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Introduction

In compliance with UWS 3.05 and the UW-Eau Claire policy contained in the UW-Eau Claire Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook (FASH), all instructional staff will be evaluated periodically by the Department Chair and/or the Department Personnel Committee (DPC), or its equivalent, or a subcommittee thereof, for the purposes of reappointment, promotion, tenure, and salary recommendations and for post-tenure review. This document adds to the FASH policies, however, if any policy of this document is found to be in conflict with a policy in the FASH, the FASH policy shall be honored.

Chapter 5 of the UW-Eau Claire FASH outlines the general UW-Eau Claire policies for formation, organization, meetings, responsibilities and so forth for the periodic review of faculty and instructional academic staff. While the FASH is written using a DPC and/or DPC subcommittee structure, this document allows departments to further refine that structure to include a Reviewing Body and a Voting Body for each type of periodic review. The Reviewing Body is the group vested with the authority to conduct the peer review portion of a periodic review. The Voting Body is the group vested with the authority to vote on a personnel recommendation as a result of a periodic review. This flexibility is in recognition of workload considerations and departmental cultures that delegate specific review authority and voting authority to specialized portions of the DPC. Unless otherwise stated in this document, the Reviewing Body and the Voting Body shall be one in the same.

The Reviewing Body, Voting Body, and Department Chair are required to use the procedures and performance criteria defined herein for all periodic reviews including reappointment, promotion, tenure, post-tenure recommendations and post-tenure review. In addition, the Department Chair may also include other budgetary restrictions as deemed necessary and relevant.

While this document contains the normal procedures and criteria for the periodic review of faculty and instructional academic staff, exceptions to these procedures and criteria may occasionally occur. In such cases the Candidate, Reviewing Body, Voting Body, and Department Chair must agree in writing that the exception is requested. This request for exception, with sufficient supporting justification, shall be forwarded, along with all other review materials, to all subsequent levels of administration, and approval by the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is required for the exception to be granted.

Each academic year, the DPC shall meet to elect a chair and secretary for the subsequent academic year. The elected DPC chair shall convene the first meeting of the DPC. At times when there is no DPC (due to an insufficient number of tenured faculty members) or when the previously elected chair vacates the position, the Department Chair is responsible for calling the first meeting of the DPC. See the Body Compositions portion of this document for policies and procedures governing the composition of the Reviewing Body and the Voting Body for each form of periodic review.

General Policies and Procedures

Performance Criteria

All faculty members are expected to actively engage in all required performance criteria outlined in the FASH: teaching, scholarship, service, and advising. Every periodic review of faculty must measure performance against all criteria subject to any restrictions specified in the contract of employment (e.g.,
in the case of instructional academic staff, clinical instructors, etc.). While individuals will vary in strengths and interests, and while professional emphasis will vary over the tenured period, effectiveness in teaching shall be the most important criterion for all evaluations. Solid performance in teaching is necessary for a positive review. Poor performance in teaching alone is sufficient to support a negative review. Poor performance in one of the other areas must be offset by excellent performance in at least one other area to support a positive review. Poor performance in more than one other area is sufficient to support a performance review.

The criteria to be used for each form of periodic review are delineated in the Performance Criteria portion of this document. All performance reviews for the purposes of reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure will be based on the criteria in this section. All performance reviews of faculty and instructional academic staff must include consideration and documentation of both peer and student evaluations of instruction.

The text with the gray background is shown only as an example of how criteria could be specified by a department. The text is not meant to establish any actual criteria.

The terms used in this section are defined as follows.

- **Required**: Demonstrated satisfaction of this criterion is required for a positive evaluation.
- **Expected**: Demonstrated satisfaction of this criterion is expected of the candidate. The degree to which the evaluation is positively or negatively affected by this criterion is a direct reflection of how the candidate’s performance compares to that of a typical candidate.
- **Progress**: Demonstrated progress toward satisfaction of this criterion is required for a positive evaluation.
- **Potential**: Demonstrated potential to satisfy the criterion is required for a positive evaluation.
- **Valued**: Demonstrated satisfaction of this criterion is of value to the department and may be used in support of a positive evaluation. Failure to satisfy this criterion will not result in a negative evaluation.
- **Allowed**: Demonstrated satisfaction or the failure to demonstrate satisfaction of this criterion will not affect the evaluation, unless the candidate’s contract explicitly lists successful satisfaction of the criterion as part of the candidate’s responsibilities.

In addition, departmental terms, if any, are defined as follows.

**Departmental Text**
### Table 1: Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching (in order of descending value/priority)</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Reappt</th>
<th>Assist</th>
<th>Assoc Lect</th>
<th>Lect</th>
<th>Senior Lect</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Post-Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A pattern of sufficient quantity and quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 effective classroom content and delivery resulting in significant student learning and participation</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 appropriate course modernization</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 positive student evaluations</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 positive faculty peer evaluations</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 high expectations for student effort and work</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 educational activities that are challenging and engaging for the students, as deemed by faculty peers</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 adherence to department-approved content of courses</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 demonstrated effectiveness in teaching a wide range of courses in the majors and/or minors offered by the department</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 curriculum and/or program modernization and innovation</td>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship (in order of descending value/priority)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A pattern of sufficient quantity and quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 published scholarly work (in a discipline valued by the department) in refereed journals, conferences proceedings, and/or books.</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 funded discipline-specific regional, state, and/or national grants</td>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 participation in and presentations at national or international conferences in a discipline valued by the department</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 participation in faculty/student collaborative research in a discipline valued by the department</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 participation in and presentations at local, regional, and/or state conferences in a discipline valued by the department</td>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 funded discipline-specific internal grants</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 scholarship that has a direct or indirect significant impact on the major/minor program array</td>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>Valued</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 significant professional growth over the evaluation period</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 dedication to and demonstration of success in remaining current in a discipline valued by the department</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Service (in order of descending value/priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A pattern of sufficient quantity and quality</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. positive departmental citizenship</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. positive participation in the daily life and operation of the department</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. active organization of, or effective and constructive participation in, curriculum discussions and redesign, advising discussions, accreditations and assessment reviews, etc.</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. active organization of, or effective and constructive participation in, meetings, seminars, and workshops at the department, college, and/or university level</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. active organization of, or effective and constructive participation in, committees, boards, and professional organizations at the department, college, and/or university level</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Allowed</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Advising (in order of descending value/priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A pattern of sufficient quantity and quality</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. well-informed and effective advising of majors/minors as assigned by the department</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Progress</td>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Criteria for all Periodic Performance Reviews**
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Performance relative to the **teaching** criterion can be documented in many ways, including but not limited to:

**Departmental Text**

Performance relative to the **scholarship** criterion can be documented in many ways, including but not limited to:

**Departmental Text**

Performance relative to the **service** criterion can be documented in many ways, including but not limited to:

**Departmental Text**

Performance relative to the **advising** criterion can be documented in many ways, including but not limited to:

**Departmental Text**

“Departmental citizenship” is a departmental service requirement designed to ensure that the candidate who exhibits professional misconduct or malfeasance, who obstructs the ability of colleagues to carry out their normal functions, who engages in personal attacks, who violates ethical standards, or who passively or actively creates a negative departmental climate, may receive a negative evaluation, and consequently a negative recommendation for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

**Standard Operating Procedures**

This section outlines the general procedures that apply to all periodic reviews. Where necessary and appropriate, separate procedures are outlined for the **Reviewing Body**, **Voting Body**, and the **Department Chair**.

**Body Compositions**

See the *FASH* (page 5.9) for general information on the membership and organization of the **DPC**, its subcommittees, and, when necessary, appropriate functional equivalents. For departments that wish to further specify the composition of the various bodies involved in periodic review, the following additional policies apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodic Review</th>
<th>Reviewing Body</th>
<th>Voting Body</th>
<th>Functional Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment</td>
<td><strong>Departmental Text</strong></td>
<td><strong>Departmental Text</strong></td>
<td><strong>Departmental Text</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Documentation

All performance reviews will result a Review Packet (Packet) and must include at least two separate documents: an Evaluation and the appropriately completed Academic Affairs Periodic Review Recommendation Form (Recommendation Form). Additional documents shall also be included in the Packet as specified by this policy.

In the Evaluation, the Reviewing Body will present a quantitative and qualitative assessment of the Candidate’s performance as measured against the criteria in the Performance Criteria portion of this document and must include specific language about progress towards tenure and promotion, when relevant. The Evaluation shall not, however, make any recommendations for action. Such recommendations shall be made via the Recommendation Form. In the event that the Reviewing Body cannot reach consensus on the contents of the Evaluation, minority reports are permitted, the combined total of which will be treated as the Evaluation.

Student Evaluation Procedures

Student evaluations are one source of information for evaluating teaching effectiveness. As such, every review of a faculty or instructional academic staff member must include the consideration of student evaluations across the review period as per Board of Regents Policy 20-2.

Aggregate summary data for each question of the departmentally-approved student evaluation form will be used in the review process. The summary data and the student evaluation form must be included in the Packet. Written student comments, when collected as part of the official evaluation procedure, must be included verbatim in the Packet.

Student evaluations are administered according to the following procedures.

The results of student evaluations shall not be given to the instructor until after grades are submitted for the corresponding course.

Classroom Visitation Procedures

Every periodic review of instructional staff, excluding reviews conducted for salary
recommendations, must include at least one classroom visit by at least one member of the **Reviewing Body**.

The **Candidate** must be informed in writing at least 5 days in advance of any classroom visit. The **Candidate** has the right to suggest alternate visitation dates (e.g., to avoid examinations, review sessions, and so forth); however, the reviewer determines the date of the actual visit.

When written communication with the **Candidate** concerning the classroom visit is desired by the **Reviewing Body**, the following procedures apply. Such written communication must be included in the Packet.

**Open Communication Procedures**

All interactions between the **Candidate** and the **Reviewing Body** shall be conducted in a manner that fosters open communication with fair and reasonable discourse.

The **Reviewing Body** shall present to the **Candidate**, in writing, a notice of the review. This notice must inform the **Candidate** as to the intent of the review (reappointment, tenure, promotion, etc.), the date on which the review shall begin, the date by which the review is expected to conclude, and the due date(s) for all materials that are to be submitted by the **Candidate**. This written notice shall provide at least 20 days for the preparation and submission of said materials. The written notice must be included in the Packet.

For the purpose of review, the **Reviewing Body** and the **Department Chair** shall each separately hold a minimum of one meeting with the **Candidate**. The meeting shall be held for the purpose of providing the opportunity for face-to-face dialog with the **Candidate** regarding the **Candidate**’s submitted materials and must provide the **Candidate** with the opportunity to ask questions regarding the review. When the **Reviewing Body**, the **Voting Body**, or the **Department Chair** desires additional meetings with the **Candidate**, the following procedures also apply.

**The Voting Body** shall review the Evaluation and, except in the case of a post-tenure review, vote on the appropriate recommendation. See the Meeting Minutes and Records portion of this document for voting procedures.

When a department distinguishes between the **Reviewing Body** and the **Voting Body**, the following procedures also apply.

A copy of the Packet must be given to the **Candidate** at the same time that it is forwarded to the **Department Chair**. The **Department Chair’s** Evaluation must be added to the Packet and the
Recommendation Form appropriately completed. A copy of the Department Chair's Evaluation and the updated Recommendation Form must be given to the Candidate at the same time that the Packet is forwarded to the next level of administration.

Open Meetings

Wisconsin Statute 19.85(1)(c) authorizes a closed meeting for “[c]onsidering employment, promotion, compensation or performance evaluation data of any public employee over which the governmental body has jurisdiction or exercises responsibility.” Wisconsin Statute 19.85(2) requires a minimum of twenty-four hours advance notice of the body’s intent to move into closed session. The notice must contain the specific nature of the business, as well as the exemption under which the chair of the meeting believes a closed session is authorized, and a statement that the body will reconvene in open session to conduct any voting on the business.

Wisconsin Statutes 19.83 and 19.85(1) require that every meeting must convene in open session. Before moving into closed session, the body must pass a motion, by recorded majority vote, to convene in closed session. If the motion is without descent, there is no requirement to record votes individually. Before the body votes on the motion, the chair must announce and record in open session the nature of the business to be discussed and the specific statutory exemption which is claimed to authorize the closed session. The body cannot vote in closed session but must emerge from closed session and reconvene in open session (immediately, if desired and included in the advanced notice) for the purpose of voting.

Wisconsin Statutes authorize a closed meeting but do not require any meeting to be held in closed session. However, in the best interest of the integrity of the review process and the Candidate’s right to privacy, closed meetings shall be conducted when authorized by Wisconsin Statute.

Wisconsin Statute gives wide discretion to the body to admit to a closed session anyone whose presence the body determines is necessary for the consideration of the matter at hand.

Meeting Minutes and Records

Wisconsin Statute 19.88(3) requires that a record be kept of motions and votes at each open meeting of the body. All votes are conducted by voice, by show of hands, by signed ballot, or by roll call. If any member of the Voting Body requests a roll-call or signed-ballot vote, then the vote must be conducted in that manner and the name and vote cast by each member of the Voting Body must be recorded, preserved, and be available for public inspection. No secret ballot may be used to determine a decision of a body, except the election of officers of a body. No additional requirements for taking minutes apply.

Documentation Deadlines

The Reviewing Body shall incorporate into its deliberations all documentation submitted by the Candidate up to the time at which the Reviewing Body concludes its review. After this point, updates to the Candidate’s documentation (for example, last word on the acceptance or rejection of a publication) shall not be considered at any level of the review process.

Adoption of DEP Revisions

Revisions and updates to the departmental portions of this document will be put into effect upon its
written acceptance by the Dean and the Provost and the corresponding electronic submission of the accepted document to the Provost. Until such written acceptance is obtained and electronic submissions received, revisions and updates to this document are not official and are not applicable in any periodic review.

Reappointment Policies

Reappointment Expectations for Probationary Faculty

A positive recommendation for reappointment shall require documentation of sufficient progress toward tenure and, where appropriate, promotion. The evaluation of a probationary faculty member will be based on the criteria defined in the Performance Criteria portion of this document.

Reappointment Expectations for Instructional Academic Staff

A positive recommendation for reappointment of instructional academic staff shall be based on the criteria in the Performance Criteria portion of this document, but shall be limited to those areas specifically listed in the employment contract. However, regardless of the areas of responsibility listed in the contract, satisfactory departmental citizenship is required.

Tenure Policies

Tenure Expectations

The criteria specified in the Performance Criteria portion of this document represent a necessary and minimum level of expectation. Additional constraints, such as departmental needs and resource limitations may also influence tenure recommendations.

A faculty member recommended for tenure is expected to have demonstrated _long-lasting contribution_ to the department. This means that the faculty member has demonstrated contributions to the department that have improved the department in significant and lasting ways. Further, and of equal importance, the faculty member shows a pattern of activity that suggests such significant contributions will to continue in the future.

Tenure Procedures

UW System policies state that there are three official votes for any tenure decision: the Department, the Chancellor, and the Board of Regents (UWS 3.06). The vote of the Voting Body shall constitute the official Department vote.

In addition to the procedures in the Open Meetings portion of this document, in the case of tenure deliberations, Wisconsin Statute 19.85(1)(b) indicates that the notice of moving into closed session must state that the Candidate has the right to request that the meeting be held in open session. If the Candidate requests an open session, the body may not convene in closed session under Wisconsin Statute 19.85(1)(b).

Promotion Policies

Promotions are not automatic but are based on evidence of continued high quality professional
performance. Each rank carries with it expectations of overall performance in the primary areas of review. Further, each rank explicitly carries with it the expectations of the previous rank, adding additional expectations where appropriate, as listed in the Performance Criteria portion of this document.

**Promotion Expectations**

Faculty and instructional academic staff may be considered for promotion when they meet the minimum criteria specific in the *FASH*. The criteria in the Performance Criteria portion of this document represent the minimum level of expectation for each rank.

**Faculty Rank**

**Assistant Professor**

An assistant professor is expected to demonstrate a readiness for a professional career in academia. This readiness will typically be demonstrated through (1) the attainment of a terminal degree in the discipline (or a closely related field) and (2) the affirmative endorsement of the department faculty that the assistant professor possesses the necessary skills and knowledge to begin a career in academia. In addition, the following departmental expectations, if any, also apply.

**Associate Professor**

Associate professor represents a rank between the readiness of the assistant professor rank and the demonstrated excellence and leadership of the professor rank. An associate professor, therefore, is expected to have demonstrated a pattern of effectiveness across the primary areas of evaluation. Typically, this effectiveness is demonstrated during the full probationary period as an assistant professor. In addition, the following departmental expectations, if any, also apply.

**Professor**

A professor is expected to have demonstrated excellence and leadership holistically across the primary areas of evaluation. Typically, these are demonstrated during the full period as an associate professor. Excellence and leadership can be demonstrated in many ways, but fundamentally establishes a professor as a role model for more junior faculty and staff, and for students. A professor should be an influential contributor to the excellence of the department – including its curriculum, policies, direction, and mission. A professor demonstrates an understanding of and commitment to the role of mentoring students and faculty alike. In addition, the following departmental expectations, if any, also apply.

**Instructional Academic Staff Rank**

Instructional academic staff may be considered for promotion when they meet the minimum criteria specific in the *FASH* and when their knowledge of the discipline and experience in instruction have reached the level of independence indicated in each of the following rank descriptions.
Associate Lecturer

An associate lecturer is expected to perform at the entry level of proficiency. An associate lecturer is expected to demonstrate an ability to effectively implement specific instructional duties; subject to broad guidelines on the subject matter and topics to be covered. In addition, the following departmental expectations, if any, also apply.

Lecturer

A lecturer is expected to perform at the level of a fully competent professional instructor. Typically, such performance requires knowledge and skills gained only through considerable experience. A lecturer is expected demonstrate an ability to effectively and independently develop and implement instructional duties given broad guidelines on the subject matter without the need for an outline of specific topics and/or the extent to emphasize those topics. In addition, the following departmental expectations, if any, also apply.

Senior Lecturer

A senior lecturer is expected to perform at a level of proficiency typically requiring advanced knowledge and skills and extensive experience gained through employment in an educational setting. A senior lecturer is expected to demonstrate the ability to effectively apply disciplinary and pedagogical expertise in the development and implementation of courses and curricula. In addition, the following departmental expectations, if any, also apply.

Promotion Procedures

The Candidate has the responsibility of assembling a Dossier into a professional presentation format. The Dossier must include direct evidence of the impact of courses taught by the Candidate, and the scholarship, service, and advising conducted by the Candidate. The Dossier should clearly indicate how the Candidate’s accomplishments have satisfied the criteria for promotion to the desired rank.

A nomination (including a self-nomination) for promotion must be forwarded to both the DPC and the Department Chair by October 15 of the year in which that nomination is to be considered. Any nominations for promotion received after this date will be acted upon at the discretion of the DPC. The DPC must inform the Reviewing Body and the Voting Body of all nominations received.

In addition, the following departmental policies and procedures, if any, also apply.
Post-Tenure Review Policies

Post-Tenure Expectations
All tenured members of the department shall undergo periodic post-tenure review at least once every five years. Such a peer review shall be formative and summative in nature with the express purpose of both evaluating past performance and facilitating improvement in future performance. For faculty below the rank of Professor, the post-tenure review must include explicit discussion of the faculty member’s progress toward promotion to the next rank using the appropriate criteria specified in the Performance Criteria portion of this document. A formal review for promotion may be substituted for the post-tenure review. For faculty at the rank of Professor, the post-tenure review must include explicit discussion of all four primary areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, service, and advising).

Post-Tenure Procedures
In addition to the procedures outlined in the FASH and in the Standard Operating Procedures of this document, the written notice of the start of the post-tenure review process must inform the Candidate of the right to discuss the Reviewing Body’s Evaluation with the Department Chair and of the right to submit to the Department Chair a written response to the Evaluation. The Candidate’s written response must be submitted to the Department Chair within 5 days of the Reviewing Body’s submission of the Packet to the Department Chair (which must be copied to the Candidate). After reviewing the submitted materials, the Department Chair may include a written reaction in the Packet. The Department Chair shall then return the Packet to the Candidate and acknowledge completion of the post-tenure review to the Dean via the Recommendation Form.