

TO: Academic Affairs
Faculty Handbook Committee

FROM: Faculty Senate
Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Teaching Faculty Rights and Responsibilities

RE: Handbook Revisions and Policy Changes: Teaching Faculty

DATE: March 7, 2014

Background:

The Faculty Senate created a committee to reexamine CSM policy and procedures with respect to Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) faculty with two charges: (1) make recommendations to the Faculty Handbook Committee with respect to the rights, responsibilities, and promotion procedures of NTT faculty; (2) make broader recommendations about the role of NTT faculty to achieve the long-term goals of CSM, including those in the strategic plan. The committee focused its preliminary efforts on teaching faculty (TF), but efforts to stimulate further dialogue for research and library faculty are underway.

Composed of representatives from both tenure-line (3) and teaching faculty (5), the committee solicited extensive feedback from academic faculty campus wide, including via three faculty townhall meetings collectively involving approximately 2/3 of the teaching faculty. The committee is also working with Faculty Senate to launch a Faculty Climate Survey to gather additional data with respect to faculty workloads, productivity, and practices across the campus, as well as their overall attitudes and satisfaction. That data should be available for analysis later this semester.

The Senate unanimously endorsed the recommendations of the committee, and it is hereby transmitting its recommendations for consideration of CSM faculty and administration.

Vision and Goals:

As noted in the strategic plan, Colorado School of Mines is striving to be a student-centered institution focused on pedagogical excellence and innovation. Consistent with this goal, we recognize the value of a thriving and committed instructional faculty line, working symbiotically with the research-active line to maintain CSM's excellent reputation for both research and instruction. Prior initiatives have established faculty ranks that are primarily devoted to the instructional mission of the institution, an important and productive first step. To fully capitalize on their pedagogical expertise, this line of faculty must be supported and incorporated into the campus as fully as possible.

From the vantage point of our students, teaching faculty, no less than tenure-line faculty, are the professors responsible for their educations. Beyond instruction, teaching faculty play critical roles in retention, recruitment, and student life activities, campus service and leadership, and scholarly work. Most of our teaching faculty are not professors who "couldn't make it" on the tenure track. Nor are they here at Mines merely to transition elsewhere. To the contrary, they are dedicated

instructors who see teaching as their core mission, and they have selected CSM as a place to pursue this calling.

Given this profound role in meeting one of the primary missions of the institution, a viable career track for scholars whose calling and expertise is the classroom should be established. To recruit and retain an exceptional instructional faculty, we envision a system that recognizes and rewards great instruction, with career security and opportunities that are consonant with what these faculty members might expect from an institution whose sole mission is undergraduate education. CSM should be a leader in acknowledging the specialized knowledge provided by the teaching faculty and developing a model that fully utilizes both instructional and tenure-line faculty to accomplish its dual goals of being a premier research institution as well as a leader in undergraduate education. This is our “positive vision” for how we see the teaching faculty track serving the broader mission, vision, and values of CSM.

It may be instructive to consider as well what we wish to avoid. As we think about Mines achieving “elite status” and becoming the institution of choice for more and more top students in STEM, we should be mindful of the perils of the failed state-school model with its overreliance on overworked and under-supported instructional faculty, who have few incentives for innovation, pedagogical excellence, engagement in academic and student life, or long-term commitments to the institution. This formula privileges temporary labor: a transitory stopping point for faculty on the road to tenure-track, a resting place for those not able to make it on the tenure-track, or a way station for those who are place-bound. Were such a system to be instituted at Mines, it would jeopardize CSM’s hard-earned reputation for quality undergraduate instruction. This is not the formula for quality undergraduate education; it is merely higher education on the cheap.

Our vision is bolder and more positive: to make CSM a place where teaching faculty are valued, supported, and nurtured so that the career path is attractive and rewarded for those whose calling and passion is the classroom. We have made great strides in this direction. Now is the time to do more.

To move CSM forward in achieving this vision, we emphasize the following recommendations that require significant changes in the way the institution supports and employs teaching faculty.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. CSM should rethink the appropriate balance between teaching, service, and professional development (including scholarly activity) of our teaching faculty to better recognize, promote, and support the meaningful contributions to curricular development, academic service, and student life, they can (and do) provide.

Present policy is uneven, inconsistent, and contradictory. Some TF do extraordinary service for their departments, for the university, and for their professions – above and beyond their heavy teaching loads, putting a strain on their ability to provide the student support CSM needs to offer to further improve its retention and to achieve the “student centered” value we profess. Other TF are so burdened by their course loads and high enrollments that they do not have the time, and rarely the incentive, to become more involved in campus and academic life, thus encouraging a “second class” faculty detached from the mission, vision, and values of CSM.

The Faculty Handbook exemplifies this confusion. Section 6.1.1 explains that teaching faculty should “distribute their efforts between service and instruction,” but the very next passage (6.1.2) identifies a teaching assignment that involves “teaching only,” at 12 credit hours per semester, and with zero responsibilities for service or scholarship. Again later, Section 8.2.2, in establishing promotion criteria for TF, notes that TF “are expected to perform teaching and service” and it lists both “scholarly activities” and “significant service” as criteria for promotion.

This is a contradiction in both practice and policy. The policy suggests that service is required, but that appointments can be made which exclude service, thereby preventing promotion. Likewise, in practice, CSM has TF who are assigned 100% teaching at 12 credit hours per semester (or equivalent), with no opportunity for service except via overload, similarly precluding them from promotion. The institution is effectively telling these faculty: there is a pathway to promotion, but you are not eligible for it by virtue of your appointment. This strikes us as an ethical, professional, and quite possibly legal vulnerability

More to the point, it pushes CSM away from where we want it to go. We want, indeed need, our TF to be engaged in academic life, to be partners in achieving CSM’s mission. It does not serve CSM’s long-term interests to continue TF assignments that are “teaching only” at 12 hours/semester. Exceptional teaching also requires curricular development, assessment, and scholarly activities which are strained by the current model. And everyone agrees piling service upon such a load is untenable in the extreme. (Our townhall meetings were clear as can be on this point: any assignment that envisioned 12 hours + service would trigger wholesale revolt and defection of TF.)

Recommendation #1: Recalibrate Teaching Loads

We therefore recommend a change in the “default assignment” of TF: assignments at 100% teaching at 12 hours/semester should be abandoned in theory and in practice (as they are for the tenure-line). A more sustainable policy that would promote classroom excellence and deepen faculty engagement in campus and academic life would create a norm of 9 hours/semester + service and professional development.

When coupled with a reduction in teaching load, such a meaningful service commitment among TF would have several benefits. It would further integrate TF into normal CSM academic life, and afford them more time to work with and interact with students – thus enhancing both faculty and student satisfaction. It would facilitate achieving CSM’s retention goals; educational research and the FACTIR committee’s report note that close faculty-student interaction is a key metric of student satisfaction and retention. In addition, it could potentially lighten some of the service burden on the tenure-track thereby enhancing their ability to bring in research funding (and meet the strategic plan’s ambitious goals). We note for the record that in our teaching faculty townhall meetings, every single TF member in attendance expressed a commitment and desire to performing meaningful service.

We also underscore that this recommendation is essential for implementing effective and equitable promotion criteria for teaching faculty. It is, in other words, the most important recommendation of the senate. Everything in the existing Faculty Handbook, and in our proposed revisions below, hinges upon a teaching load that permits teaching faculty to engage in service to academic and student life at CSM and to implement transformative innovations in the classroom.

II. CSM should recognize the value of job security as an impetus for incentivizing innovative and excellent teaching, faculty retention, and bold and imaginative campus leadership.

The present system of promotion is a step in the right direction, but a small raise in salary and status are not by themselves sufficient incentives for encouraging the long-term creation of a world-class teaching faculty at CSM. Considering the investment CSM makes in hiring just one teaching faculty member, it is in the institution’s interest to offer *real* incentives that encourage TF retention, promote and reward innovation, risk-taking, and teaching excellence, and acknowledge service contributions to campus life. In our view, the most meaningful such incentive is job security.

Moreover, genuine innovation in the classroom entails risks. Students sometimes recoil at new pedagogies that put them outside their comfort zones, particularly active-learning strategies that require them to engage material and fellow students in ways that are unfamiliar. This forces faculty to make a choice: pursue the new teaching strategy, but risk a reduction in course evaluations; or continue with traditional approaches, regardless of their effectiveness. For teaching faculty hired “at will,” taking these kinds of risks, without job security, come across as perilous business. A drop in evaluations raises concerns about the difference between employment and unemployment. Accordingly, the promotion of true innovation in the classroom will require CSM to provide multi-year contracts to its teaching faculty to provide space for the kinds of adaptation and experimentation that advance the laudable goals for pedagogical excellence in the strategic plan.

Recommendation #2: Provide Multi-Year Contracts to Teaching Faculty

We raise for consideration one possible system:

- I. Upon promotion from assistant to associate teaching professor, a faculty member becomes eligible for a multi-year contract for a two-year term: a rolling contract renewed annually.

- a. We acknowledge the subcommittee's correspondence with Anne Walker noting that changes in Colorado state statute appear to now make such multi-year contracts permissible.
 - b. We emphasize that such a benefit would amount to a significant incentive for teaching excellence and for retaining CSM's best, most accomplished, teachers.
- II. Upon promotion from associate to full teaching professor, a faculty member is offered a multi-year contract, but for three years, again a rolling contract renewed annually. (We understand three years to be the maximum currently allowed by statute).

Recommendation #3: Provide Notice of Non-Renewal to Teaching Faculty

We also recommend that for teaching faculty at all levels, but especially at the associate and full levels, CSM should consider modifications to its "at will" language to provide notice for termination, as is provided for the tenure-track.

We are concerned by the language in Section 4.8: "Exempt employees in non-tenure track appointments are employees at will and, as such, are subject to termination at any time, with or without cause." (Similar language is in 7.3.2 and in 9.5.1). Such legalese implies TF can be fired arbitrarily at any time, as in the middle of a semester, for no reason whatsoever.

The potential arbitrariness of this is damaging to morale among teaching faculty, encourages them to seek employment elsewhere, undermines their mission of being able to contribute to academic leadership on campus when such leadership may require taking contrary or unpopular positions that may nevertheless serve the greater good, and discourages the creation of an engaged, committed, and long-term teaching faculty cohort. It encourages teaching faculty to "fly under the radar" rather than contribute proactively to campus life and governance. (This situation persists notwithstanding the more positive language about fairness and good faith in Item#5 of the NTT contract: https://inside.mines.edu/UserFiles/File/PoGo/Policies/ACD/PM_Sec15.3.pdf.)

We therefore recommend CSM extend to TF the same rights and courtesies as are currently provided to tenure-track (untenured) faculty in Section 9.1.1.A:

"A tenure-track faculty member whose contract will be non-renewed by CSM prior to its expiration date shall be notified of that fact in a letter from the Provost delivered according to the timetable set forth below: First year of CSM service: At least 10 weeks before effective date of non-renewal; Second year of CSM service: At least 5 months before effective date of non-renewal; More than two years of CSM service: At least 12 months before effective date of non-renewal."

We believe that extending such rights to TF would cost CSM little, while contributing greatly to morale and retention by adding predictability to TF terms of employment and by guaranteeing TF reasonable opportunities to seek other employment should their positions at CSM be terminated.

Recommendation #4: Extend Professional Development Leave to Teaching Faculty

We also recommend creating a professional development leave program, paralleling that of the tenured faculty sabbatical benefit, for meritorious activities that advance teaching excellence, enhance subject expertise, and further the professional development of TF. We believe this is an important incentive for recruiting, retaining, and developing our teaching faculty members. We propose consideration of language like the following for implementing this policy in the Faculty Handbook (modeled after similar programs at other universities):

“Professional development leave (PDL) programs are intended to advance the abilities of faculty members and to strengthen the university. Such programs contribute significantly to the quality and success of academic universities, and they provide eligible faculty members with the opportunity for professional renewal, planned travel, study, formal education, research, writing, faculty development, certification, or other experiences of professional value.

PDL assignments normally are one semester in length, but individuals may propose other approaches (a summer stipend, support for other professional development activities that do not fit a standard semester schedule, internship support, etc.). The process for application and review of proposals follows the same deadlines and procedures as the sabbatical review process. A teaching faculty member becomes eligible for PDL upon achieving the rank of teaching associate professor or teaching full professor and seven years of full-time service to CSM. The faculty member may seek a PDL for the seventh year following the year in which CSM granted the prior PDL. A faculty member denied a PDL for whatever reason is free to submit a new proposal the following year. Unused PDL allocations are not forwarded to the following year.”

III. CSM should amend and update its promotion procedures for teaching faculty in the Faculty Handbook and Procedures Manual to better align with the unique roles they play on campus.

In Appendix I & II of this report, we have appended draft language and comments recommending changes to the Faculty Handbook and Procedures Manual, especially (but not exclusively) those sections governing promotion. We explain here our reasoning for the more significant changes we propose.

It is especially important that promotion dossiers for teaching faculty convey adequately candidates’ pedagogical innovations and classroom contributions. The University Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee needs more meaningful data (beyond mere quantitative scores on course evaluations) to assess a faculty member’s contribution to the educational mission of CSM.

Recommendation #5: Require Portfolio of Teaching Materials in Promotion Dossier

Accordingly, we believe a portfolio of teaching materials documenting instructional activities should be a required component of the dossier (see Appendix II, item 12, for draft language). We need dynamic ways to understand and evaluate successful teaching beyond student evaluations or numbers of courses developed, credit hours delivered, etc. A peer review group would gain greater insight if they were presented with these types of materials. This offers a measure to concretely evaluate the actual quality of teaching, rather than the perceived quality of teaching. Creating the portfolio also encourages reflection on teaching methods and encourages professional development.

Because such a portfolio would need to represent the truly diverse range of teaching activities on campus, we recommend CSM create an ad hoc faculty committee (perhaps composed of a TF representative from each college) to develop useful guidance for faculty members clarifying the nature of materials to be included in this section of the dossier.

Recommendation #6: Implement Peer Evaluation System

Peer evaluations should supplement student evaluations. While neither student nor peer evaluations are perfect metrics, we believe having both sets of perspectives are important for evaluation of teaching effectiveness. (For example: a faculty member may deploy a pedagogical tactic that makes students uncomfortable because of its novelty, but which is effective: something a peer evaluation can help document and clarify.) We also believe that peer evaluations can serve as important sources for professional development for both the instructor and the peer evaluator. It is an opportunity for each faculty member to learn from the other.

We therefore recommend CSM create an ad hoc faculty committee (perhaps composed of a TF representative from each college) to develop an appropriate and effective procedure for peer evaluation with the advice and consent of the faculty. This committee should consider not just the “evaluative” nature of peer evaluations, but also the constructive use of peer evaluations to enhance the quality of instruction on campus.

Recommendation #7: Professional Development as Handbook Promotion Criterion

Professional development is critical to promote innovation and further the disciplinary expertise that is a hallmark of higher education. Accordingly, we recommend in the proposed Handbook language requiring “professional development” as a category for assessing promotion criteria from teaching associate to teaching full professor.

We use the term “professional development” as an umbrella concept to include the wide range of intellectual activities (pedagogical and academic) that contribute to the ability of a faculty member to teach effectively and authoritatively, including pedagogical workshops and seminars, participation in and attendance at professional meetings, involvement with professional organizations, scholarship on pedagogy or in the faculty member’s academic field, and other activities that enhance disciplinary expertise and pedagogical excellence.

(We also note for the record that while pedagogical research remains important for many TF on campus, for many others different forms of professional development are more appropriate and beneficial. Accordingly, the broad concept of “professional development” speaks to the committee’s concern and unanimous opposition in the townhall meetings to defining professional development too narrowly or exclusively as “pedagogical research.”)

APPENDIX I: COMMENTS AND SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO FACULTY HANDBOOK

SECTION 4

4.9.3 B

Change title to “Teaching Faculty and Research Faculty”

Regarding this language: “Subject to their legislatively mandated employment at-will status...” We understand that multi-year contracts are now permissible under CO law; does this underscore the need to revisit this language?

SECTION 6:

6.1.2

The “Teaching Assignment Guidelines” chart should be modified to take into account the observations made under part I of this memo, namely that a “teaching only” assignment of 12 hours/semester by definition denies the possibility of promotion to affected faculty, since service and other professional development is required for such promotion.

SECTION 7:

7.2

We believe that Professional Growth and Development Plans (7.2) should include Teaching Faculty, with a goal of mentoring such faculty to achieve promotion, to encourage retention, and to cultivate strong teachers who are experts in their fields.

7.3.2

Change title to “Teaching Faculty” (and “Research Faculty”)

7.3.2 A Availability of Institutional Support

Is this paragraph still applicable as written? And are there not mechanisms for providing support these days?

SECTION 8:

NOTE: The comments/edits for SECTION 8 below make reference to the edited version of the Handbook emailed from Tom Boyd to Lincoln Carr on 12/9/13; the numeration system may differ from existing Handbook.

Change all of 8.2.1 as follows:

“8.2.1 Criteria for Promotion

Promotion in teaching rank is based on the quality of the faculty member’s teaching and overall engagement with the CSM community as evidenced by performance in teaching, service, and professional development, which may include scholarship. [The minimum qualifications for teaching faculty are set forth in subsection 4.3 above.]

As departmental and CSM goals change, so, too, will the criteria for evaluating teaching faculty. Additionally, teaching faculty member roles and responsibilities vary widely between and within departments, a consideration that should be borne in mind when considering an individual faculty member’s application for promotion. To help each department nurture its teaching faculty, Department Heads will work with them to help define a career path and assignment that puts teaching faculty on a track for professional growth and promotion.

While Teaching Assistant Professors are appointed based on their potential for effective teaching, their promotion to Teaching Associate Professor is premised primarily upon demonstrated success in teaching, but should include as well a meaningful contribution to academic and student life at CSM. The following list provides general criteria that should be considered when evaluating a promotion from Assistant Teaching Professor to Teaching Associate Professor: (1) development of high-quality curricular and instructional materials, to be assessed via a portfolio of teaching materials to be included as a component of the dossier; (2) the quality and trajectory of the candidate’s teaching and instructional methods, to be assessed via peer and student evaluations, as well as annual Faculty Data Reports and evaluations; (3) departmental or institutional service, which may include activities to enhance student learning or progress, such as individual and group advising, recruitment and retention efforts, and/or student life programs (e.g., additional tutoring, workshops, student organizations and activities). The professional development activities specified below may also be considered.

Promotion to Teaching Professor is premised upon continued teaching excellence, overall contribution to the institution, and professional development. **In addition to the criteria listed above**, the following list provides general criteria that should be considered when evaluating a promotion from Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor: (1) demonstration of curricular leadership, which may include developing courses, coordinating courses, mentoring junior faculty, and/or curricular service to departments or CSM; (2) significant service on both institutional and departmental committees; and (3) professional development that contributes to teaching effectiveness, which may include pedagogical workshops and seminars, participation in and

attendance at professional meetings, involvement with professional organizations, scholarship on pedagogy or in the faculty member's academic field, and other activities that enhance disciplinary expertise and pedagogical excellence.

The final decision to promote a faculty member lies solely within the discretion of the Board."

8.2.2 Departmental Promotion Committee

To address Tom Boyd's request for a "statement on role of departmental committee" (in effect to clarify distinct roles and perspectives between departmental and university committees), we propose inserting something like the following at the start of 8.2.2:

"The Departmental Promotion Committee reviews the promotion application from the perspective of departmental colleagues with expert knowledge of the standards and practices of the candidate's discipline and the curricular needs and norms of the department or program, as well as familiarity with the candidate's teaching, interaction with students and colleagues, and contribution to the department or program."

For parallel wording with respect to University Committee, see notes for 12.9.1 below.

Suggestion: Consider changing last sentence to put deans in charge of approving temporary departmental P&T committee members.

Question: Should this section be re-titled: "Departmental Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee"? (to be consistent with University Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee, referenced in 8.2.4 and 12.9.1)

8.2.3 No change

8.2.4 Promotion Review Process

Suggestion: Role of deans in promotion process should mirror that of tenure track.

Suggestion: 8.2.4 F should include a reference to section 12.9.1 re "University Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee."

SECTION 12:

NOTE: The comments/edits for SECTION 12 below make reference to the edited version of the Handbook emailed from Tom Boyd to Lincoln Carr on 12/9/13; the numeration system may differ from existing Handbook.

12.9 Suggestion: Rearrange order of this section, as follows:

- Function
- Membership
- Method of Appointment
- Terms of Appointment
- Method Operation

12.9.1

To address Tom Boyd's request for a "statement on role of university committee" (in effect to clarify distinct roles and perspectives between departmental and university committees), we propose inserting something like the following to 12.9.1: Function:

"The University Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee shall be responsible for evaluating the qualifications of teaching faculty candidates for promotion and providing advice and recommendations thereon to the Provost. The University Committee reviews the promotion application to insure that broadly understood institutional standards and uniformity of review are applied to all candidates across the institution. Although the University Committee may not possess the same disciplinary expertise as the candidate's departmental reviewers, the University Committee's ability to offer a detached assessment of the candidate's qualifications and contributions provides valuable additional insights into the promotion application."

[For parallel wording with respect to Departmental Committee, see notes for 8.2.2 above.]

12.9.2

Delete "neither" in 2nd sentence. Delete "equitably" in last sentence (laudable, but not feasible under existing conditions).

Comment: We agree in principle that it would be desirable to reduce the size of the committee to 5, but it raises too great a probability of not making a quorum given recusal procedure.

12.9.3

Insert "Annually," at start of first sentence: "Annually, the Provost shall appoint the chairperson of the Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee." [to clarify that one chair will not serve for 3 years]

12.9.4

Insert "University" before Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee?

APPENDIX II: PROPOSED CHANGES TO PROCEDURES MANUAL

To guide the implementation of our Handbook recommendations above, we propose language like the following for revision of and additions to the Procedures Manual with respect to TF promotion procedures. Such language should be revisited, with the advice and consent of the faculty, based upon the final Handbook language that is approved.

Suggested changes to Academic Affairs Procedure Manual

Rename Section 6.1 to: **Tenure-track Faculty Promotion/Tenure Timetable and Scenario**

Add Section 6.2 as indicated below

Re-number and rename existing Section 6.2 as follows: **Section 6.3 Tenure-track Faculty Guidelines for Submission of Promotion/Tenure Material**

Add section 6.4 as indicated below

Re-number Existing Section 6.3 to **Section 6.5**

Re-number Existing Section 6.4 to **Section 6.6**

Re-number and rename Existing Section 6.5 to **Section 6.7 Items for Tenure-track Candidate, Department Head/Division Director and Department/Division Promotion & Tenure Committee to Consider When Preparing Application Package**

6.2 TEACHING FACULTY PROMOTION TIMETABLE AND PROCEDURES

Promotion is discussed in Section 8 of the Faculty Handbook at http://inside.mines.edu/UserFiles/File/policies/FAC/HB_Sec8_Promotion_Tenure.pdf.

The following information is a supplement to the policies outlined in the Handbook. Deadlines will be announced by Academic Affairs early in Fall semester and are available at <http://inside.mines.edu/Calendars>.

1. The candidate prepares the application package outlined in Section 6.4 of this Procedures Manual and submits it to the appropriate department head/division director.
2. The department/division promotion and tenure committee reviews the application package and submits its recommendation(s) in writing to the department head/division director. In preparing this letter, the committee should consider the criteria for promotion listed in the Faculty Handbook. The letter of recommendation will list the names of all members of the department/division promotion and tenure committee and be signed by all members who participated in making the recommendation. At least $\frac{3}{4}$ of the eligible members of the committee must participate in the decision. The final vote (unanimous, or a number for or against the candidate's request for promotion and/or tenure) should be given. This written recommendation should be added to the application package before submission of the package to the department head/division director.

3. The department head/division director reviews the application package and the candidate's evaluation summaries from the last three years and makes a written recommendation, which is added to the application package. In preparing this recommendation, the department head/division director should consider the criteria for tenure and/or promotion listed in the Faculty Handbook. The complete application package is forwarded to the Provost.
4. All files will be available in the Academic Affairs Office for review by the **University Teaching Faculty Promotion Committee**.
5. **The University Teaching Faculty Promotion committee** will review the files and make its recommendations in writing to the Provost, using the guidelines in sections 8 and 12.8 of the Faculty Handbook.
6. The Provost reviews these recommendations and communicates decisions to department heads/division directors. All positive decisions are announced at the April Faculty Forum.

6.4 Teaching Faculty Guidelines for Submission of Promotion Material

Please see Section 8 of the Handbook for complete information:

http://inside.mines.edu/UserFiles/File/policies/FAC/HB_Sec8_Promotion_Tenure.pdf.

Material should be collected in a three-ring binder (maximum size: three inches) with a divider for each section. The binder's spine should be labeled with the faculty member's name and department.

Sections should be in the following order:

1. Table of contents
2. Statement from candidate regarding submission.
3. Memorandum from the department head/division director naming the faculty member for whom the material is being submitted. Additionally the DHDD shall certify that all required dossier sections are complete and in the order as stated within this section of the Procedures Manual.
4. Letter of recommendation from the department/division promotion and tenure committee. The letter of recommendation should list the names of all members of the committee and be signed by all members who participated in making the recommendation. At least $\frac{3}{4}$ of the eligible members of the committee must participate in the decision. The final vote

(unanimous, or a number for or against the candidate’s request for promotion) should be given.

5. Letter of recommendation from the department head/division director, signed
6. Current Faculty Data Report
7. Most recent, signed Faculty Contract (if the employee or department/division do not have a copy, please contact Academic Affairs)
8. Curriculum Vitae (see Section 3.2 of this Manual for appropriate formatting information). Include full citations of any publications. The list should clearly differentiate between refereed publications, conference proceedings, books, presentations, etc.
9. Faculty Evaluation Summary Sheets and Faculty Data Reports for three most recent years
10. Evaluation of teaching to include summaries of student evaluation of teaching for three most recent years and peer evaluations.
11. Summary of teaching accomplishments. Information and tables might include: courses taught, course development, and information about independent studies, undergraduate thesis advising, senior design, Honors program involvement, and other teaching contributions. An example might include:

Course Number	Course Title	Course Hours	Semester Taught	Number of Students

12. Portfolio of teaching materials. In general, a teaching portfolio should include a brief (250-300 word) teaching philosophy statement followed by materials that show the application of learning objectives, which may include sample lesson plans, syllabi, sample of graded student work, and/or activities. It is not necessary to include all such materials, but the candidate should select those materials that demonstrate teaching excellence. Example assessment measures should also be included to illustrate ways that the instructor evaluated the efficacy of the curriculum, addressing: (a) rationale for the changes/development, (b) evidence of how material changed (c) assessment results—did the development accomplish desired goals? How do you know?

[Note: we expect this guidance to evolve on the recommendations of the proposed faculty ad hoc committee on teaching portfolios.]

13. Table(s) summarizing service to your Department, CSM, and External/Professional Organizations. An example might look like:

Departmental Service

Committee/Service Obligation	Years Served	Brief Description of Responsibility	Notable Personal Contributions

14. Evidence of professional development that contributes to teaching effectiveness, which may include pedagogical workshops and seminars, participation in and attendance at professional meetings, involvement with professional organizations, scholarship on pedagogy or in the faculty member’s academic field, and other activities that enhance disciplinary expertise and pedagogical excellence.

15. Graduate students

If applicable list involvement in graduate student committees and/or table of graduate students advised or co-advised.

An example of such a table is as follows:

Student Name	Degree & Year	Funding Source	Publications, Presentations, etc. Resulting from Research

16. Other information from the candidate, which could include grants received, letters of support, teaching awards received, other contributions to campus life, etc.