MONTANA
STATE UNIVERSITY

Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures

of the

English
_____
(Name of Department/School/College)

Effective Date: July 1, 2019

APPROVALS	SIGNATURE	DATE
Philip Gaines		5-3-19
Department Faculty	Chair, Primary Review Committee	
Kirk Branch		5/3/19
Primary Administrative Reviewer	Department Head/Director	
N/A		
Intermediate Review Committee	Chair, Intermediate Review Committee	
NICOL C-RAE		
Intermediate Administrative Reviewer	College Dean	
David Eitle		5/7/19
College Review Committee	Chair, College Review Committee	
DAVID J. SINGEL		
University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	
Robert L. Mokwa		5-7-19
Provost		

Role and Scope Document
for
English

Article I.   **Role and Scope of Unit**

The Department of English constitutes a core academic discipline at Montana State University, and contributes to the mission of the College of Letters and Science, the University, and the state of Montana through its instructional, research/ creative activity, service and outreach roles, activities which are closely intertwined.

The curriculum leading to the Bachelor of Arts in English provides the student three options: 1) the literature option for students who wish to specialize in the study of literature, especially those preparing for a broad range of careers including graduate study in English or related fields; and 2) the writing option for students who wish to specialize in the study and production of expository and creative writing and rhetoric, in preparation for professional writing careers or graduate study; and 3) the English teaching option for students wishing to specialize in the study of literature, language, and composition as preparation for certification for secondary school teaching. In addition, the Department offers an MA in English that focuses on the interconnectedness of writing, teaching, and literary studies. This graduate program expands the professional options of our graduate students by providing a broadly conceived course of study that emphasizes the process by which knowledge in the field of English is made.

Scholarship and creative activity are an integral part of the Department's mission. Our scholarship advances professional and public understanding and appreciation of literature, of language, of writing and rhetoric, and of cultural, historical, professional and pedagogical issues. An equally important function of our discipline is the production of original creative works. These activities not only add to knowledge and art, but also serve to enhance instruction on both the undergraduate and graduate levels, providing rigorous educational challenges and resources for students and fostering on-going faculty development in their respective areas of expertise.

The Department of English faculty fulfill active service and outreach functions locally, nationally and within the academic, professional and public spheres. The department is expressly committed to engendering excellence in the teaching of English in the State of Montana through its English Education program, providing continuing education and outreach services to English instructors around the region. Department members serve on national and state humanities committees, professional boards and organizations, various institutional committees, and community committees. Tenure Track Faculty in the Department of English will have the appropriate terminal degree for their position, which will, in most cases, be a Doctoral Degree (the possible

1

exception being for a creative writing position, which may potentially be filled by a candidate with an MFA, the terminal degree in that area).

The Department of English operates with a Chair system. The Chair is elected by the Department for a three-year term, and is eligible for re-election for another three-year term upon completion of the first term. There is a two-term limit for the Chair.

Article II.   Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

Not applicable.

Article III.   Annual Review Process

An annual review assesses a faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year, and is based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, role statements, annual assignments, self-assessment, and the department head's evaluation of the individual's performance. The annual review process, appeals to the dean, and changes in assigned percentages of effort are described in the University Faculty Handbook.

Faculty members will individually compile their materials from Activity Insight and submit these to the Department Chair, along with copies of relevant publications and other research and/or creative activity materials and the complete set of teaching evaluations from the previous academic year. These materials will be reviewed by the Chair's Executive Committee, which will provide an advisory evaluation to the Department Chair, who has final determination regarding the evaluation. The Chair will provide a written evaluation for each faculty member. Each faculty member will meet with the Chair to discuss the written evaluation. Once faculty members and the Chair have reviewed the evaluation, the Chair will submit the materials to the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences.

The Chair's Executive Committee is comprised of three tenured faculty members elected by the department for one two-year term. For the Annual Review process, the Chair will appoint an untenured faculty member to serve in an advisory capacity with CEC.

Faculty members can appeal a Chair's evaluation by submitting a written letter to the Chair; should the Chair decide to retain the original evaluation, the faculty member may ask that the appeal letter be submitted with the rest of the Annual Review material to be reviewed by the Dean.

Non-Tenure Track faculty who are not represented by the CBA will be reviewed by the Chair, under advisement from appropriate tenure track faculty. (i.e. The chair will work with creative writing faculty to review NTT faculty teaching creative writing courses.) These faculty members will submit course

evaluations, syllabi, and a teaching statement.

Article IV Primary Review Committee and Administrator

Section 4.01

The Primary Review Committee is the Department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee, which will consist of three tenured faculty elected by the English Department and one tenured faculty appointed by the Chair. Normally a majority of the RTP Committee will hold the rank of Full Professor. The Department Chair will appoint one of these members as Chair. They will serve two year terms on the committee. If committee composition is restricted due to limitations or conflicts within the Department, the Head will request approval from the University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee to make an alternate tenured faculty appointment.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

The Primary Review Administrator will be the Department Chair. Should the Primary Review Administrator have a conflict of interest with a candidate under review, the CLS Dean will identify an individual to serve as Primary Review Administrator for the case under review.

Section 4.03 Identification of responsible entities

(a) The Department Chair will establish the Primary Review Committee either by facilitating the election or appointment of the members as described in section 4.01.

(b) The Primary Review Committee will select external reviewers and solicit review five letters as described in section 6.03.01.

(c) The Primary Review Committee will direct the candidate to select and solicit Internal Reviews for teaching performance as described in section 6.03.02.

(d) The Primary Review Committee, with the assistance of the Department Chair, will assure the following materials are included in the Dossier:

    (i) Internal and external reviewer letters of solicitation, letters from the reviewers and, in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch of the reviewer should be included in the Dossier.

    (ii) Applicable Role and Scope Document.

(iii) Letter of hire, any Percentages of Effort changes, all annual reviews, and all Evaluation Letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.

(iv) Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period.

The Department Chair will maintain copies of all review committee Evaluation Letters and internal, (if applicable), and external review letters after the review.

Section 4.04 Next Review Level

The next review level after the reviews by the Primary Review Committee and the Primary Review Administrator is the College of Letters & Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (CLSRTPC).

Article V.   Intermediate Review Committee Administrator

Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee – Composition and Appointment

The Intermediate Review Committee is the College of Letters and Science Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee, with composition and appointment as described in the CLS Role and Scope.

Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator

The Intermediate Review Administrator is the Dean of the College of Letters and Science.

Section 5.03 Level of Review Following Intermediate Review Administrator

The next level of review after the Intermediate Review Administrator is the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Article VI.   Review Materials

Section 6.01

Materials for external review must include:

A. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.

B. A brief statement that identifies the candidate's area of Scholarship.

C. Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represents their Scholarship.

Materials for Dossier must include:

- Cover sheet obtained from the Provost's office.

- A comprehensive CV with Teaching, Scholarship, and Service activities of the candidate.
- A Personal Statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of Scholarship.
- Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation shall include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition itemized by year over the relevant Review Period.

If included in the CV, the candidate should separate the following categories:
- Refereed books or book chapters
- Refereed journal articles
- Invited book chapters or articles
- Invited conference presentations
- Contributed conference presentations
- Seminars and/or colloquia
- Grant proposals submitted and grants funded
- Non-refereed publications

The candidate may choose to include other categories as appropriate to the discipline and the candidate's record. For papers, grants funded, and other scholarly products, full author lists must match the publication or grant award.

This list is a general requirement for all dossiers. For further details including evidence of teaching, scholarship, service, and integration activity, see Articles VIII-XI of this document.

Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

Conventions for crediting collaborative work vary greatly among the different disciplines and journals represented in the Department. In particular, author order on published works can generally not be used to infer any information about the nature, quantity, or quality of the contribution of any particular author.

The candidate will provide a single document briefly describing the candidate's contribution to each collaborative scholarly work over the relevant review period. The candidate may choose to use a single statement to describe any long-term collaboration that has resulted in multiple publications or grants.

Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Process

The process and requirements for soliciting peer review materials are described in the University Faculty Handbook, "Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," section 6.

6.03.1 External Peer Reviews

External reviewers should be specialists in the candidate's field and familiar with the Department expectations for faculty performance. Departments should elaborate how these guidelines apply to their disciplines. At least half of the external reviewers must be selected by the department RTP committee; the remainder may come from a list of names submitted by the candidate. Candidates shall not be informed of the identity of outside evaluators to protect the confidentiality of the review process.

The five external review letters must be requested by the Department Head or the Department Committee, and must not be solicited by the candidate. The Department report should state clearly how external referees were chosen and should include a professional biosketch. Referees will be asked to state knowledge of or relationship to the candidate, if either applies.

External evaluators will be sent be sent a copy of the candidate's vita and the English Department Role and Scope document, as well as a selection of relevant publications and/or unpublished manuscripts, along with other materials, as appropriate. They should be asked to comment specifically on the quality of the candidate's written scholarship and his or her productivity, as well as the candidate's recognition in the field.

6.03.2 Internal Peer Reviews

The candidate, in consultation with the Department Head or the Chair of the Committee, will solicit at least three internal letters from peers who have observed their classroom teaching and reviewed their teaching materials during the two years prior to the review. These internal peers can include members of the candidate's department, other faculty from across the University, and University administrators. These letters will evaluate the teaching practices and methods of the candidate.

Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01 Retention Review

Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position.

Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review

Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee

Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review

The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion.

Article VIII.   Retention Reviews

Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Reviews

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 8.02 University Standard

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

(a) effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and

(b) integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and

(c) satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Performance indicators and weighting are defined in Section 9.03. The same indicators used in tenure review are used in retention review.

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Effectiveness in teaching is as described in Section 9.04.

Effectiveness in Scholarship:

Quantitative:

In order to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship, candidates for retention are expected to have one peer-reviewed article published, accepted for publication, or under review, or their equivalent demonstrating scholarly production. Candidates for retention in creative writing will have published with a nationally recognized literary press (including small presses) or in a literary or commercial magazine judged significant within the field of creative writing.

Qualitative:

The candidate is expected to demonstrate the development a research/creative activity program appropriate to the candidate's field. Factors such as prestige of different presses and journals, the impact and reputation of publications, the scope of awards and other recognition, and the varying publication opportunities in different fields will be considered. Locally and nationally competitive grants and fellowships in support of research/creative activity are considered evidence of research/creative productivity. The scope, nature and venue of scholarly presentations or invited readings will also be considered (e.g., keynote or plenary address, invited lecture, etc.)

Effectiveness in service is as described in Section 9.04.

Effectiveness in integration is as described in Section 9.04.

Candidates will demonstrate integration between two areas of scholarship, teaching, and/or service. While there is no quantitative measure for this, candidates will show clear connections between their work in two of these areas.

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Evidence of Performance Indicators are listed in Section 9.05. The same performance indicators and evidence that are used in tenure review are used in retention review,

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

Because candidates for retention will be reviewed early in their career, the Dossier for retention review may include works submitted but not yet accepted or other preliminary steps toward publication, and/or other materials that demonstrate progress on a coherent research/creative program. In cases of tenure and promotion, works or products that have not yet been accepted may not be considered as part of the Dossier.

Article IX. Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 9.02 University Standard

The University standards for the award of tenure are:
a.   sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and

b. integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and

c. accomplishment in scholarship.

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Teaching performance indicators and weighting

The MSU Faculty Handbook defines teaching as "the set of activities performed by faculty that fosters student learning, critical and ethical thinking, problem solving, and creativity. It requires the faculty member to have a command of the subject matter, to maintain currency in the discipline, and to create and maintain instructional environments that successfully promote learning. In addition to the instructional responsibilities in the Academic Responsibilities policy, teaching includes incorporation of current pedagogical innovations, incorporation of new technologies and approaches to learning and assessment, course and curriculum design and development; thesis and professional project assistance, mentoring, and participation in student projects, theses, and dissertations; academic and career advising of undergraduate and graduate students; supervision of student teachers, graduate teaching and research assistants, student interns; and any valuable contributions to the university's instructional enterprise."

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to teaching. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in teaching is evaluated.

- Delivering quality instruction in support of the Department's teaching mission (as documented by faculty peer review of teaching)
- Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum materials (note that publications resulting from such activities are performance indicators of scholarship)
- Design and facilitation of instructional programs, e.g., graduate teaching assistant training (note that publications resulting from such activities are performance indicators of scholarship)
- Mentorship of graduate students (e.g., supervising or substantially contributing to graduate student research)
- Mentorship of undergraduate students (e.g., supervising undergraduate research or independent study projects)
- Student evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments

Student evaluations are vulnerable to various forms of bias (e.g., evaluations may be based on criteria other than quality of instruction). Therefore, evaluation scores and averages should be applied with caution as a measure of teaching effectiveness and supplemented by other evidence. In particular, written student comments may be viewed as formative feedback to be used for instructor improvement, but are not considered a form of evaluation.

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in teaching, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP

Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

Scholarship performance indicators and weighting

Faculty members in the Department of English have an obligation to develop their research and/or creativity and to enhance the effectiveness of MSU--Bozeman in performing its mission in preserving, expanding, and transmitting knowledge. Evidence of an ongoing scholarly and or creative publication record appropriate to the faculty member's field(s) of interest and expertise is required of all faculty members. The Department recognizes individual differences in the quality and quantity of the scholarly and creative work, and takes into account in its assessments and recommendations both the resources and time available to the faculty member and the mission of the Department within the College and University. Regardless of the combination of professional activities, a sustained record of research/creativity and publication is expected of all faculty and necessary for advancement to tenure.

The indicators listed in Group 1 carry the most weight in the performance evaluation of scholarship. Those from Group 2 also contribute to the evaluation of scholarship but carry less weight.

Group 1

- Refereed monographs, journal articles (print or online), book chapters, appropriate to the candidate's field of scholarship.
- Published creative works (for candidates being evaluated on creative writing);
- External grants funded;
- Editing of scholarly journals and books;
- Invited major talks (e.g., plenary or keynote).

Group 2

- Conference presentations at professional meetings;
- Serving as respondents or discussants at conference sessions;
- Internal grants funded;
- Grant proposals submitted (internal and external);
- Non-refereed publications;
- Shorter publications such as book reviews and encyclopedia entries;
- Development of scholarly source material for the profession (i.e. curriculum materials or software);
- Manuscripts in preparation for submission to publication.

Service Performance Indicators and weighting

Service includes committee activities for the English Department, the College, and the University, as well as outreach and other forms of activity related to the Department's role and scope. A record of service is expected of all Department members as well as candidates for promotion and tenure. Everyone is expected to contribute to the common enterprises of the Department. Where necessary, statements of support and evaluation of service may be solicited from outside the English Department.

Service includes:

> Departmental committees and governance;
>
> Faculty governance and administration;
>
> Participation in professional meetings and organizations, including holding office, organizing conferences and panels, chairing panels, reporting to colleagues on meetings;
>
> Reviewing manuscripts for publication;
>
> Consulting activities;
>
> Community service and outreach which utilize the faculty member's professional training and professional expertise relevant to his or her faculty position;
>
> Supporting other faculty inside and outside the Department in their teaching and research/creative endeavors (that is, generally serving as a catalyst for growth within the academic community by calling attention to opportunities for publication, presentations, training, course development, teaching improvement, grant submission, etc.);
>
> Initiatives beyond solicited assignments.

While candidates will be expected to have performed service at the Department level, the varieties of service performed make additional weighting difficult. Weight will be placed on the impact and extent of particular service activities.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Teaching

Effectiveness in teaching is achieved through the candidate's positive contributions to the design, delivery, and instruction of courses, both in and beyond the Department, as well as in the various areas articulated in the definition of teaching in the Faculty Handbook and throughout Section 9.03 on teaching.

Written peer evaluations based on class observations (sec. 6.03.2) will be, in the majority, positive.

Typically, candidates will be no more than one point below the Department mean in overall performance on the student evaluation scores.   Candidates should address in writing any cases where the scores fall below the department mean.

Instruction methods and material are demonstrated to be appropriate to the respective course content and objectives, with materials reflecting current issues and scholarship in the field. Syllabi include outcomes, course requirements, assignments and grading policies. The candidate will present these materials with a teaching statement that contextualizes them and connects them to a developed teaching philosophy and goals.

Many candidates will have performed a range of additional teaching activities beyond the classroom and the department. These will be evaluated according to their reach and their impact, and the candidate will contextualize any non-classroom and/or department teaching activities in the teaching statement.

It is expected that the faculty member will exhibit no serious pedagogical deficiencies as reflected by the various teaching criteria.

Scholarship

Normally, in order to demonstrate accomplishment in scholarship, candidates for tenure are expected to have four peer-reviewed articles published or accepted for publication, or one peer-reviewed book-length monograph published or accepted for publication (candidates must submit a letter from the press indicating that a completed manuscript has been submitted and will be published). Normally, candidates for tenure in creative writing will have published a book with a nationally recognized literary press (including small presses) or have a series of related publications in literary or commercial magazines judged significant within the field of creative writing. In unusual circumstances, such as work of considerable impact or prestige, exceptions to this standard are possible.

The candidate is expected to demonstrate steady scholarly activity. Materials from Group 1 carry more weight than materials from Group 2 (see Section 9.03). Factors such as prestige of different presses and journals, the impact and reputation of publications, the scope of awards and other recognition, and the varying publication opportunities in different fields will be considered. Locally and nationally competitive grants and fellowships in support of research/creative activity are considered evidence of research productivity. The scope, nature and venue of scholarly presentations will also be considered (e.g., keynote or plenary address, invited lecture, etc.) The evaluations of external reviewers will also play a role in determining the quality of the research/creativity program.

Service
On the typical 40-40-20 workload assignment in the department, candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to have served on one or more Department, College and/or University committee(s) on a regular

basis during the evaluation period, or to have performed other service for the department, college, university and/or a local or national community or organization. Candidates will perform service commensurate with the assigned percentage of effort.

Candidates will have performed service efficiently and accurately. This will include committee work at various levels, as well as other service as assigned.

Integration

Candidates will demonstrate integration between two areas of scholarship, teaching, and/or service. While there is no quantitative measure for this, candidates will show clear connections between their work in two of these areas.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Teaching:

Candidates will submit teaching portfolios as evidence of teaching effectiveness. Portfolios will include a brief statement from the candidate reflecting teaching philosophies, objectives, and strategies, as well as the nature and extent of teaching responsibilities; representative course syllabi; summaries of student evaluations; and written statements from Department and University colleagues who have observed classes and reviewed materials. Portfolios can also describe, with supporting materials: teaching and curricular innovations; external recognitions and awards for teaching; invitations from outside agencies or other campuses to highlight teaching practices or participate in teaching related activities; and the development of other programs or activities supporting teaching and learning. (This is not meant to be an exhaustive list of possibilities.) These portfolios will be used with other materials to assess the teaching methodologies, philosophies, and pedagogical goals of the candidate.

Candidates will provide detailed information on both the quality and quantity of teaching. For some of this information, faculty may use quantitative and narrative evaluations from the instructor evaluation instrument to measure student satisfaction and experience. While we understand the limits of student evaluations to determine teaching effectiveness, these evaluations may provide evidence that the candidate is in the appropriate range of overall performance and also highlight the methods, organization, and student experiences.

The Primary Review Committee will take into account factors such as class size, level of instruction (lower and upper division, graduate), and whether the course is new or well-established. Grants supporting course development, including on-line courses, and research aimed at improving overall teaching performances will also be considered as evidence that a candidate is working to develop new pedagogical approaches and materials.

Scholarship:

Faculty reviews regarding research/creative activity are based on completed work either published or accepted for publication. (In the case of the third year retention review, materials being prepared for publication may be reviewed.) Materials demonstrating scholarship may include, but are not limited to: peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and books; juried creative work such as fiction and poetry and exhibitions; grants applied for and/or received; and papers and/or presentations delivered or critiqued at professional conferences. Candidates will also submit a statement outlining their research/creativity program, progress, and goals, along with a current CV. These materials will be used to assess the scholarly performance of the candidate.

Service:

Service is defined as work done to benefit the Department, College and University; the faculty member's profession; or the wider community. Service to the Department, College and University includes, but is not limited to, membership on committees and/or participation in University governance. Professional service includes, but is not limited to, membership on professional committees and/or service as an officer of a professional organization, and manuscript refereeing. Public service includes, but is not limited to, public presentations, participation in public programs and/or service on committees and boards devoted to public issues. The candidate will provide a statement regarding service performed, and a list of committees, presentations and other service activities. These materials will be used to assess the service performance of the candidate.

Article X.   Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Section 10.01   University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

Article XI.   Promotion to Rank of Professor

Section 11.01   Timing of Review.

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service in the current rank, however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they "meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank."

Section 11.02   University Standard

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

a. sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and,

b. sustained integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and

c. excellence in scholarship.

Section 11.03   Performance Indicators and Weighting

The performance indicators and weighting used for this review are the same as those defined in Section 9.03, with the addition that faculty at the Associate level are expected to contribute significantly in service roles.

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Teaching

The expectations for this review is effectiveness in teaching, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04.

Scholarship

Although the candidate's complete body of work since the tenure review is important, the candidate's scholarship performance will be reviewed primarily on the most recent five years of appointment, regardless of the amount of time that has elapsed since the candidate's tenure review. Normally, in order to demonstrate excellence in scholarship, candidates for promotion to Full Professor are expected to have four peer-reviewed article published or accepted for publication, or one substantial peer-reviewed book published or accepted for publication, since having received tenure. The candidate's documentation will demonstrate substantial national or international recognition from peers for contributing to the relevant body of knowledge. Normally, candidates for promotion to Full Professor in creative writing will have published a book with a nationally recognized literary press (including small presses) or have a series of publications in literary or commercial magazines judged significant within the field of creative writing. In unusual circumstances, such as work of considerable impact or prestige, exceptions to this standard are possible.

In order to demonstrate excellence in scholarship, the candidate is expected to demonstrate steady scholarly production throughout the review period. Materials from Group 1 carry more weight than materials from Group 2 (see Section 9.03). Factors such as prestige of different presses and journals, the impact and reputation of publications, the scope of awards and other recognition, and the varying publication opportunities in different fields will be considered. Locally and nationally competitive grants and fellowships in support of research/creative activity are considered evidence of research productivity. The scope, nature and venue of scholarly presentations and invited readings will also be considered (e.g., keynote or plenary address, invited lecture, etc.) The evaluations of external reviewers will also play a role in determining the quality of the research/creative program.

Service

The expectation for this review is effectiveness in service, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04, with the addition that faculty at the Associate level are expected to contribute significantly to service roles.

Integration

Candidates will demonstrate integration between two areas of scholarship, teaching, and/or service. While there is no quantitative measure for this, candidates will show clear connections between their work in two of these areas.

Section 11.04   Evidence of Performance Indicators

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier. The description of evidence of performance indicators is found in Section 9.05 of this document.

Article XII.   Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document

Faculty members are entitled to propose changes to Role and Scope Documents of their academic unit.
Review committee members or administrators that identify a need for improvement, clarification, or other revision to an academic unit's Role and Scope Documents may submit the request for changes to the Chair of UPTC. The UPTC Chair will forward the recommendations to the unit. Submission to the UPTC Chair should occur after the review committee or administrator completes all reviews for the year.
Units will act on any proposed changes received from the UPTC Chair on an annual basis and will undertake a full review of their Document no less than every three years.

Article XIII.   Approval Process

Role and Scope Documents of the academic units must be approved, as detailed below, before taking effect. Effective dates for approving Documents will be established by the provost. Article XIII is prescribed by policy and will be the same across all units.

Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

> (a) tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit;
> (b) promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (usually colleges);
> (c) University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC); and
> (d) provost.

Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

(a) promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of the intermediate unit;
(b) University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC); and
(c) provost.

Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document

(a) University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC);
(b) Faculty Senate;
(c) Deans' Council; and
(d) provost.

Background: The provost, working with the URTPC, will resolve any conflicts that arise during the approval of Role and Scope Documents of the academic units. Once approved by all required parties, the provost will establish the effective date for the revised documents. Current documents will remain in force until revised documents are effective.