

seminar is open to interested members of the academic community. The committee receives feedback from faculty members in attendance at the presentation.

8. **Recommendation of Finalist:** The committee votes on finalists and recommends to the dean one or more of the final applicants and the appropriate academic rank to be awarded and the appropriate amount of experience credit to be awarded. If the dean does not concur, he or she requests recommendations of other finalists. The committee's recommendations are forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
9. **Final Decision:** The dean (and provost where appropriate) must concur on a hiring decision and recommended academic rank. The Vice President for Academic Affairs concurs or differs with the recommendations and forwards the recommendations to the President. The President either concurs with the recommendations or consults with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Dean and other members of the search committee. The committee may present additional information to the President before the President reaches a final decision. If the recommendation is not accepted, the search committee shall begin the search process again.
10. **Notification:** In consultation with the Office of Faculty and Staff Human Resources/EEO, the Academic Vice President, with a copy to the dean, sends the selected candidate an offer in accordance with decisions reached after completion of the search process.

The dean or the Office of Faculty and Staff Human Resources/EEO sends letters of nonselection to the unsuccessful candidates and secures the files of the search committee in accordance with University policy.

III. EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR PURPOSES OF RETENTION AND PROMOTION

A. GENERAL POLICIES AND CRITERIA

The faculty shall be responsible for playing the primary role in advancing the mission of GGU. To that end, the faculty is responsible and will be held accountable for two basic performance categories: scholarship and University service. Within the category of scholarship are the components of teaching, integration and application, and discovery, defined briefly as follows:³²

³²More detailed definitions are found in the pages that follow.

Teaching: Instructional efforts that contribute to beneficial and purposeful student learning.

Integration & Application: The investigation of the significance and meaning of knowledge and the interpretation and integration of knowledge. The investigation into the significance of something already known and the application of such knowledge to real world problems or events.

Discovery: The development of new knowledge through disciplined, investigative efforts.

Within the category of University service are the components of work on University committees, administrative or committee work within a department or school, student advising, and other forms of University and community service that serve the University's mission.³³

Although the mission of the University emphasizes the scholarship of teaching, the University is committed to the importance of the scholarship of integration, application and discovery. It also recognizes the critical nature of faculty governance. In addition, the University recognizes that every faculty member offers a unique combination of skills, depending on interest, academic discipline, and experience. Consequently, each faculty member, in concert with his/her dean, will decide on an annual basis the composition of his/her responsibilities for the year, based on the specified ranges indicated below.³⁴ Such responsibilities will determine the relative energy and time spent on each responsibility and form the basis for the criteria upon which the faculty member will be evaluated for the year.

The overall responsibilities and accountability of each faculty member are to be determined within the following ranges:

Scholarship:	50-80%
University Service:	20-50% ³⁵
Total Energy and Time	100%

Within each basic responsibility category, each component will be weighted as follows:

SCHOLARSHIP:

Teaching	40-80%
Integration & Application	10-40%

³³It is acknowledged that the lines of demarcation between the various components of responsibility are not hard and fast. Frequently, the components may overlap, and what is an aspect of teaching in one discipline may more appropriately be considered an aspect of scholarship of application in another discipline or may be considered an aspect of both.

³⁴See below for information on the process to be taken to achieve this.

³⁵Deans, provosts and vice presidents with academic rank may select up to 100% of their responsibilities to be in the area of service while serving in the position of dean, provost or vice president.

Scholarship of Discovery	<u>0-40%</u>
Total	100%

SERVICE:

University Committees	10-100%
Department/School/ Campus-based Service	0-90%
Student Advising	0-40%
External and Other	<u>0-20%</u>
Total	100%

In determining the appropriate weight to be selected for each faculty responsibility, detailed guidelines found in the appendix shall be applied.

B. DEFINITIONS, ELEMENTS AND TOOLS FOR ASSESSMENT

1. SCHOLARSHIP (50-80% overall weight)

Golden Gate University accepts a broad interpretation of scholarship and believes that scholarship is reflected not only in the performance of original research (scholarship of discovery), but in the investigation of connections (scholarship of integration), the building of bridges between theory and practice (scholarship of application) and the communication of knowledge to students (scholarship of teaching).³⁶ The significance of scholarship at Golden Gate University is not limited to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. Scholarship is important to the extent that it supports the University's mission: providing the intellectual foundation for successful professional careers, integrating theory with practical experience.

a. SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING (40-80%)

Knowledge "becomes consequential" only as it is understood by others.³⁷ Student learning is the focus of the University's mission and the primary commitment of the faculty at Golden Gate University. The scholarship of teaching includes time spent in the classroom, class preparation, keeping current in the subject area being taught, preparation of course materials, evaluation of students, and office hours spent counselling students in the class. In addition, teaching may include directing student dissertation theses and supervising student internships. The scholarship of teaching consists of the following four components:

³⁶ Concepts and terminology from Ernest Boyer, Scholarship Reconsidered, (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching).

³⁷ Scholarship Reconsidered, p. 23.

1. INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY SKILLS (35%)

ELEMENTS:

- * Creation of a classroom environment conducive to learning: clarity of communication, enthusiasm, respectful and caring attitude towards students

ASSESSMENT TOOLS:

- * student evaluations³⁸
- * alumni survey³⁹

2. INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN (35%)

ELEMENTS:

- * application of theory to practice
- * course objectives
- * level of rigor and challenge
- * selection of topics, order of their presentation and emphasis
- * method of teaching (seminar style, lecture, etc)
- * scope and sequence of topics
- * integration with broader curriculum
- * method of evaluating student performance
- * level of work product
- * innovation & creativity

ASSESSMENT TOOLS:⁴⁰

- * student evaluations⁴¹
- * narrative⁴²
- * syllabi
- * assignments
- * exams

³⁸Student evaluations to be revised in order to objectively assess instructors' success at creating an environment conducive to learning for purposes of using assessment as a tool in making personnel decisions. Student evaluations should also be revised to enable other their use for faculty development.

³⁹The use of alumni surveys to provide evaluative information is an option available to each school, which, if it chooses to use this source, will need to develop the appropriate survey procedures.

⁴⁰See Chart "Teaching Assessment Tools" for specific weights to be given to each assessment tool.

⁴¹To be revised to enable student to objectively assess clear enunciation of class objectives and success in accomplishing these.

⁴²Faculty will be asked to respond to specific questions on choice of teaching methodology, method of integrating theory with practice, method of evaluation, etc.

- * handouts
- * students' work-product⁴³

3. CONTENT EXPERTISE (25%)

ELEMENTS:

- * level of knowledge
- * currency of knowledge

ASSESSMENT TOOLS:

- * narrative⁴⁴
- * course materials
- * classroom visits⁴⁵
- * faculty writings & presentations
- * participation in continuing education

4. COURSE MANAGEMENT (5%)

ELEMENTS:

- * punctuality
- * attendance
- * grade reporting
- * accessibility for student mentoring

ASSESSMENT TOOLS:

- * student evaluations⁴⁶
- * late grade sheets
- * grade distributions

In addition to the above required tools of assessment, the following may, at the option of the faculty member, be provided as additional teaching assessment tools:

- * teaching awards
- * publications in educational journals
- * presentations on pedagogical methodology

⁴³Graded work from the best and poorest students with instructor's feedback to students.

⁴⁴Faculty member to provide narrative specifically addressing method by which he/she keeps current in teaching area.

⁴⁵The purpose of classroom visit in this regard is very limited. Visitor will be asked simply to assess apparent level of understanding of the topic being taught and how current the faculty member appears to be on the topic.

⁴⁶To be used in this regard to assess faculty member's punctuality and attendance record and promptness of feedback when applicable.

- * external recognition of quality of teaching
- * letters from students and others (preferably unsolicited)
- * other tools that in the faculty member's opinion are useful tools for evaluative purposes

C. SCHOLARSHIP OF INTEGRATION AND APPLICATION (10-40%)

Scholarship of integration involves the investigation of the significance and meaning of knowledge. This form of scholarship involves critical analysis and interpretation.⁴⁷ Scholarship of application involves applying knowledge to real world problems and determining how the knowledge can be used to help individuals and institutions resolve such problems. Application includes service activities tied to one's special field of knowledge. Golden Gate University is committed by its mission to the scholarship of integration and application.

ELEMENTS:

- * Quality
- * Quantity

EVIDENCE:

The following are possible ways in which the scholarship of integration and application may be reflected:

- * Scholarship resulting in published work
- * Scholarly presentations
- * Creation of course materials (case studies, GGU published casebooks and curriculum guidances, instructors guides, etc.)
- * Scholarship resulting in tangible, yet unpublished evidence of work (reviewer or editor of professional publications, video tapes, etc.)
- * Professional consulting in academic discipline
- * Professional and community service in academic discipline
- * Involvement in professional/scholarly organizations⁴⁸
- * Participation in major scholarly meetings as program chair or moderator
- * Fellowship or research awards including grants
- * Active involvement on doctoral dissertation committee
- * Mentoring and sourcing of adjunct faculty teaching in academic discipline

D. SCHOLARSHIP OF DISCOVERY (0-40%)

⁴⁷Scholarship Reconsidered, p. 20

⁴⁸The level of involvement will be reflected by such factors as the position held (officer, chair, member of task force or board, etc) and the work produced.

Scholarship of discovery is the development of new knowledge through disciplined, investigative efforts. This form of scholarship, while a worthy endeavor, is not a primary focus of Golden Gate University and therefore is not required of faculty.

ELEMENTS:

- * Quality
- * Quantity

EVIDENCE:

- * Publications and presentations reflecting the discovery of new knowledge (both refereed and non-refereed)
- * Development of new software and other non-print materials reflecting the discovery of new knowledge
- * Scholarship resulting in tangible, yet unpublished evidence of work
- * Participation on review panel for research awards
- * Receipt of prestigious awards
- * Issuance of patent related to discipline
- * Research grants received

2. UNIVERSITY SERVICE (20-50%)

Faculty must contribute substantially to Golden Gate University in service not involving scholarship in order to enable the University to continue to pursue and advance its mission. This is particularly true because of the University's commitment to the special contribution that adjunct faculty offer to the advancement of the University's mission, resulting in a relatively smaller number of full-time faculty (particularly at non-San Francisco campuses).

a. SERVICE ON UNIVERSITY-WIDE COMMITTEES (10-100%)

Contribution to the University at large evidenced by work on Faculty Senate, Committee on Academic Standards, Committee on Faculty Affairs, Committee on Faculty Research, Committee on Scholarship and Professional service, Grade Grievance Committee, Probation Committee, Admissions Committee, Faculty Personnel Committee, Faculty Library Advisory Committee, DPA Committee, DBA Committee, Faculty Senate Task Forces and Ad Hoc Committees, The Faculty News, Program Review Committee, and other University Task Forces and Ad Hoc Committees and as student club advisors. Each faculty member is expected to serve on at least one of the faculty governance committees. The committee selected, the capacity of service (chair or member), the participation on additional governance committees or university-wide work (including regionally based University service) will determine

the percentage weight applied to this form of service.⁴⁹

ELEMENTS:

- * Participation
- * Level of Participation: chair or member
- * Flexibility regarding particular committee assignments and responsibilities

TOOLS FOR ASSESSMENT: (100% peer based)

- * Attendance records of committee meetings (provided by chair of committee)
- * Meeting minutes
- * Narrative of committee chair
- * Narrative of provost (when applicable)

b. DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL/CAMPUS-BASED SERVICE (0-90%)

Contribution to the University by participating in departmental, school and/or regional campus administration or committee work. Because of the significant role that adjunct faculty play in advancing the mission of the University, activities that work toward creating greater connection between adjunct faculty members and the University are a particularly important form of department/school/campus-based service. This may take the form of faculty involvement in the selection, hiring and/or evaluation of adjunct faculty members as well as efforts to provide administrative, curricular or pedagogical support to adjunct faculty members. Because of the significant role played by regional campuses in delivering academic programs, activities that work toward greater relations among all campuses are a particularly important form of service.

ELEMENTS:

- * Participation
- * Level and amount of work
- * Quality of work

TOOLS FOR ASSESSMENT: (100% peer based)

- * Narrative of faculty member
- * Narrative of Department Chair, Program Director, Provost and/or Dean

c. STUDENT ADVISING & MENTORING (0-40%)

Advising and mentoring of students on issues regarding the University, career, program performance, course selection, program curriculum.

⁴⁹The approximate time commitment involved in the serving on the various faculty governance committees is detailed in the appendix.

ELEMENTS:

- * Participation
- * Quality of Participation

TOOLS FOR ASSESSMENT:

- * Record of advising appointments
 - * Narrative of faculty member
 - * Narrative of Department Chair, Program Director, Provost and/or Dean
 - * Narrative of Director of Advising, Chair of Probation Committee (standing committee of Faculty Senate), or Executive Director of Enrollment/Student Services
 - * Student, staff and/or administrative letters (unsolicited)
- d. COMMUNITY SERVICE, EXTERNAL RELATIONS AND OTHER FORMS OF SERVICE (0-20%)

Contributions to the University, School, Program or regional campus through other means such as fund raising, outreach to the business community and participation in university graduation ceremonies, career days, student organizations, and other activities (inside or outside the University) that serve the University's mission.

ELEMENTS:

- * Participation

TOOLS FOR ASSESSMENT:

- * Faculty narrative
- * Other appropriate evidence of participation

C. ANNUAL MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Each year in April, the dean of each school shall hold a group meeting with all the full-time faculty in that school for the purpose of determining the most appropriate overall allocation of faculty responsibilities among the various forms of scholarship and service for the upcoming year.⁵⁰ The Vice President of Academic Affairs will oversee the school allocations and develop a general University faculty plan to ensure that overall University allocations of faculty responsibilities result in sufficient distribution of faculty energies to fulfill the requirements of faculty governance, university and professional service, and the University's commitment to the

⁵⁰The dean of the school shall make the final decision regarding overall allocation within the school. However, the dean should strive to arrive at some level of consensus with the faculty as to the best allocation. In schools where there is more than one department or program, the faculty and dean of the school will determine prior to April the best method to accomplish this process to minimize complexity yet ensure the voice of each individual faculty member.

scholarship of integration, application and discovery. These requirements will include analyses of regional campus program needs.

Once the school has developed allocation guidelines for the upcoming year, each faculty member will meet with the dean (and provost if another campus is pertinent to the faculty member's responsibilities) to design a memorandum of understanding stating the faculty member's contractual responsibilities for the year, based on the specified ranges indicated above.⁵¹ The rationale for the selected weight of each factor should be indicated in the memorandum of understanding. Such contractual responsibilities will determine the relative energy and time spent on each responsibility and will be the basis for the criteria upon which the faculty member will be evaluated for the year.⁵²

D. PERFORMANCE REVIEWS

Faculty members will undergo a complete performance review in the appropriate years according to the review time line in appendix 2.⁵³ The performance review will be primarily based on portfolios prepared by the faculty member and will provide for each faculty member a qualitative assessment of the faculty member's activities during the review period in the areas of scholarship and service with relative weightings based on the memorandum of understanding between the faculty member and his/or dean.

1. REVIEW PROCESS

The Vice President of Academic Affairs is responsible for initiating and overseeing the review process to ensure that the policies and time-lines are followed. The Vice President of Academic Affairs will initiate the process by presenting a calendar to each school dean, provost, and the Faculty Personnel Committee which identifies those faculty members subject to review as well as the status and purpose the performance review. Upon receipt of this calendar, each dean is responsible for notifying those full-time

⁵¹The memorandum of understanding must be completed and signed by both the faculty member and dean (and provost is applicable) by June 1 of each year. The signed memorandum of understanding must be submitted to the VPAA's office by June 1 to be attached to the faculty member's contract for the upcoming year. In cases where the dean and faculty member are unable to agree regarding the terms of the memorandum of understanding, the Vice President of Academic Affairs will act as facilitator and final decision-maker in the process.

⁵²See appendix 1 for a flow chart illustrating the steps to be taken to develop the faculty member's memorandum of understanding.

⁵³The time-line provides for complete performance reviews to be carried out every two years, with an occasional one-year review as indicated. The Dean is encouraged to meet with the faculty member in years where a complete review is not required to discuss informally the faculty member's performance. The dean and faculty member should discuss performance expectations across a typical faculty career. Ideally, a personal career plan should be developed. Such reviews are for the improvement of the faculty member and are not to be used as the basis of retention or promotion decisions.

faculty members subject to review within his/her school that a performance review is scheduled.⁵⁴ Each faculty member is responsible for preparing a scholarship portfolio and a university service portfolio and submitting them to the dean. The portfolios should contain as many of the assessment tools listed on pages 16 through 22 as there exists for the review period involved.

Separate review committees will evaluate the faculty member's scholarship and service portfolios.⁵⁵ The results of such reviews will be summarized by the faculty member's dean and provided to the faculty member who will have a period of time in which to provide a written response if desired. Such response will be provided to the review committee for consideration before finalization of its review. The dean will then forward the final review of the review committee to the University Faculty Personnel Committee. The dean will also review the portfolios and provide a separate review and recommendation to the Faculty Personnel Committee.⁵⁶

The reviews of the peer committees and the dean will be provided by the dean to the University Faculty Personnel Committee, which will examine the review files and determine the degree to which the faculty member has successfully met the various criteria spelled out below. The Faculty Personnel Committee will notify the faculty member of its tentative decision and receive final input from the faculty member before making a final recommendation to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.

In cases involving the application for tenure, the Vice President of Academic Affairs will submit his/her recommendation to the President along with that of the Faculty Personnel Committee and the review results of the peer committees and the dean. The President, after considering all recommendations, shall make the final decision on the appropriate course of action with regard to the faculty member under review.⁵⁷

In non-tenure cases, with the exception of post-tenure review decisions, the Vice President of Academic Affairs shall make the final decisions. In post-tenure review cases, the Faculty Personnel Committee shall make a recommendation to the Vice President of

⁵⁴The dean will discuss with the faculty member the time-line of the process, the composition of the three review committees (scholarship review, service review, faculty personnel committee), and an overview of the process.

⁵⁵See "Professional Liability Coverage" regarding such activities in Section I.G.

⁵⁶The dean will use the same performance evaluation forms used by the scholarship and service committees.

⁵⁷It is expected that the President will carefully consider the recommendations of the Faculty Personnel Committee, the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the dean. In cases where the President does not follow the recommendation of the Faculty Personnel Committee, the President shall meet with the committee to discuss his/her proposed action. The Faculty Personnel Committee will have the opportunity to respond before the President takes final action.

Academic Affairs: If the Vice President of Academic Affairs concurs with the recommendation, the decision of the Faculty Personnel Committee will be final. In post-tenure cases where there is disagreement between the Faculty Personnel Committee and the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the President shall make the final decision.

If either the Vice President of Academic Affairs or the President intends not to follow the recommendation of the Faculty Personnel Committee, he/she will meet with the Faculty Personnel Committee to discuss the case before making a final decision.

The Vice President of Academic Affairs shall notify the Faculty Personnel Committee, the dean and provost (where applicable) of the final decision. The dean shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the final decision and the recommendations that led to it.

All discussions engaged in during the course of the review process are confidential and must remain confidential amongst the parties involved except where disclosure is provided for in this manual in order to perform the review.

Appendix 3 contains a flow chart illustrating the steps to be taken and the dates upon which each step must be completed.

a. Scholarship Portfolio

The scholarship portfolio will be separately evaluated by the dean(s) of the school in which the faculty member teaches and a peer committee consisting of at least 3 full-time faculty members who teach in the same discipline or school appointed by the dean.⁵⁸ In no circumstances can this committee consist of more than 5 full-time faculty members. If there are fewer than 3 faculty members teaching in the same discipline or school, an outside expert (either a faculty member(s) teaching in the discipline outside of Golden Gate University or a person otherwise considered to be an expert in the field) must be appointed by the dean.

Each member of the review committee will be responsible for reviewing the scholarship portfolio and completing a series of questionnaires/forms which rate various elements of the faculty member's performance in accordance with the levels of performance set

⁵⁸ A faculty member may not serve on a review committee if there exists a significant conflict of interest with the faculty member subject to review. All personal and professional conflicts of interest must be revealed to the Dean, including personal and professional interactions and relationships that would preclude highly objective and unbiased review. Spouses, immediate family members, and colleagues with an intimate personal relationship with the faculty member subject to be reviewed are prohibited from participation in the review. Any concern of the faculty member subject to review regarding the appropriateness of the review committee composition should be directed to the dean. If resolution of the concern is not reached to the satisfaction of the faculty member subject to review, the VPAA shall make the final decision after consultation with the Faculty Personnel Committee.

forth below.⁵⁹ The dean shall objectively summarize all completed initial reviews and discuss the summary with the faculty member under review, being careful not to compromise the confidentiality of those completing the reviews. The faculty member may provide to the review committee a written response and any additional data that he/she believes might be informative. The committee members will finalize their review after consideration of the faculty member's response, and will then submit their final reviews to the dean. The dean shall separately review the faculty member and submit all the completed final reviews to the University Personnel Committee.

When the performance review is for the purpose of determining whether tenure shall be granted, in addition to the 3-5 full-time faculty member review committee, no fewer than two outside experts must provide separate reviews of the faculty member's scholarship.⁶⁰

b. University Service Portfolio

The university service portfolio will be evaluated by the university committee designated to review faculty member's service to the University. This committee shall consist of 3 full-time faculty members who have been appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to serve for a term of 2 years.⁶¹ When appropriate to the faculty member's responsibilities, a provost may be appointed as an additional member of the committee.

Each member of the committee will be responsible for reviewing the university service portfolio and completing a series of questionnaires/forms which rate various elements of the faculty member's performance in accordance with the levels of performance set forth below. The Dean shall summarize all completed initial reviews and discuss the summary with the faculty member under review, being careful not to divulge any information leading to the lack of confidentiality of those completing the reviews. The faculty member may provide to the review committee a written response and any additional data that he/she believes might be informative. The

⁵⁹ See forms in appendix.

⁶⁰ The faculty member under review shall provide to the dean a list of suggested outside experts (either faculty members teaching in the discipline outside of Golden Gate University or a person otherwise considered to be an expert in the field). The dean shall solicit reviews either from the outside experts provided on the faculty member's list or others the dean believes to be appropriate experts. The outside experts shall be provided with the performance review forms located in the appendix upon which he/she may provide his/her review and shall return the completed forms to the dean.

⁶¹ A faculty member may not serve on a review committee if there exists a significant conflict of interest with the faculty member subject to review. All personal and professional conflicts of interest must be revealed to the Dean, including personal and professional interactions and relationships that would preclude highly objective and unbiased review. Spouses, immediate family members, and colleagues with an intimate personal relationship with the faculty member subject to be reviewed are prohibited from participation in the review. Any concern of the faculty member subject to review regarding the appropriateness of the review committee membership should be directed to the VPAA for final decision after consultation with the Faculty Personnel Committee.

committee members will finalize their review after consideration of the faculty member's response and submit their final reviews to the Dean. The Dean shall separately review the faculty member and submit all the completed final reviews to the Faculty Personnel Committee.

2. LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE

a. Overview

Each faculty member's activities will be assessed using the following levels of performance as guidelines:

- * **Outstanding** (4.5-5.0):
Performance that greatly exceeds required standards
- * **Very Good** (4.0-4.49):
Performance that clearly exceeds required standards
- * **Good** (3.0-3.99)
Performance that meets required standards; basic performance expected of all faculty members
- * **Needs Improvement** (2.5-2.9)
Performance that is below required standards and needs to be improved
- * **Unacceptable** (0-2.49)
Performance that is markedly below required standards and is unsatisfactory

b. Pertaining to Scholarship

1. Teaching

The elements of good teaching are detailed on pages 16 through 18. The definition of "good" for these elements is found in the reviewer forms/questionnaires in the appendix at page xv. The appropriate quality will be determined by the reviewer.

2. Integration and Application

The elements and assessment tools to determine a faculty member's level of scholarship of integration and application are found on page 19. What constitutes the appropriate quantity of this form of scholarship for the faculty member is determined by the faculty member's memorandum of understanding. The appropriate quality will be determined by the reviewer.

3. Discovery

The elements and assessment tools to determine a

faculty member's level of scholarship of discovery are found on page 20. What constitutes the appropriate quantity of this form of scholarship for the faculty member is determined by the faculty member's memorandum of understanding. The appropriate quality will be determined by the reviewer.

c. Pertaining to Service

1. University Committees

The elements and assessment tools to determine a faculty member's level of university service are found on pages 20 & 21. The definition of "good" for these elements is determined by the reviewer.

2. Department/School/Campus-based

The elements and assessment tools to determine a faculty member's level of departmental service are found on page 21. The definition of "good" for these elements will be determined by the reviewer.

3. Student Advising & Mentoring

The elements and assessment tools to determine a faculty member's level of student advising and mentoring are found on page 21. The definition of "good" for these elements will be determined by the reviewer.

4. External and Other

The elements and assessment tools to determine a faculty member's level of external and other service are found on page 22. The definition of "good" for these elements will be determined by the reviewer.

3. ELIGIBILITY FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, ROLLING CONTRACT OR TENURE

The following are guidelines intended to be helpful in determining the most appropriate action to be taken regarding faculty retention and promotion.⁶²

a. Retention

⁶²The Faculty Personnel Committee shall base its decision using these guidelines and all the information provided to it as a result of the review process. Transition rules for implementation in the 1994 at detailed at Section II.D.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WORKSHEET

OVERALL
WEIGHT⁷⁵

I. SCHOLARSHIP:

Teaching: _____

Classroom units to be taught _____

Location of classes to be taught:

Other responsibilities: (e.g. supervision of dissertation or
internship programs, etc.)

Integration and Application: _____

Responsibilities:

Discovery: _____

Responsibilities:

TOTAL SCHOLARSHIP (must be between 50-80%) _____

⁷⁵It is helpful to use attached worksheets to determine the overall weight to be given to each type of responsibility.

II. SERVICE

University Service: _____

Faculty Governance Committee participation:

Other University service responsibilities:

Department/School Service: _____

Responsibilities:

Other Service _____

Responsibilities:

TOTAL SERVICE (must be between 20-50%) _____

TOTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

100%

TIME AND UNIT EQUIVALENCIES

The following charts may be helpful to the faculty member and dean in preparing his/her annual contractual obligations. The charts contain a method of equating selected percentage weights to commitments in terms of suggested hours. A central principle underlying this policy manual is that a faculty member shall be evaluated and held accountable on the basis of the level of performance of the responsibilities he/she has agreed to assume for the year. The level of performance shall be determined according to the principles set forth in the manual. The actual hours a faculty member spends in fulfilling his/her responsibilities shall not be considered a factor in the evaluation process unless it is spelled out as a factor in the manual (for example, hours may be a factor in university committee work).

Within this context, the charts are intended to ensure that faculty members do not assume a workload that is inequitable or unreasonable. The charts are intended as guidelines only, to aid in helping the faculty member determine the most appropriate weights to be selected for his/her individual situation for the upcoming year. They are also intended to help the faculty member and dean determine the appropriate amount of units a faculty member should be required to teach during the year and to help determine the most appropriate amount and evidences of scholarship of integration, application and discovery for the faculty member for the year. In addition, they provide guidance helpful in determining the type of university committee work to be selected for the year.

I. SCHOLARSHIP

TEACHING	SCHOLARSHIP			
	50%	60%	70%	80%
40%		24%		32%
50%				40%
60%				48%
70%				56%
80%	40%	48%	56%	64%
INT. & APP.				
10%	5%	6%	7%	8%
20%	10%	12%	14%	16%
30%	15%	18%	21%	24%
40%	20%	24%	28%	32%
DISCOVERY				
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
10%	5%	6%	7%	8%
20%	10%	12%	14%	16%
30%	15%	18%	21%	24%
40%	20%	24%	28%	32%

Teaching	%
Int. & App.	%
Discovery	%
TOTAL (50% - 80%)	%

Carry these totals to the Summary Page.

II. UNIVERSITY SERVICE

UNIVERSITY SERVICE				
	20%	30%	40%	50%
U. CMTEES				
10%	2%	3%	4%	5%
20%	4%	6%	8%	10%
30%	6%	9%	12%	15%
40%	8%	12%	16%	20%
50%	10%	15%	20%	25%
60%	12%	18%	24%	30%
70%	14%	21%	28%	35%
80%	16%	24%	32%	40%
90%	18%	27%	36%	45%
100%	20%	30%	40%	50%
DEPT. SVCES.				
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
10%	2%	3%	4%	5%
20%	4%	6%	8%	10%
30%	6%	9%	12%	15%
40%	8%	12%	16%	20%
50%	10%	15%	20%	25%
60%	12%	18%	24%	30%
70%	14%	21%	28%	35%
80%	16%	24%	32%	40%
90%	18%	27%	36%	45%

II. UNIVERSITY SERVICE (Cont'd.)

UNIVERSITY SERVICE				
	20%	30%	40%	50%
ADVISING				
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
10%	2%	3%	4%	5%
20%	4%	6%	8%	10%
30%	6%	9%	12%	15%
40%	8%	12%	16%	20%
OTHER				
0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
10%	2%	3%	4%	5%
20%	4%	6%	8%	10%

U. Committees	%
Dept. Service	%
Advising	%
Other	%
TOTAL (20% - 50%)	%

Carry these totals to the Summary Page.

IV. SUMMARY

FACULTY NAME:			Hours/Year	Hours/Week 40-wk Year	Teaching Units
Teaching	%				
Int & App	%				
Discovery	%				
SCHOLARSHIP (50% - 80%)		%			
U. Committees	%				
Dept. Service	%				
Advising	%				
Other	%				
UNIV. SVCE (20% - 50%)		%			
GRAND TOTAL			100.0%	1700-2250	42.5-56.25

NOTES:

- One 3-unit course equals 45 contact hours, plus 90 - 135 outside hours for prep/office hours/staying current (i.e., 2-3 hours outside for each one contact hour.)

Thus, one 3-unit course equals 135 - 180 hours, and 1 unit equals 45 - 60 hours.

- Maximum weighting on teaching is equal to 64% of total workload: 80% on Scholarship x 80% on Teaching = 64% total.

Thus, assuming that 8 courses per year represents a full teaching load, 64% of total workload is equivalent to 24 units of teaching (i.e., 8 course per year). Since a 3-unit course is 135 - 180 hours, $64\% = (8 \times 135)$ to $(8 \times 180) = 1080 - 1440$ hours per year.

Thus, 1% = 17 - 22.5 hours.

PACKAGE OF FORMS TO BE COMPLETED BY REVIEWERS

1. Scholarship of Teaching
To be completed by discipline based committee and dean
2. Scholarship of Integration and Application
To be completed by discipline based committee and dean
3. Scholarship of Discovery
To be completed by discipline based committee and dean
4. University Service
To be completed by university-service committee and dean
5. Student Advising and Mentoring
To be completed by university-service committee and dean
6. External and Other Service
To be completed by university-service committee and dean
7. Department/School/Campus Based Service
To be completed by Dean /and or Department Chair and/or Provost
8. Composite Rating of Faculty Member
To be completed by Faculty Personnel Committee
9. Recommendation of Faculty Personnel Committee

PEER EVALUATION FORM¹
SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING

I. Instructional Design

a. *syllabi*:

A "good" syllabus includes:

-course overview	-readings and course materials
-course objectives	-class schedule
-course policies	-explanation of major
(grading, attendance, etc) assignments	

All syllabi should contain the above features to warrant an evaluation of "good". A "very good" or "outstanding" syllabus need not contain additional features but should illustrate a higher quality relative to presentation and depth of explanation, etc.

The quality of the syllabi used by the faculty member is:

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

b. *Course assignments**

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

c. *exams and student work-products**

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

*Rate course assignments, exams, and student work-products, after considering the following elements

- application of theory to practice
- course objectives
- level of rigor
- selection of topics and order of their presentation
- scope and sequence of topics
- integration with the broader curriculum
- innovation and creativity

syllabi _____ + course assignments _____ + students work product _____ = _____ /3
= _____ Average for Instructional Design

¹To be completed by disciplined-based committee.

II. CONTENT EXPERTISE

Rate the level of knowledge and currency of knowledge of the faculty member using the following assessment tools:

- * faculty narrative
- * course materials
- * classroom visits
- * faculty writings & presentations
- * participation in continuing education
- * other

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

III. COURSE MANAGEMENT

Rate the ability of the faculty member to manage the course, using student evaluations, late grade sheets and grade distribution information.

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

COMMENTS:

PEER EVALUATION FORM¹
SCHOLARSHIP OF INTEGRATION AND APPLICATION

The following are possible ways in which the scholarship of integration and application may be reflected:

- * Scholarship resulting in published work
- * Scholarly presentations
- * Creation of course materials (case studies, GGU published casebooks, instructors guides, etc.)
- * Scholarship resulting in tangible, yet unpublished evidence of work (reviewer or editor of professional publications, video tapes, etc.)
- * Professional consulting in academic discipline
- * Professional and community service in academic discipline
- * Involvement in professional/scholarly organizations²
- * Participation in major scholarly meetings as program chair or moderator
- * Fellowship or research awards including grants
- * Active involvement on doctoral dissertation committee
- * Mentoring and sourcing of adjunct faculty teaching in academic discipline

Given the percentage weight selected to be placed on this type of scholarship, rate both the quality and quantity of the evidences of scholarship of integration and application provided by the faculty member:

a. **quality**

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

b. **quantity**

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

COMMENTS:

Quality _____ + quantity _____ = _____ / 2 = _____ Overall Rating

¹To be completed by disciplined-based committee.

²The level of involvement will be reflected by such factors as the position held (officer, chair, member of task force or board, etc) and the work produced.

PEER EVALUATION FORM¹
SCHOLARSHIP OF DISCOVERY

The following are possible ways in which the scholarship of integration and application may be reflected:

- * Publications and presentations reflecting the discovery of new knowledge (both refereed and non-refereed)
- * Development of new software and other non-print materials reflecting the discovery of new knowledge
- * Scholarship resulting in tangible, yet unpublished evidence of work
- * Participation on review panel for research awards
- * Receipt of prestigious awards
- * Issuance of patent related to discipline
- * Research grants received

Given the percentage weight selected to be placed on this type of scholarship, rate both the quality and quantity of the evidences of scholarship of integration and application provided by the faculty member:

a. *quality*

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

b. *quantity*

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

COMMENTS:

quality _____ + quantity _____ = _____ / 2 = _____ Overall Rating

¹To be completed by disciplined-based committee.

PEER EVALUATION FORM
UNIVERSITY SERVICE¹

1. Rate the faculty member's service on University-wide committees after considering the following elements:

- * participation
- * level of participation (chair or member)
- * flexibility regarding particular committee assignments

The following tools should be used for assessing the faculty member's performance in this area:

- * Attendance records of committee meetings (provided by chair of committee)
- * Meeting minutes
- * Narrative of committee chair(s)
- * Narrative of faculty member under review
- * Other data provided in service portfolio

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

COMMENTS:

¹To be completed by university service review committee.

PEER EVALUATION FORM¹
STUDENT ADVISING & MENTORING

Rate the faculty member's performance in the activity of advising and mentoring students on issues regarding the University, career, program performance, course selection, program curriculum taking into consideration the following tools for assessment:

- * record of advising appointments
- * narrative of faculty member
- * narrative of Department Chair, Program Director, Provost and/or Dean
- * narrative of director of advising, chair of probation committee, or executive director of enrollment/student services
- * Student, staff or administrator letters

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

COMMENTS:

¹To be completed by university service review committee.

EVALUATION OF OTHER AREAS OF SERVICE

Rate the faculty member's contribution to the university in alternate forms such as fund raising, outreach to the business community and participation in university graduation ceremonies, career days, student organizations, and other activities (inside or outside the University) that serve the University's mission.

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

COMMENTS:

PEER EVALUATION FORM¹
SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT/CAMPUS SERVICE

1. Rate the faculty member's service to the department/school after considering the following elements:

- * participation in departmental/school/regional campus administration or committee work
- * level and amount of work
- * quality of work

1	2	3	4	5
unsatisfactory	needs improvement	good	very good	outstanding

COMMENTS:

¹To be completed by Dean of school in which department/school based service is performed.

COMPOSITE RATING OF FACULTY MEMBERS¹

I. Scholarship of Teaching

COMPONENT	Student	Self	Peer
Instructional Delivery Skills	student ratings ____ x 50-100% = _____	as developed ____ x 0-50% = _____	
Instructional Design Skills	student ratings ____ x 15% = _____	self rating ____ x 5% = _____	peer ratings ____ x 80% = _____
Content Expertise		self rating ____ x 20% = _____	peer ratings ____ x 80% = _____
Course Management	student ratings ____ x 50% = _____		peer ratings ____ x 50% = _____

Instructional Delivery skill:
 student rating average _____
 other assessment tools + _____
 Overall rating = _____ x 35% = _____

Instructional Design Skills:
 student rating average _____
 self rating + _____
 peer rating average + _____
 Overall rating = _____ x 35% = _____

Content Expertise:
 self rating _____
 peer rating average + _____
 Overall rating = _____ x 25% = _____

Course Management:
 student rating average _____
 peer rating average + _____
 Overall rating = _____ x 5% = _____

OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING FOR TEACHING = _____

COMMENTS:

¹To be completed by University Faculty Personnel Committee, using peer reviews of scholarship and service portfolios.

3/14/94

II. SCHOLARSHIP COMPOSITE RATING

ROLE	ASSIGNED WEIGHT	x	COMPOSITE RATING	=	WEIGHTED COMPOSITE RATING
<hr/>					
SCHOLARSHIP					
Teaching					
Integration/ Application					
Discovery					

OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING FOR SCHOLARSHIP = _____

COMMENTS:

3/14/94

III. SERVICE COMPOSITE RATING

ROLE	ASSIGNED WEIGHT	x	COMPOSITE RATING	=	WEIGHTED COMPOSITE RATING
<hr/>					
University Committees					
School/Department/Campus Service					
Student Advising/ Mentoring					
External and Other					
<hr/>					
OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING FOR SERVICE				=	_____
COMMENTS:					

IV. OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING FOR YEAR

ROLE	ASSIGNED WEIGHT	x	COMPOSITE RATING	=	WEIGHTED COMPOSITE RATING
Scholarship					
University Service					
OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING FOR YEAR				=	_____

COMMENTS:

RECOMMENDATION OF FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

1. Purpose of Review: (circle)
 - a. Two-year term contract
Three-year term contract
Tenure
Rolling Contract (initial)
Rolling Contract renewal
Post-tenure
 - b. Advancement in rank: Associate Professor Professor
2. Years of full-time faculty equivalent service _____
3. Required level of performance _____
4. Peer Composite Rating for Review Period _____
5. Dean Composite Rating for Review Period _____
6. External Reviewer Ratings for Review Period (in tenure cases only) _____
7. COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

REASONING and COMMENTS: