. It is optional whether the faculty member includes the Peer Observation of Teaching form in his/her

materials. If the Peer Observation of Teaching form is included it can be substituted for one of the three required reviews from a faculty peer. If the Peer Observation of Teaching form is not submitted the faculty member should reflect on the peer observations (how you will use the feedback) under “Special efforts undertaken to enhance teaching effectiveness.”

4. Student Evaluations

- a. Student evaluations are available for review by faculty each semester after grades are submitted to the Registrar.
- b. Statistical summaries of student evaluations from the academic year(s) under review must be compiled and submitted by the faculty according to one of two formats established by the University of Maine Board of Trustees. (BOT alternative #1 is the preferred method.)
- c. All signed representative student comments must be attached to the statistical report for each course. Individual course evaluation data is not aggregated until the faculty member is reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor and/or tenure and thereafter or for continuous contract faculty after 6 years of service. These materials will be forwarded to the Dean and the Provost.
- d. Unsigned comments for each course may be included or excluded at faculty discretion. If the faculty member chooses to use unsigned comments for a particular course, all unsigned comments must be submitted from that course. Another option is to submit a summary of unsigned comments compiled by the faculty member or their designee. These summaries must be validated by a second party. (See Appendix A for appropriate form to be completed for each course.) At the time of promotion to Associate Professor or Professor and/or tenure and thereafter or for continuous contract faculty after 6 years of service “signed” and “unsigned” student comments are limited to two single spaced pages, signed comments should be noted as such.
- e. B and C or D if applicable are placed in Section IV of the BOT document.

5. Department Chairperson/Director Evaluation

- a. The Chairperson/Director will submit a letter, to be included with the faculty’s Peer Review file, that addresses teaching, departmental service, scholarship (if appropriate), and collegiality. A copy of this letter must be completed and presented to the faculty member at least one week prior to the Peer Review Committee beginning its review of the faculty member’s dossier.
- b. The faculty member has one (1) week to respond to the chairperson/ director’s letter. The faculty member should address and present his/her letter to the Chairperson of the Peer Review Committee for inclusion in the dossier. The Chairperson/Director should be copied on this letter.

6. Teaching Portfolio

Faculty may develop comprehensive teaching portfolios on a voluntary basis. The primary motivation for developing a comprehensive teaching portfolio will be the improvement of teaching not Peer Review. Each faculty member electing to develop a comprehensive portfolio will select a format and mentors, which best meet his/her needs. It is recommended that faculty work with USM’s Center for Teaching when developing portfolios. The Peer Review Committee will review information from a comprehensive

portfolio, in addition to already required materials, for cases of promotion and tenure when the faculty member being reviewed submits the portfolio to the committee.

7. Letters for Promotion (Associate/Full) and/or Tenure

All candidates for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor and/or tenure must have their scholarly work externally reviewed or juried. This means that the written work or performance will be reviewed by a group of peers recognized for their expertise, and who can provide an independent, objective review.

The faculty candidate submits to the Dean up to ten (10) possible reviewers and their credentials no later than May 31st prior to the academic year in which the candidate is requesting consideration for promotion and/or tenure. In consultation with the Dean, the faculty member will select a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) external reviewers from the list. If necessary, additional names may be identified by the Dean in consultation with the faculty member. The Dean confirms the external reviewer's willingness to complete the review according to the timeline. The Dean prepares a summary of the qualifications of the reviewers for inclusion in the Peer Review file.

The Dean and faculty member prepare the materials for submission to the external reviewers no later than the first week of July with the primary focus of the review being on the candidate's scholarship. Materials forwarded to the reviewer include the BOT document, the faculty member's curriculum vitae, the College's criteria, and selected scholarly products. The candidate's BOT document is forwarded to the reviewers in order to provide them with orientation of the breadth of teaching and service that the faculty member has been engaged in during the period of review. However, reviewers are not expected to evaluate the faculty member's teaching and service contributions. The external reviewers submit their letters to the Dean who forwards a copy to the faculty member and places the original in the Peer Review file. All external letters received are forwarded to the Provost's office with the dossier. The required three (3) letters that go forward to the President and Board of Trustees (for tenure decisions) will be selected by the Provost in consultation with the faculty member. The faculty member can elect to include the additional external letter(s) if applicable in an appendix to his/her BOT document.

If a letter is received after the Peer Review Committee completes their letter of recommendation, the Committee will be asked to review the external letter(s) and either (1) confirm that the original Peer Review Committee recommendation letter stands as written or (2) resubmit a revised Peer Review Committee letter. The faculty member will have the opportunity to comment on a revised letter from the Peer Review Committee consistent with established guidelines.

External letters received after the Dean completes his/her recommendation letter will not be considered within the College. The letter(s) will be forwarded to the Provost.

Faculty requesting promotion and/or tenure who would like to solicit additional letters from individuals at USM and/or within the University of Maine System (optional) should provide the names of these individuals to the Dean. The faculty member should indicate which missions he/she would like the individual to comment on (e.g. teaching, scholarship, service). The Dean's office will solicit these letters, providing the faculty member with copies as they are received. It is the faculty member's decision how many

letters within USM and UMS are to be solicited.

Prior to submission to the Board of Trustees, the faculty member, in consultation with the Dean, will identify which letters the candidate wants included in their presentation (i.e. 3 external, 3 internal to USM, and 3 internal to UMS (optional).

8. The faculty must attach to the BOT Faculty Presentation Outline a statement of goals for his/her next review period plus a statement of progress made towards previously stated goals.

B. Review Procedures

1. The faculty is responsible for compiling all materials required for the review process and verifying that they are placed within the faculty's Peer Review file, according to the schedule established by the Peer Review Committee.
2. The Committee meets and conducts a critical review of the materials presented based on the established criteria of the College.
3. For tenure-track faculty, activities that occurred prior to hiring at the University of Southern Maine College of Nursing and Health Professions cannot be used by the Committee in making recommendations and should not be included in the BOT document. The only exceptions are the faculty's professional employment history, which should be comprehensive, and when prior experience has been applied toward tenure or when the faculty is requesting promotion to Associate Professor prior to beginning his/her sixth year of service at USM. In these later two cases, it is expected that the faculty member will limit his/her comments in the BOT document and dossier materials to the previous five (5) years.
4. A faculty member should be available for clarification or explanation during his/her review.
5. Anyone, including members of the Committee, may be called upon to elaborate on or clarify further a peer evaluation they have submitted on the individual being reviewed.
6. The Committee expects to find some evidence of activity in all three areas of evaluation over a period of time for tenure-track and tenured faculty and in teaching and service for fixed-length or continuous contract faculty. At one given time, more emphasis may be placed on one area over another. Faculty may wish to address this in their dossier.
7. The Committee may request to meet with the faculty after the peer evaluation to share the results of the review.
8. The results of the review, which include the reasons for the decision and the recommendations, will be transmitted in writing to the faculty and to the Dean.
9. For one (1) week prior to forwarding the written evaluation to the Dean or placing in the faculty's official personnel file, the faculty shall have the opportunity to supply a written response, which, if provided, will be attached to the Peer Committee's evaluation.

10. Upon receipt of a written response, the Committee will meet with the faculty within five (5) working days.
11. The final decision of the Committee will be forwarded in writing to the faculty and the Dean unless the faculty chooses to withdraw from the review process. The evaluation, with response, if any, shall be placed in the faculty's personnel file by the custodian of the file.
12. The intent of the Peer Review Committee recommendation letter is to evaluate and recommend promotion, tenure, and/or retention of the faculty member.

C. Retention Policies

1. Strongly negative student and/or faculty responses are the basis for written and/or oral dialogue with a faculty member before reappointment. The Dean may request that the Peer Review Committee evaluate the faculty member's teaching prior to the regularly scheduled review time.
2. Strongly negative student and/or faculty responses for non-tenured faculty, who may be on the tenure track, may be taken as a basis for recommending non-reappointment. Failure to participate in scholarly and service activities may also be a basis for recommending non-reappointment for tenure-track faculty.
3. For tenured faculty, strongly negative student and/or faculty responses which continue for two (2) semesters after a Peer Review Committee and faculty member discussion may be basis for the Peer Review Committee to recommend that the faculty member be disciplined with due recognition of his or her rights under the law and the AFUM contract. This policy also applies to failure to participate in scholarship and/or service activities within the faculty member's review period.

D. Lewiston-Auburn College (LAC) Nursing Faculty Peer Review

1. Nursing faculty at LAC will be reviewed for reappointment and promotion by the CONHP Peer Review Committee with input from a member of the LAC faculty who is appointed by the LAC Faculty Chairperson (2), in consultation with the nursing faculty member.
2. The CONHP Peer Review Committee will track the time frame for faculty review and notify faculty in a timely manner, including providing the relevant criteria for review and what documentation is required.
3. For non tenure-track full-time appointments, the faculty member will be reviewed during the first year of appointment and annually for a total of six years, assuming the faculty member is reappointed. After six years, the non tenure-track full-time faculty member will be reviewed at the time of reappointment. Tenure-track and tenured nursing faculty at LAC will follow the established UMS timelines for review.

2 The LAC Faculty Chairperson will designate one LAC faculty member to serve on the CONHP Peer Review Committee for the LAC Nursing faculty member's review. The LAC faculty member will not review non-LAC nursing faculty members or other faculty in the College of Nursing and Health Professions.

4. The LAC nursing faculty member will include in his/her materials at least one peer review from a nursing faculty member and one peer review from an LAC faculty member.
5. The Chairperson of Nursing will provide the Peer Review Committee a summary of the work assignment for fixed-length nursing faculty.
6. If the LAC nursing faculty member has administrative responsibilities he/she will be evaluated jointly by the LAC Dean and the individual that he/she reports to in the CONHP.
7. The Dean of the CONHP will write the letter of reappointment and/or promotion to the Provost.
8. The nursing faculty member will provide a copy of his/her Broad of Trustee's document and appendices to the LAC faculty member who will participate in the peer review.

Approved by CONHP faculty May 9, 2002, May 6, 2004
Approved Provost Wood June 24, 2002, June 21, 2004

J289 (7/7/04)

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MAINE
COLLEGE OF NURSING AND HEALTH PROFESSIONS
EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION, TENURE,
AND/OR RETENTION FOR FULL-TIME FACULTY**

INTRODUCTION

Working within the framework of the agreement between the University of Maine System (UMS) and the Associated Faculties of the University of Maine (AFUM) surrounding tenure, reappointment, and promotion, evaluation of faculty members within the College of Nursing and Health Professions (CONHP) will be based on performance in teaching, scholarship, and service for tenure-track and tenured faculty and teaching and service for fixed-length and continuous contract faculty.

The areas of teaching, scholarship, and service must be viewed as part of a whole rather than as distinct entities and should be balanced accordingly. Thus, no single category may be pursued to the exclusion of another. Although faculty are required to participate in all three areas, the requirement for balance among the areas does not imply that a faculty member contribute equally in each area. It is expected that influencing factors, such as personal interest, strengths, academic program needs, advising loads, administrative responsibilities, and current rank, will affect the faculty member's participation within each area.

Although this document defines and provides examples, it is not intended to be inclusive of all the teaching, scholarship, and service activities in which a faculty member may be involved. Additionally, examples of scholarship and service are not listed in rank order of importance, but are provided to inform faculty of opportunities and exemplars of scholarship and service.

EVALUATION OF TEACHING

Introduction

Teaching is a complex process, thus the evaluation of teaching effectiveness requires the use of multiple sources and types of evidence including evaluations by students and peers, teaching awards, and examples of course materials. Teaching evaluation, as conducted in CONHP, will focus on the six areas: course goals and content; instructional methods and materials; evaluation of students' work; contributions to curriculum program development and evaluation; teaching improvement; and other academic roles related to teaching. Faculty must address each of the six areas. Example questions are provided to facilitate self-evaluation. Because teaching is a complex task, the questions for each area should not be considered as all inclusive. Faculty are encouraged to add supplemental information which supports their teaching effectiveness.

Teaching: Rank Specific Information

Lecturer and Instructor:

1. Demonstrates competence and knowledge in the designated content areas of teaching
2. Utilizes effective teaching strategies.
3. Incorporates research findings in teaching.
4. Evaluates own teaching.
5. Seeks mentoring experiences when needed.

In addition for Assistant Professor:

1. Articulates a philosophy of teaching and learning.
2. Continues to develop knowledge of content and/or clinical expertise.
3. Demonstrates creative skills in instructional design, delivery, evaluation, and revision.
4. Incorporates the use of research findings in teaching on a regular basis.
5. Utilizes faculty and student input to improve teaching effectiveness.
6. Contributes to curricular and/or program development and evaluation.

In addition for Associate Professor:

1. Demonstrates excellence in teaching.
2. Demonstrates expertise in course and curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation.
3. Assists other faculty members in matters of teaching and learning.

In addition for Professor:

1. Maintains a high level of knowledge about current developments in the area of teaching and in the professional discipline.
2. Mentors others in the development of teaching skills.
3. Leads the program/college in the development and evaluation of curriculum.
4. Demonstrates and creates opportunities for students to link theory, practice, and research.
5. Provides leadership in the development of faculty.

Examples of Documentation for Teaching

- A. Evidence for teaching effectiveness is provided through student and peer evaluations and teaching portfolios when available.

Required Student Evaluations: Rating on accepted College of Nursing and Health Professions student evaluation form(s) or Lewiston-Auburn College student evaluation form for LAC based nursing faculty.

Required Peer Evaluations: Evaluation of examples of course syllabi, study materials, learning experiences, lectures, observations of classroom/clinical teaching, bibliographies, and/or audiovisual materials.

Teaching Portfolios: Evaluation of course syllabi, examples of students' work, examples of lectures or seminar-facilitated notes, and/or web-based/CD-ROM-based materials. (Optional)
Additional evidence may include special recognition of teaching (e.g., awards, letters).

- B. Designated areas of teaching:

1. Course goals and content:
 - a. Are the goals and content being implemented through the syllabus and actual classes?
 - b. Is the course content current with the science and research in the field?
 - c. Was the student work assigned appropriate for the goals and content?
 - d. Were the intellectual tasks set by the faculty appropriately related to the course goals and content?
2. Instructional methods and materials (e.g., lecture, discussion, media, group projects, role playing):
 - a. Are the methods varied and suitable to the content and variety of learning styles?

- b. Are the teaching aids (e.g., handouts, slides) appropriate to the content?
 - c. Is the time allotted to students to complete assignments reasonable?
 - d. Is the reading list appropriate for the course?
 - e. Is the level of assignment difficulty appropriate to the course?
3. Evaluation of students' work:
- a. How adequately do the tests and assignment represent the kinds of student performance specified in the course objectives?
 - b. Are exams reasonable in length and appropriately difficult?
 - c. Do exams and assignments reflect appropriate level of cognitive proficiency for course objectives?
 - d. Are the grading criteria for the course and assignments clear and appropriate?
 - e. Is feedback to students constructive and timely?
4. Contributions to curriculum and program development and evaluation:
- a. Has the faculty member participated in course and/or program development, evaluation, and revision?
 - b. Has the faculty member mentored or collaborated with other faculty in teaching or curriculum development?
5. Teaching improvement:
- a. Has the faculty member demonstrated continuous improvement in teaching?
 - b. Has the faculty member developed innovative methods and/or materials?
 - c. Has the faculty member integrated students' and colleagues' input (feedback) into the improvement process?
6. Other academic roles related to teaching:
- a. Has the faculty member provided adequate support and direction related to students' learning activities, if applicable (e.g., independent studies/theses)?
 - b. Has the faculty member been an effective academic advisor for students?
 - c. Has the faculty member provided adequate levels of development and support for internships/clinical practica, if applicable?

Adapted from: Van Note Chism, N. (1999). *Peer Review of Teaching*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP³

Introduction

Scholarship is an integral part of the faculty role because it enables the creation, restructuring and dissemination of knowledge that is used by society to evolve. Scholarship activities must also be disciplined, goal oriented and reflective of high standards of integrity. In his book, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Boyer (1990) redefined the scholarship role of faculty to encompass a more inclusive conception of scholarly activities. Boyer recognizes four separate yet overlapping elements, i.e., discovery, integration, application, and teaching. The scholarship of integration focuses on the interpretation and synthesis of existing knowledge to bring about new insights and ideas. This type of scholarship is often interdisciplinary in nature. The scholarship of discovery involves investigative, research efforts to produce new knowledge. The scholarship of application is concerned with applying the

³ Not required for Instructors or Lecturers.

knowledge of one's academic discipline to "real world" settings to solve problems or to provide needed service to individuals, groups, or institutions. Lastly, the scholarship of teaching is focused on the production of knowledge that can be used to enhance the transmission of ideas and concepts in educational settings.

CONHP uses the four elements of scholarship described by Boyer to represent various kinds of scholarly work for which faculty should be recognized when undergoing peer and administrative review. Although faculty scholarship must reflect at least one of Boyer's elements, faculty are not required to participate in each element. Over one's career, however, a faculty member could participate in more than one element. Regardless of a faculty member's scholarship focus, it is expected that faculty engage in a sustained program/pattern of scholarship which shows evidence of peer reviewed publications.

Scholarship: Rank Specific Information

Lecturer and Instructor:

1. Demonstrates competence in applying theory and research to teaching and/or practice.

In addition for Assistant Professor:

1. Defines a scholarship focus.
2. Develops and initiates a scholarship agenda.
3. Exhibits consistent scholarly productivity.

In addition for Associate Professor:

1. Demonstrates progress in scholarly area(s).
2. Develops an in-depth scholarly agenda over time.
3. Contributes through own scholarship to the body of knowledge in the field.

In addition for Professor:

1. Achieves national/international recognition for scholarship.
2. Provides leadership in promoting and developing research activities.
3. Provides research training to students and/or faculty through mentoring.
4. Influences theory, policy, practice, and/or pedagogy through scholarship.

Examples of Documentation for Integrative Scholarship

1. PUBLICATIONS
Peer-reviewed publications of research, policy analysis and complex case study analysis
Published integrative reviews of the literature
Published books and/or book chapters
Reports describing interdisciplinary programs or service projects
Policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments
2. PRESENTATIONS
Peer reviewed or invited (local, regional, national, international) presentations
Invited panel discussions
3. GRANTS
Funded grant awards
Unfunded grant proposals that have received peer review and/or approval
4. OTHER PRODUCTS OF SCHOLARSHIP

Examples of Documentation for Scholarship of Discovery

1. PUBLICATIONS
Peer-reviewed publications of research, theory, or philosophical essays
Published books and/or book chapters
2. PRESENTATIONS
Peer-reviewed or invited presentations of research, theory, or philosophical essays
3. GRANTS
Funded grant awards
Unfunded grant proposals that have received peer review and/or approvals
4. OTHER PRODUCTS OF SCHOLARSHIP
Documented involvement in the development or implementation of grants or grant proposals
Documented mentorship of colleagues in research or scholarship
Formal recognition at the state, regional, national, or international level as a scholar in an identified area
Local, university, or professional awards recognizing scholarship (may include nominations for awards)

Examples of Documentation for Scholarship of Application

1. PUBLICATIONS
Peer-reviewed publications of case studies, technical applications, or other practice/teaching issues
Published books and/or book chapters
Reports compiling and analyzing client or health services outcomes
2. PRESENTATIONS
Peer reviewed or invited presentations related to practice (local, state, regional, national, international)
3. GRANTS
Funded grant proposals and/or awards in support of practice
Unfunded grant proposals that have received peer review and/or approval
4. OTHER PRODUCTS OF SCHOLARSHIP
Copyrights, licenses, patents, or products developed
Consultation reports
Formal recognition at state, regional, national, or international levels as a master practitioner or clinician
Professional certifications, degrees, and other specialty credentials
Reports and other non-peer reviewed materials related to practice
Policy papers related to practice
Professional consultation in scholarly or clinical projects, including reports
Ongoing scholarly projects related to clinical practice
Development of clinical evaluation instruments

Examples of Documentation for Scholarship of Teaching

1. PUBLICATIONS
Peer-reviewed publications related to teaching methodology or learning outcomes
Reports and other nonrefereed publications related to teaching
Published books and/or book chapters
2. PRESENTATIONS
Peer reviewed or invited presentations related to teaching/learning (local, state, regional, national, international)
3. GRANTS
Funded grant awards in support of teaching and learning
Unfunded grant proposals that have received peer review and/or approval
4. OTHER PRODUCTS OF SCHOLARSHIP
Development and/or testing of educational models or theories
Accreditation or other comprehensive program reports
Development of new technology for teaching and learning
Design of outcome studies or evaluation/assessment of programs
Investigation of pedagogical approaches

EVALUATION OF SERVICE

Introduction

Service can be generally defined as assistance or benefits afforded another. All faculty are required to provide service to the university, external communities, and to one's profession. Service within these three areas supports the advancement of learning, the enrichment of campus culture, and development of one's discipline. Service also provides opportunities to develop interdisciplinary collaboration, identify links in knowledge across disciplines, and facilitate the implementation of community partnerships and interdisciplinary education. Service is considered an important part of a faculty member's role. Distinction is drawn between service to the community provided as a faculty member and that provided as a private citizen. Service to the community should be directly related to, or flow from, the faculty member's academic/ professional expertise.

Service: Rank Specific Information

Lecturer and Instructor:

1. Serves as an active member of departmental/program committees.
2. Participates in community and/or professional organization's activities.

In addition for Assistant Professor:

1. Promotes college/university goals through membership in committees/work groups.
2. Participates in professional and/or community organizations at the local and state level.

In addition for Associate Professor:

1. Contributes significantly to the college/university through active leadership and participation in departmental, college and/or institutional committees/activities.
2. Demonstrates active involvement in professional service activities at the local, state, or regional level.
3. Provides leadership to community service organizations and/or activities.

In addition for Professor:

1. Maintains ongoing leadership roles in college and university activities.
2. Actively influences policy discussion at the community and professional levels.
3. Advances community and/or professional organizations.
4. Demonstrates involvement in professional service at the national or international level.

Examples of Documentation for Service

University

- Participation in department/college/university committees and activities
- Leadership in department/college/university/committees and activities
- Fostering the departmental relationship with clinical, practicum, and internship site agencies
- Participation in student recruitment and retention activities
- Advisor for student organizations
- Assumes leadership responsibility as department chairperson/director or Associate Dean
- Assumes responsibility for special academic projects such as accreditation coordination or clinical/internship site coordination
- Develops published materials (e.g., newsletters, websites, brochures) related to program and/or college

External Community

- Participates on advisory boards related to professional role
- Participates in organizations and activities related to areas of professional expertise
- Organizes community workshops/conferences/activities
- Receives public awards and/or recognition
- Conducts a professional practice in the community

Professional Community

- Participates in discipline-based organizations at local, state, regional, national, or international levels
- Serves as editor and/or reviewer for professional publications and media products
- Develops published materials related to profession (e.g., newsletters, brochures)
- Provides consultation materials
- Works as peer-reviewer for professional conferences
- Organizes professional workshops/conferences/activities
- Promotes profession through public awareness activities
- Serves as expert witness

Approved by CONHP faculty May 9, 2002

Approved by Provost Wood June 24, 2002

J289