

**PERSONNEL
REVIEW
STATEMENT**

OAKLAND UNIVERSITY

**School of Education and
Human Services**

PERSONNEL REVIEW STATEMENT
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

Approved by School Assembly	<u>September, 1983</u>
Approved by FRPC	<u>November, 1983</u>
Amended	<u>July, 1986</u>
Revised/Edited	<u>January, 1991</u>
Approved by FRPC	<u>March 12, 1992</u>
Revisions Approved by School Assembly	<u>March 29, 1999</u>
Approved by FRPC	<u>April 29, 1999</u>
Revisions Approved by School Assembly	<u>January 26, 2004</u>
Approved by FRPC	<u>January 30, 2004</u>

This document supersedes all prior documents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERSONNEL REVIEW STATEMENT

	Page
I. Oakland University/AAUP Agreement	1
II. Personnel Decisions Level	1
III. Notification and Initiation Procedures	1
IV. Committee on Appointment and Promotion	2
V. Charge to the Committee	3
VI. Advocate's Role	3
VII. Dossier	4
VIII. General Priorities Among the Three Professional Categories: Teaching, Scholarship, Service.....	4
IX. Changing Expectations: Review Criteria.....	5
X. Untenured Assistant/Associate Professor Reviews	
C-1 Review	5
C-2/C-3 Reviews.....	7
C-4/D Reviews.....	8
XI. Tenured Associate Professor Review	
I-Review	10
XII. Special Instructor Reviews	
42a Review	11
42b Review	11
42c Review.....	11
42d Review	12

	Page
XIII. B-1 Review	13
XIV. Adjunct Faculty Appointment and Review Procedures.....	13
XV. Special Assignments	13
XVI. Examples of Evidence in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service.....	14
XVII. Suggested Dossier Format	18
XVIII. Dossier Appendix: Status of Requested Information.....	20
XIX. Supplementary Back-Up Material File	20
XX. Initial Appointment above the Assistant Professor Level.....	21

Table One

Summary of Review Criteria	25
----------------------------	----

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

PERSONNEL REVIEW STATEMENT

Procedures, Priorities and Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion

1. Oakland University/AAUP Agreement

In accordance with the current Oakland University/American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Agreement, the following review statement has been formulated by the Committee on Appointment and Promotion (CAP) for the members of the School of Education and Human Services (SEHS).

Personnel decisions are not considered competitive, but are to be determined on the basis of the criteria established by the School. A wide-ranging diversity of faculty roles within the School is reflected in the initial appointments, and is reflected again in the reappointment and promotion decisions. Provision for this diversity is made within the established criteria, and the weighting of some criteria may be modified for special types of assignments (See Section 15).

All personnel decisions are forwarded in the form of recommendations.

2. Personnel Decision Levels

Personnel decisions are any of the employment evaluation decisions that are required by the current Oakland University/AAUP Agreement.

3. Notification and Initiation Procedures

3.1 Notification procedures shall be in accordance with all relevant sections of the current Oakland University/AAUP Agreement. However, due to the fact that the School of Education and Human Services (SEHS) is the contractually defined "Academic Unit" and the term "department" is used to refer to administrative divisions within SEHS that are not academic units, the Committee on Appointment and Promotion provides a review at both academic unit and CAP levels. As a result of this, the due dates for transmittal of dossiers and support files will occur sooner than contractually specified where departments are academic units. Candidates for reappointment and promotion in the School of Education and Human Services who are subject to a CAP review will be notified in writing of the due date for dossier transmittal to CAP. Candidates who do not meet the specified due date will, at the CAP's sole discretion, forfeit the right to a Hearing (see Article 6, Section 6.4).

3.2 Initiation Without Notification: Any faculty member may initiate his/her own unscheduled candidacy by informing his/her department chair and the

chairperson of the CAP, in writing, by September 1 for fall review or December 1 for winter review.

Any tenured faculty member may initiate another faculty member's unscheduled candidacy by informing the candidate's department chair and the chairperson of CAP, in writing, by September 1 for fall review or by December 1 for winter review. The potential candidate has the right to decline such a nomination.

- 3.3 Circulation - Prior to taking action on any candidate, the CAP shall solicit from the Dean a list of all faculty members subject to review according to the current Oakland University/AAUP Agreement.

4. *Committee on Appointment and Promotion*

The Committee on Appointment and Promotion shall consist of one tenured faculty member from each department and the Dean or Dean's representative (ex officio and non voting). It shall act on all candidates for initial appointment above the assistant professor rank and all contractually designated reappointments and promotions.

- 4.1 Members from each department will be elected at large from the School. As slots open, the current CAP Chairperson will confer with department faculty who are willing to stand for election. Except in extenuating circumstances, in which no other candidate is available, department chairs normally will not serve on CAP.
- 4.2 Membership shall be for three-year staggered terms commencing August 15. Elections shall be conducted by the CAP Chairperson during the preceding winter semester. Election results shall be transmitted by the CAP Chairperson to SEHS faculty, via campus mail, no later than the last Monday in April.
- 4.3 The succeeding CAP shall hold an organizational meeting during the first week of each fall semester. It will: (a) set a preliminary schedule for the forthcoming academic year, (b) review processes and procedures delineated in the *Personnel Review Statement* of the School of Education and Human Services, and (c) familiarize itself with procedures and due dates specified in the current Faculty Agreement between Oakland University/AAUP Agreement.
- 4.4 The CAP will, following its own procedures, select a chairperson-elect at its second meeting in September. The Chairperson's term of office shall be for one calendar year beginning in January.
- 4.5 Faculty members may not serve on the committee in the year they are being reviewed for promotion, but will continue their term subsequent to the year of review.

5. *Charge to the Committee*

- 5.1 The charge to the committee shall be to determine whether the candidate has met the review criteria.
- 5.2 It shall then work towards a judgment regarding the overall quality of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service to the profession, School and University. As evidence, it shall make use of the candidate's dossier and supplementary file.
- 5.3 It shall then determine whether or not the candidate has met the specific criteria established for that particular decision level. In the absence of consensus, the committee shall be polled, and its decision shall not be considered valid unless all committee members have voted or abstained. Abstentions shall not be permitted without full committee consent, and shall be given only for extraordinary reasons. Personnel decisions require a majority of the full committee, excluding abstentions. Each decision shall be put in the form of a written evaluation and recommendation, supported by the committee, and signed by the committee chairperson.

The recommendation shall become a part of the candidate's dossier (Section 7), and copies forwarded to the next committee and the candidate.
- 5.4 The committee shall not rank candidates.
- 5.5 A written evaluation shall be provided that is of sufficient scope and detail to assess a candidate's performance using the SEHS criteria.

6. *Advocate's Role*

- 6.1 An advocate is any person selected by the candidate to assist in preparing and presenting his/her candidacy. The advocate must not have any other assigned responsibility for determining the outcome of the personnel decision.
- 6.2 It is recognized that the role and circumstances of each faculty member are unique and that this uniqueness often may best be placed in perspective by the advocate.
- 6.3 The advocate may: (a) assist the candidate in the preparation, organization, and presentation of all required and optional evidence submitted on behalf of the candidate; and (b) serve as a spokesperson for the candidate before the committee, except during the final discussion and vote of the committee. The advocate should be prepared to clarify, verify, and qualify any evidence presented by the candidate.
- 6.4 If, at any time, in the estimation of the committee chairperson, a favorable decision might not be reached, he/she shall consult with the candidate or advocate. In that event, the candidate and advocate shall be given formal opportunity to hear

the reasons for the committee's reservations, and to discuss those reasons with the committee until, in the judgment of the committee, the discussions can go no further. The candidate or advocate may then request that the committee defer its decision until, in the judgment of the candidate or advocate, all appropriate information has been received and considered. However, the candidate may not request a delay that will go past CAP deadline dates for transmittal of recommendations to Oakland and/or the Faculty Re-employment and Promotion Committee (FRPC).

7. *Dossier*

The dossier is a collection of evidence assembled by the candidate, which has been required by the committee or optionally offered by the candidate. The dossier and supplementary file shall be submitted to the chairperson of the committee prior to consideration of his/her candidacy. (For specific description, see Sections 17, 18 and 19.)

8. *General Priorities for Tenure Track Faculty Among the Three Professional Categories: Teaching, Scholarship, Service*

- 8.1 Teaching is fundamental to the work of the faculty. It serves as the foundation for the candidate's overall record. Therefore, teaching is the professional area that should be most emphasized, especially in the first several years of one's appointment. It is important to achieve teaching effectiveness so that one can sustain a program of scholarship.
- 8.2 Scholarship is important at every level of review. Scholarly work is the primary way most candidates extend their professional activities as university teachers. The School values each candidate's emerging independence as a scholar as demonstrated by either independent or collaborative scholarship. The weighting of scholarship can only be reduced in the review process when balanced by a strong record of professional service and teaching.
- 8.3 Service becomes increasingly important at each succeeding review level. Service to one's profession should not be confused with "community service." Service must be directly related to one's profession.

9. *Changing Expectations: Review Criteria*

The CAP does not construe reappointment or promotion at any level to guarantee the next level of reappointment or promotion. The continual academic progress of the individual, and not simply past achievement, is the basis for advancement through the academic ranks. Therefore, expectations of accomplishment increase from one level of review to the next. In a general sense, the expectations go from "satisfactory" and "potential" at the C-1 level of review to "strong leadership" at the I level of review (for

full professor). For an overview of these changing expectations, see Table 1: Summary of Review Criteria.

- 9.1 The most important evidence for review at the C-1 level is that which demonstrates potential in both teaching and scholarship.
- 9.2 By the time of the C-2 (or C-3) level there should be evidence of effectiveness in teaching and scholarship, as well as a satisfactory record of service.
- 9.3 At the C-4 (or D) level the typical pattern is to show mature accomplishment in teaching and scholarship with at least effectiveness in service. Alternative patterns may show evidence of mature accomplishment in teaching and service, or in scholarship and service, with effectiveness in the remaining category.
- 9.4 At the I level, strong leadership should be demonstrated in one category, with evidence of mature accomplishment in the remaining two categories.
- 9.5 For examples of evidence that may be cited under teaching, scholarship and service, see Section 16.
- 9.6 For the changing criteria used at each review level to weigh the evidence submitted, see Sections 10, 11, 12, 13, and Table 1: Summary of Review Criteria.

10. Untenured Assistant/Associate Professor Reviews

10.1 C-1 Review (First two-year reappointment at assistant professor rank)

- 10.11 At this level of review it is understood that the candidate is new in the profession and may experience some difficulty in adjusting to the demands of full-time instruction and other academic responsibilities. More emphasis is placed upon potential at this review than at any other. Moreover, less emphasis is placed on service than on teaching and scholarly activity.

10.12 Teaching (potential)

There should be a clear indication that the candidate can become an effective teacher. The candidate should show potential for becoming effective by demonstrating generally positive patterns of Student Perception of Teaching-Learning Effectiveness (SPTLE) scores for the majority of courses taught.

- 10.121 In addition, potential may be demonstrated by:

10.1211 Other information provided by students or peers who can offer their perceptions of the candidate's teaching effectiveness;

10.1212 Evidence indicating thorough and current knowledge of the candidate's major teaching discipline.

10.122 The candidate should demonstrate an understanding of any deficiencies in teaching performance and develop a plan to correct any noted problems.

10.123 The candidate should exhibit a sense of professional responsibility toward teaching.

10.13 Scholarship (potential)

There should be clear indications that the candidate is, or can become, an effective scholar. There should be evidence of scholarly attainment indicating potential for becoming effective, as shown by presentations at professional meetings, published or unpublished manuscripts, funded research grants, or applications for internal or external funding of research projects. By this means, the candidate should show movement towards a sustained line of scholarship, and seek feedback from colleagues through seminars or other means.

10.14 Service (satisfactory)

There should be responsible participation in departmental meetings and School Assembly meetings and satisfactory performance of any departmental or School assignments, such as advising students and serving on committees.

10.2 C-2/C-3 Reviews (Second two-year reappointment at assistant professor rank)

10.21 At this level of review, the candidate's record should indicate that there is reasonable evidence of on-going professional growth. More is now expected in the area of service, but the primary emphasis continues to be in the areas of teaching and scholarship, with a shift from potential to the demonstration of professional effectiveness.

10.22 Teaching (effectiveness)

At this level, the candidate's teaching is expected to be effective, so that a sustained effort in scholarship can take place without jeopardizing the quality of instruction.

10.221 The candidate is expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through the continuation or growth of a positive pattern of SPTLE scores for the majority of courses taught since his or her last review or from the time of initial appointment. Other items from Section 16.1 may be used to support the judgment of effective teaching.

10.222 The candidate is expected to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching through the continuation or growth of a positive pattern of faculty perceptions of teaching effectiveness.

10.223 In addition, effectiveness may be demonstrated by:

10.2231 Evidence of having corrected any deficiencies identified in the prior review;

10.2232 Self-appraisal of teaching, which includes specific plans for improvement;

10.2233 Any other relevant evidence (see 16.1).

10.23 Scholarship (effectiveness)

The candidate is expected to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship by showing scholarship attainment in several of the items in 16.2.

10.24 Service (satisfactory)

The candidate is expected to demonstrate satisfactory participation in the work of the School and the University through active committee work or professionally related service.

10.3 C-4/D Reviews

10.31 As these reviews involve the granting or denial of tenure, they are most important. At either review level the candidate should show evidence of mature professional accomplishment in two of the categories, teaching, scholarship, and service, and at least effectiveness in the third.

10.32 Teaching (mature accomplishment or effectiveness)

10.321 Mature accomplishment

The candidate should present evidence of having become an accomplished teacher by: (a) demonstrating a positive pattern of student perceptions from SPTLE for the majority of courses

taught since his or her most recent review or from the time of initial appointment; (b) receiving generally favorable evaluations from tenured colleagues who have observed the individual's teaching; and (c) providing other evidence, of the candidate's choice, from section 16.1.

10.322 Effectiveness

It is sufficient to show evidence of effective teaching when scholarship and service can be demonstrated at a level of mature accomplishment (see 10.22 for criteria of effectiveness in teaching).

10.33 Scholarship (mature accomplishment or effectiveness)

10.331 Mature accomplishment

Evidence of scholarship provided by the candidate must include several published scholarly works identified in 16.22, 16.23, and/or 16.24. Additional items in section 16.2 will be reviewed as further evidence of scholarly attainment, particularly items identified in 16.27. There should also be generally positive evaluations of the candidate's scholarship by at least three outside reviewers who are experts in the candidate's field.

10.332 Effectiveness

It is sufficient to show evidence of effective scholarship when teaching and service can be demonstrated at a level of mature accomplishment. The candidate can demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship by showing evidence of several of the items in 16.2, specifically including items identified in 16.23, 16.24 and 16.27. There should also be generally positive evaluations of the candidate's scholarship by at least three outside reviewers who are experts in the candidate's field.

10.34 Service (effectiveness or mature accomplishment)

10.341 Mature accomplishment

The candidate is expected to show a strong sustained record of participation in at least two of the following:

10.3411 School and University committee work or similar assignments;

10.3412 Committee work or similar assignments in state or national professional organizations;

10.3413 Professional presentations and/or consultations to local schools or agencies, or other similar work.

There should be at least three generally positive evaluations of the candidate's involvement from two of the three general areas of service: School and University committees, state or national organizations, or local schools or agencies.

10.342 Effectiveness

The candidate should present evidence of having performed at least effective service to the department, School, University and educational community. S/he is expected to have contributed meaningfully to committees or other assignments and to have engaged in some professionally related community service, such as becoming an officeholder or committee member of a state or national professional organization or presenting in-service workshops for local educational organizations or other similar activities (See 16.3 for other relevant evidence of service).

It is sufficient to show evidence of effective service when teaching and scholarship can be demonstrated at a level of mature accomplishment.

11. Tenured Associate Professor Review (I-Review): Promotion to Full Professor

11.1 Promotion to full professor is achieved by attainment of strong professional leadership qualities in one of the traditional three areas of teaching, service, and scholarship, along with a pattern of mature accomplishment in the remaining two categories (see 11.2, 11.3, 11.4). In scholarship, the professional achievements of the candidate should result in national prominence to the candidate as well as the University; in teaching, the leadership qualities may be limited to the University; in service, they should extend throughout the School, University, and candidate's profession, such as state or national professional organizations, or significant leadership contributions in local schools or agencies.

A strong professional leader is one who provides the initiative, model, or knowledge for others to follow or build upon. The candidate for full professor must give evidence of strong professional leadership qualities in at least one of these areas.

11.2 Teaching (strong leadership)

To demonstrate strong leadership in teaching, the candidate must show evidence of several of the following: successful initiatives with team-teaching or other collaborative teaching efforts; funded grants to support or enhance teaching; university recognition or awards for excellence in teaching; examples of effective mentoring of college or student teaching; and program development within their department or School.

11.3 Scholarship (strong leadership)

The candidate should show evidence of national prominence as a scholar. Such evidence should come from at least three letters attesting to the candidate's scholarship from professionals outside the University. The scholarly accomplishments should include several of the following: grants, on-going research of significance, publications in juried journals of national importance, citations in the work of others, published books, monographs or research reports, reviews of professional materials such as books and teaching materials, membership on national grant or proposal review bodies, and any other examples of leadership.

11.4 Service (strong leadership)

The candidate should show evidence of significant contributions in the affairs of the School, University, and in one's professional field. Strong leadership in service should come from several of the following: chairing important committees, planning and evaluating new academic programs, planning and evaluating annual conventions in the candidate's field, editing bulletins and journals, holding an office in a professional organization, in-service education at schools, consulting services for others in the field, and any examples of professional leadership in service to a wide audience beyond the University.

12. Special Instructor Reviews

12.1 42a Review (First re-employment as a Special Instructor)

12.11 Candidates for a first re-employment as a Special Instructor are evaluated on the basis of teaching. At this level of review it is recognized that while the candidate may have been successful in settings such as elementary or secondary schools, a period of adjustment may be necessary in learning to teach at the University. Thus at this level of review, the candidate is required to present evidence of potential in teaching.

12.12 Teaching (potential). See Article 10, Section 10.12 for criteria for potential in teaching.

12.2 42b Review (Second re-employment as a Special Instructor)

12.21 The focus of this review remains upon teaching. It is anticipated that the candidate will achieve effectiveness as a teacher.

12.22 Teaching (effectiveness). See Article 10, Section 10.22 for criteria for effectiveness in teaching.

12.3 42c Review (Third re-employment as a Special Instructor with job security)

12.31 As this review involves the granting or denial of job security, it is a most important one. At this level, the candidate should show evidence of mature professional accomplishment in teaching and one of the following: satisfactory service or potential in scholarship. (The choice of a secondary focus involving service or scholarship allows candidates to retain the option of proceeding to an optional 42d review.)

12.32 Teaching (mature accomplishment). See Article 10, Section 10.321 for criteria for mature accomplishment in teaching.

12.33 Service (satisfactory). See Article 10, Section 10.24 for criteria for satisfactory service, or

12.34 Scholarship (potential). See Article 10, Section 10.13 for criteria for potential in scholarship.

12.4 42d Review (Promotion of Special Instructor with job security to associate professor with tenure)

12.41 As this review provides for a change in appointment to associate professor and the granting of tenure, it is equivalent to the C-4 review, with the additional stipulation that the candidate has completed the doctorate in his or her field or a closely related one. At this review level, the candidate should demonstrate, at a minimum, evidence of mature professional accomplishment in two of the categories: teaching, scholarship and service, and effectiveness in the third.

12.42 Teaching

12.421 Mature accomplishment. See Article 10, Section 10.321 for criteria for mature accomplishment in teaching.

12.422 Effectiveness. See Article 10, Section 10.322 for criteria for effectiveness in teaching.

12.43 Scholarship

12.431 Mature accomplishment. See Article 10, Section 10.331 for criteria for mature accomplishment in scholarship.

12.432 Effectiveness. See Article 10, Section 10.332 for criteria for effectiveness in scholarship.

12.44 Service

12.441 Mature accomplishment. See Article 10, Section 10.341 for criteria for mature accomplishment in service.

12.442 Effectiveness. See Article 10, Section 10.342 for criteria for effectiveness in service.

13. B-1 Review: (First re-employment as Instructor with promotion to Assistant Professor)

13.1 Instructor Review

13.11 As this review provides for a change in appointment to a tenure track position, it is equivalent to the C-1 review with the additional stipulation that the candidate has completed a terminal degree in the field. See 10.1 for a description of the expectations for this review.

13.12 Teaching (potential)

See 10.12 for criteria for potential in teaching.

13.13 Scholarship (potential)

See 10.13 for criteria for potential in teaching.

13.14 Service (satisfactory)

See 10.14 for criteria for satisfactory service.

14. Adjunct Faculty Appointment and Review Procedures: Under Development

Criteria for Adjunct Faculty Appointments have not, as yet, been developed.

15. Special Assignments

The weighting of some criteria may be modified if the candidate has been given a special assignment. A special assignment is a task or role requiring a unique distribution of effort, described in writing and assigned by the Dean, or by the candidate's department with the Dean's approval, and agreed to by the faculty member.

Such assignment and written approval may take place at any time. However, any changes made to the weighting of criteria must be approved by CAP and FRPC within one year of initial appointment or at the time of making the special assignment for continuing faculty. The intent is to permit a unique distribution of a faculty member's effort where deemed appropriate without prejudicing the candidate's promotion or reappointment review. The written assignment, in combination with the criteria presented herein, becomes the basis for evaluating the candidate at each level.

16. Examples of Evidence in Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

It is the responsibility of the candidate to present evidence documenting activities in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Citation of specific evidence (e.g., a publication, presentation, or committee assignment) should be limited to a single category in teaching, scholarship, or service.

16.1 Teaching. Teaching activity within the University organizational structure or in other professional settings may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, any of the following:

16.11 A brief overview of the candidate's teaching by a professional peer.

16.12 Scores on the SPTLE questionnaire.

16.13 Peer review by tenured colleagues who team-taught with the candidate, formally observed the candidate's teaching, analyzed the candidate's course materials, or participated in a seminar conducted by the candidate.

16.14 Letters from colleagues who interviewed or solicited written statements from students of the candidate. The colleague should include a statement on how the students were selected and what questions were asked;

16.15 New course proposals or revisions of existing courses including course syllabi.

16.16 Objective evidence of teaching results, including:

16.161 Pre- and post-test scores including a description of the test and an explanation of how the scores were compared;

16.162 Measurable changes in student academic or skill performance including a description of the measurement analysis;

16.163 Video cassette of teaching with appropriate follow-up or comparison data.

16.17 Directing student research where there is evidence of the candidate's contribution to the development of new knowledge or the application of

existing knowledge in new ways; any other appropriate evidence consistent with School or University review guidelines, for example evaluation and/or assessment work which involves scholarly activity.

16.2 Scholarship. Scholarship attainment may take place within the University organizational structure or in other professional settings and may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, any of the following:

16.21 Professional assessment

16.211 Peer or colleague assessment. Professional peers or colleagues may overview and provide a critical analysis of the candidate's scholarly performance.

16.212 Evaluation by impartial experts in the candidate's field of any of the items listed in 16.22-16.29. This standard is required for all tenure reviews and for promotion to full professor (Note: see FRPC General Statement to All Academic Units published in September of each year). Departments should inform outside reviewers that they are being asked to evaluate the candidate's scholarship and not to provide an overall recommendation concerning the candidate's promotion and tenure.

16.2121 Among the total number of written evaluations that departments may solicit, at least three should be provided by impartial experts in the candidate's field who are not Oakland or former colleagues, research collaborator, mentors, etc. If there is any question as to whether a reviewer falls into one of these excluded classes, the reviewer should not be used to meet this requirement for impartial excluded reviewers. Evaluations from persons in excluded classes may be included as additional data.

16.2122 Selection of these outside reviewers should be fully described.

16.2123 All persons solicited as reviewers should be identified and all responses should be included in the dossier.

16.2124 Letters of evaluation should be solicited in a formal, documented manner. A sample letter of solicitation should be included in the dossier.

16.2125 Solicitation letters should request a Vita of the reviewer. Vitae are to be included in the supplementary file.

- 16.2126 The core dossier should include a brief biographical sketch of the reviewer. Any affiliation of a reviewer with the candidate should be specified here.
- 16.2127 All other procedures employed in external scholarly evaluation should be fully described in the dossier.
- 16.22 Publication of a book or chapter of a book. (The term publication in this document includes electronic media in addition to the more traditional vehicles of scholarship dissemination.) Note: Although the highest value will be placed on reviewed books and refereed journal articles, the categories of evidence provided in this statement are not intended to represent a ranking.
- 16.23 Publication of articles in professionally refereed journals (including electronic refereed journals). Multiple authored publications must have the contribution of the candidate specified as clearly as possible.
- 16.24 Publication of articles in professional journals or an intellectually respected magazine. Multiple authored publications must have the contribution of the candidate specified as clearly as possible.
- 16.25 Other published works, such as invited work, book reviews, columns in publications, monographs, or government documents or electronic media.
- 16.26 Foundation grant proposals, donor grant proposals, and juried grant proposals involving scholarly activity. Multiple authored proposals must have the contributions of the candidate specified as clearly as possible. NOTE: the highest value will be placed on funded proposals.
- 16.27 Papers, poster, or taped presentations at a national or state professional conference or teleconference. Multiple authored papers or presentations must have the contribution of the candidate specified as clearly as possible.
- 16.28 Book, chapter, article, grant or paper proposal manuscripts submitted but not yet accepted or funded. Multiple authored works must have the contribution of the candidate specified as clearly as possible.
- 16.29 Scholarship includes but is not limited to: demonstration of intellectual activity in the design of innovative learning environments, or in the development of teaching materials: textbooks, manuals, software, modules, exercises, or other appropriate materials, including hard copy, audio/video or digital formats.

16.3 Service. Service may take place within the University organizational structure or in other professional settings, and may be evidenced by, but is not limited to, any of the following: (The candidate is expected to provide documentation for representative service activities which reflect major foci. The candidate is encouraged to maintain a file of letters or other evidence to support the case for the review level, which should be made available upon request.)

16.31 A brief overview of the candidate's performance in professional service by a professional peer.

16.32 Serving on a department, School or University committee.

16.33 Developing a project or grant proposal to support service activities in the department, School, University or the educational community if not already included under scholarly or teaching activity.

16.34 Evaluating service programs if not already included under scholarly activity.

16.35 Serving on a county, state, regional, or national committee concerned with one's profession.

16.36 Planning and implementing a professional, educational or organizational meeting.

16.37 Editing, serving on an editorial board, or other editorial roles on juried scholarly publications. A full description of the role should be provided.

16.38 Writing for or editing nonjuried professional periodicals except in cases of work already included under scholarship.

16.39 Professional development or other similar activities for schools or agencies:

16.391 Conducting staff development activities;

16.392 Performing consultation activities;

16.393 Providing professional leadership.

16.40 Supporting and enhancing technology integration in the School of Education and Human Services or other units.

17. Suggested Dossier Format

The FRPC is contractually required to publish by September 15 of each year, a statement of its policies and procedures, including a recommended dossier format. The following format conforms to that recommended by the 2001-2002 FRPC. Candidates

for tenure or full professor are advised to review the FRPC statement each September 15 to note possible changes and to ensure that their dossiers conform to FRPC specifications.

Copies of the dossier should be submitted to the appropriate party, either one's departmental CAP representative or the Dean of the School of Human and Educational Services, depending upon one's contractually mandated review level. Seven (7) copies are required at the 42 a-b and C-1 levels and thirteen (13) copies are necessary at the 42c, C-2, C-3, C-4, D, and I levels.

The dossier is a binder with continuous pagination. It includes the following:

17.1 Departmental Chairperson's letter of recommendation.

17.2 Composite departmental faculty letter of support (if any). Some departments elect to compose and sign a group letter of support. This does not refer to letters of support from individual faculty members which may be included elsewhere in the dossier. The decision to include a composite departmental letter rests solely with the candidate. Including it is optional rather than required.

17.3 Cover page (name, level, and date of review).

17.4 Table of Contents (all pages numbered).

17.5 Candidate's Curriculum Vita. Include personal information (home and office address, telephone, e-mail, educational background (degrees and other relevant education); professional employment; list of activities in research, teaching and service (which may include categories detailed in 17.51-17.55). Copies of all publications, especially books and journal articles, listed in the vita should be included in the supplementary file. Copies of papers listed as submitted, accepted, or in-press should be included in the supplementary file with copies of acceptance letters for items listed as accepted or in-press attached to these items.

17.51 Publications

17.511 Books;

17.512 Refereed articles and publications;

17.513 Non-refereed articles and publications;

17.514 Electronic media;

17.515 Monographs;

17.516 Technical reports.

- 17.52 Presentations
 - 17.521 Refereed;
 - 17.522 Invited at international, national, regional, state, and local venues;
- 17.53 List of all courses taught with related printouts of SEHS SPTLE evaluations.
- 17.54 List of non-course instructional activities such as advising, mentoring, program leadership.
- 17.55 List of service activities to: profession, University, SEHS, department, and community (e.g. schools and other agencies).
- 17.6 Personal statement. This describes the candidate's professional identity. The statement should provide a context for understanding the candidate's professional accomplishments and goals in teaching, research, and service and how the materials in the dossier and supplementary file document the candidate's achievements. The maximum length of a personal statement should be fifteen (15) pages. Candidates are encouraged to submit concise personal statements and not feel compelled to use the maximum number of pages.
- 17.7 Copy of the current SEHS *Personnel Review Statement* used to prepare the dossier.
- 17.8 Evidence in support of teaching
 - 17.81 SPTLE results and written analysis;
 - 17.82 Letters
 - 17.821 External;
 - 17.822 Colleague or peer;
 - 17.823 Student.

17.9 Letters of support for scholarship

17.91 External. For candidates undergoing tenure reviews or promotion to full professor, letters evaluating scholarship from at least three impartial external reviewers are required by the FRPC. Letters evaluating scholarship by the required three external reviewers should be included at the front of the total set of letters assessing the candidate's scholarship. A one-page biographical sketch of each reviewer included in the supplementary file. The three external letters should be preceded by a statement regarding how external reviewers were selected and solicited.

17.92 Colleague or peer evaluations.

17.10 Letters of support for service

17.101 Profession;

17.1011 National;

17.1012 State or Regional;

17.1013 Local.

17.102 University;

17.103 School;

17.104 Department.

18. Dossier Appendix: Status of Requested Information

In the event solicited written evaluations or other support materials have not been received by the date the dossier is submitted for review, the candidate's advocate shall include a memorandum detailing the status of the requested information. The advocate should include the initial date of the request made to the individual(s) asked to supply information. The expected arrival date(s) should also be included, if possible. At the CAP's sole discretion, it may elect not to consider materials that are submitted to it after the published deadlines.

19. Supplementary File

This single file box contains support materials organized by the candidate to best represent his or her accomplishments and scholarly work in teaching, scholarship, and service. A reference system from the candidate's "core dossier" to the supporting evidence in the supplementary file is helpful. For example the teaching record section

of the core dossier cites “X,” which contains syllabi, student evaluations, etc. and the label of Appendix “X” cites the teaching record page of the core dossier.

20. Initial Appointment above the Assistant Professor Level

20.1 Review of recommendations for initial non-tenured appointment above the assistant professor level

20.11 Notification

20.111 A department wishing to recommend an offer of non-tenured employment above the assistant professor level shall simultaneously notify the Dean of the School of Education, the chairperson of the Committee on Appointment and Promotion, and its departmental representative to CAP.

20.112 The department chairperson and/or chair of the departmental search committee shall, at a minimum, transmit to the CAP Chairperson the following:

20.1121 A written recommendation stating the candidate's specific qualifications for the position, as advertised, and appointment above the assistant professor level;

20.1122 One copy of the candidate's curriculum vita.;

20.1123 One copy of the department's position vacancy announcement.

20.113 The CAP may request additional information as it deems appropriate.

20.12 Process

20.121 The CAP Chairperson shall convene a meeting of the committee within seven (7) business days of receiving the department's recommendation. In the event of the chair's incapacity or absence, the meeting will be convened by the recommending department's CAP representative who will assume the duties of the chair.

20.122 Three (3) members of the CAP shall constitute a quorum. No recommendation shall be made in the absence of a quorum.

20.123 The CAP recommendation will be based upon a majority vote of members present. CAP members may not abstain from voting.

20.124 In making its written recommendation, the CAP may:

- 20.1241 Discuss the candidate's qualifications, as reflected in the curriculum vita, for appointment above the assistant professor level;
- 20.1242 Analyze the candidate's suitability for the position for which s/he is being recommended for employment;
- 20.1243 Suggest actions that may be undertaken on the part of the candidate, department, and/or School which might contribute to a positive recommendation during the subsequent D (tenure) review.
- 20.125 CAP shall simultaneously forward its written recommendation to the candidate, the department chairperson, and the Dean.
- 20.126 The CAP recommendation shall become part of the record for the subsequent D (tenure) review.
- 20.127 CAP shall forward its written recommendation within fifteen (15) business days of its receipt of the departmental recommendation. Failure on the part of CAP to produce a written recommendation within this time period will not preclude Oakland University from tendering the offer of employment.
- 20.128 In the event CAP is unable to formulate a recommendation prior to an offer and acceptance of employment, such recommendation will be made prior to the completion of the faculty member's first semester of employment. In such instances, the committee will confine its commentary to suggested actions that may be undertaken by the faculty member, department, and/or School which might contribute to a positive recommendation during the subsequent D (tenure) review.

20.2 Procedures for Review of Recommendations for Initial Tenured Appointment

20.21 Notification

20.211 A department wishing to recommend an offer of tenured employment shall simultaneously notify the Dean of the School of Education, the chairperson of the Committee on Appointment and Promotion, its departmental CAP representative, and the School representative to FRPC.

20.212 The department chairperson and/or chair of the departmental search committee shall, at a minimum, transmit to the CAP Chairperson:

20.2121 A written recommendation stating the candidate's specific qualifications for the position as advertised and tenured appointment at the recommended rank;

20.2122 One copy of the candidate's resume/curriculum vita;

20.2123 One copy of the department's position vacancy announcement;

20.2124 Other documentation supporting the recommendation, such as publications, course evaluation data, letters of recommendation, letters supporting tenure or promotion at other universities.

20.213 The CAP may request additional information as it deems appropriate.

20.22 Process

20.221 The CAP Chairperson shall convene a meeting of the committee within five (5) business days of receiving the department's recommendation. In the event of the CAP Chairperson's incapacity or absence, the meeting will be convened by the recommending department's CAP representative who will assume the duties of the chair.

20.222 Three (3) members of the CAP shall constitute a quorum. No recommendation shall be made in the absence of a quorum.

20.223 The chairperson of the recommending department or the chair of the department search committee shall be invited to be the candidate's advocate and to interpret documentation to CAP.

20.224 The CAP recommendation will be based upon a majority vote of members present. CAP members may not abstain from voting.

20.225 The CAP's evaluation shall be conveyed to the FRPC in a written recommendation supported by a majority of the committee members present and voting.

20.226 A verbal recommendation to the Dean may precede the CAP's written recommendation.

20.227 In making its written recommendation, CAP may:

20.2271 Discuss the candidate's qualifications for appointment at the recommended level;

20.2272 Analyze the candidate's qualifications, relative to the position vacancy announcement and the criteria set forth in the School's *Personnel Review Statement*, for appointment with tenure and appointment at the recommended rank.

20.228 CAP shall simultaneously forward copies of its recommendation to the FRPC to: the candidate, the appropriate department chair, and the Dean.

The CAP shall forward its written recommendation within ten (10) business days of its receipt of the departmental recommendation. Failure on the part of CAP to produce a written recommendation within this time period will not preclude Oakland University from tendering the offer of employment.

TABLE ONE

SUMMARY OF REVIEW CRITERIA

<u>Review Level</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u> <u>Mature Accomplishment</u>	<u>Potential</u>	<u>Effectiveness</u> <u>Strong Leadership</u>
(C-1) First 2 year reappointment as Assistant Professor	service (10.14) and	teaching (10.12) scholarship (10.13)	
(C-2) or (C-3) Second 2 year reappointment as 25 Assistant Professor	service (10.24)		teaching (10.22) and scholarship (10.23)
(C4) or (D) Promotion to two categories: Associate Professor with tenure	scholarship (10.331) or service (10.341)		Any one category: Any teaching (10.322) or teac hing (10.321) or scholarship (10.332) or service (10.342)
(I) Promotion to Full Professor two categories:	Any one category: teaching (10.321) or teaching (11.2) or scholarship (10.331) or service (10.341)	service (11.4)	Any

TABLE ONE - Continued
SUMMARY OF REVIEW CRITERIA

<u>Review Level</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u> <u>Mature Accomplishment</u>	<u>Potential</u>	<u>Effectiveness</u> <u>Strong Leadership</u>
(42a) First 2 year reappointment as Special Instructor		teaching (12.12)	
(42b) Second 2 year reappointment as Special Instructor			teaching (12.22)
(42c) 26 Third reappointment as Special Instructor	service (12.33) OR	scholarship (12.34)	AND
with awarding of job security			
(42d) Optional Promotion two categories: of Special Instructor		Any one category:	Any
		teaching	(12.422) teac
		hing (12.421)	
with job security to		scholarship	(12.432) scho
		larship (12.431)	
Associate Professor		service	(12.442)
with tenure. Equivalent to C-4			
(B-1) First 2 year reappointment of Instructor with promotion to Assistant Professor. Includes completion of terminal degree. Equivalent to C-1	service (13.14)	teaching (13.12) and scholarship (13.13)	