

# V. Reappointment and Promotion Procedures

*Updated March 2012*

Prior to a review, each faculty member to be reviewed should study carefully the articles of the Faculty Agreement on Faculty Employment and Tenure, the guidelines of the College Committee on Appointment and Promotion (CAP) and the Faculty Re-employment and Promotion Committee (FRPC), and should examine the contents of his/her files in the Department office to ensure that they are up-to-date and that his/her rights have been protected. Faculty members should also take note of the University Standards for Re-employment, Promotion and Tenure appended to the current Faculty Agreement.

## A. Types of Reviews:

1. ***Departmental reviews:*** These are conducted only at the departmental level. They are internal reviews that are conducted for new faculty members at or near the end of their first year at Oakland. A report is prepared but is not submitted outside the Department unless the candidate requests it.
2. ***Contractual reviews:*** These are full reviews that employ departmental and contractual procedures. Appropriate dates are stipulated in the Faculty Agreement.

## B. Schedule of Reviews:

The current Faculty Agreement governs the review process and takes precedence if there is a conflict with this document. In all that follows, a review mandated by the current Faculty Agreement is called a contractual review and the process dictated by the Faculty Agreement for that review is called the contractual review process.

1. ***Three-year appointments (as assistant professor):***
  - a. Second term of first year — departmental review only
  - b. Second year — contractual review
2. ***Two-year appointments (as assistant professor):***

Contractual review begins before the start of the second year in a C3 review or at the start of the first year in other cases.
3. ***Four-year appointments (as associate professor without tenure):***
  - a. First year — departmental review only
  - b. Third year — contractual review

4. ***Optional promotion and/or tenure:***

These reviews are for early promotion of an assistant professor to associate professor with tenure or an associate professor without tenure to associate professor with tenure. These reviews are initiated by the individual or the Department with the approval of the individual. The contractual review process is employed.

5. ***Associate professor promotion:***

This review may be initiated by the faculty member or the Department at any time according to the contract. The contractual review process is employed.

**C. Reviewing Bodies and Voting Committees:**

In each case the Reviewing Body shall be the Voting Committee. The Voting Committee shall consist of all departmental bargaining unit members who have tenure or who have received notification that the Board of Trustees has approved their application for tenure, except in the case of promotion to professor. In this case, the Voting Committee will consist of all tenured departmental bargaining unit members who are professors.

**D. Review Procedures:**

1. ***Departmental review procedures:***

These reviews are preliminary and informal in nature. They generally take one meeting and are conducted by the appropriate Voting Committee. Full documentation is not required. A report is prepared but is not necessarily sent to higher levels. A copy is given to the person under review and is discussed with him/her.

2. ***Contractual review procedures:***

a. Two meetings will be held for each individual case — the first for information and background discussion, the second for final consideration and voting.

b. An individual's contributions will be considered in three areas:

- i. Scholarship
- ii. Instruction
- iii. Service

c. Candidates under review have the right to see all evaluations about them that are included in the dossier, including outside evaluations, colleague evaluations, and student evaluations, subject to prior restrictions on confidentiality.

All statements by faculty members must be signed. Unsigned statements will not be included in the dossier. All statements will be typed before they are included in the dossier.

**d. *The Preparation of the Dossier***

The dossier consists of a bound main dossier with consecutively numbered pages, and supporting material in a backup file. The preparation of the dossier for the review process is a joint responsibility of the candidate and the Department. The coordination of these responsibilities shall be handled by the Department's Personnel Committee.

*i. Duties of the Personnel Committee*

The Personnel Committee shall initiate the formal gathering of the documents by meeting with the candidates who will be reviewed. This meeting will include a discussion of the various guidelines and procedures that are relevant to the reviews. It will include instructions to the candidates of the materials that are required and the deadlines for submission of these materials to the Committee.

The Committee shall arrange for all items in the dossier that are not provided by the candidate. The Committee shall allow each candidate to see those materials that it has added to the dossier.

The Committee shall forward the main dossier to the Voting Committee and provide access to the backup file to the Voting Committee.

*ii. Duties of the Candidate*

The majority of the material in the dossier shall be prepared and collected by the candidate. The candidate has the guidance of the Personnel Committee, but it is also recommended that the candidate select at least one person in the Department to provide consultation on matters that may arise in the course of preparing the items needed for the review. Any other information that the candidate feels is appropriate may be supplied by the candidate.

e. The individual under review will be permitted to speak to the Voting Committee on his/her behalf at the time of review. S/he may also prepare a written statement for inclusion in the review.

f. All documentation obtained for the review will be made available to each member of the Voting Committee.

g. Any person not eligible to vote in a particular case may provide input in the form of an individual presentation to the Voting Committee prior to the final consideration of the case. On such occasions the person under review must be invited to be present.

h. All votes shall be by secret ballot. Vote counts are to be included in reports to higher levels. The Department's yes/no recommendation is determined by a simple majority of the total yes/no votes. In the event of a tie, the Chairperson shall break the tie.

i. All decisions shall be based solely on professional grounds and on merit. No decisions shall be based on age, color, handicap, height, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or weight. Principles of equal rights shall prevail.

j. The Department shall prepare a report to be included in the dossier as it is forwarded to the Dean or CAP. The report shall be written by the Chairperson when the Chairperson concurs with the Department vote. The Voting Committee shall assign a report author should the Chairperson not concur with the Department vote. This report shall be shared with and approved by the Voting Committee prior to being forwarded to the Dean or CAP. This report shall constitute the Department's recommendation on the candidate. In the event that the Chairperson disagrees with the recommendation of the Department, he or she may include a dissenting letter; however, such a letter is independent from the recommendation of the Department.

k. Individuals under review will be informed of the nature of the recommendation and the reasons for it as well as any existent dissenting letter from the Chairperson before ~~they are~~ the dossier is forwarded to the Dean or CAP. Individuals under review may, within three working days of receipt of this information, provide the Department Chairperson for inclusion in the dossier any response deemed necessary by the individual and/or, in case of a negative Department recommendation, initiate the appeal process described in section H.

#### **E. Criteria and Priorities:**

The strength and quality of the Department depend on a composite of individuals with a variety of talents and interests, who are recruited for the contributions they can make to the Department, and who are encouraged to use their special skills to a maximum. It is not expected that each person will excel in all areas. The areas of scholarship, instruction, and service are not necessarily independent, and the order in which they are listed does not imply an order of relative importance for all staff. Due account may be taken of the individual's particular responsibilities to the University which may relate more strongly to one area than another.

The question of whether to reappoint or promote an individual is extremely complex. The issue is ultimately decided by the candidate's performance in the areas of instruction, scholarship, and service. Although we use these classifications for purposes of analysis, it is the entire professional individual, not simply a sum of professional parts, who is being reviewed and assessed and on whom such decisions will have their effects. By virtue of their professional training, experience, and contact with the candidates, the Departmental Voting Committee and the Chairperson are in the best position to assess the professional qualifications, accomplishments, and potential of the candidates under review and to combine these appraisals into a comprehensive assessment of the candidate's entire professional *persona*. It is this overall rating that answers the question of the qualifications of a candidate. It is thus the responsibility of this committee to make a thorough and fair evaluation of the professional qualifications of the individual candidate and to decide if s/he is professionally qualified for reappointment or promotion.

The guidelines listed below in the areas of instruction, scholarship, and service are necessarily to be considered flexible, and performance in excess of the guidelines in one area will tend to compensate for weaker performance in another.

The probationary period for each faculty member is a time for the Department to clarify its expectations for that particular person, and to provide feedback to him/her as to how well

those expectations are being met. In particular, the Department's letter in the C1, C2, and C3 reviews and conversations between the Chairperson and the faculty member should provide ongoing interpretations of the expectations for that person, and those documents and conversations are sources of information as important to the candidate as the guidelines listed below. Similar statements apply to I reviews until promotion to professor occurs.

At all levels, and in particular prior to tenure, the highest priority is placed on effective teaching and growth as a professional mathematical scientist. In addition, a successful candidate for review at higher levels should show willingness and capacity to assist in the service functions of the Department, College, University, or profession.

Scholarship. The primary scholarly activity of candidates at all levels should be the production of original research in mathematics and statistics. All pure and applied areas of mathematics and statistics are valid subjects for original research. In judging scholarly efforts, the Department will look first to the publications in refereed books or journals of the candidate's field. The dossier will thus include copies of all the candidate's reprints and preprints (including publication status). Evidence of other scholarly activities such as attending and participating in conference and seminar activity, refereeing and reviewing scholarly articles and books, presenting colloquia, applying for grants and fellowships, and authoring high-level expository works shall also be included. For those in applied areas, strong consulting efforts are valued as well. Publications should result from some of these efforts, and the total package should be roughly equivalent to that expected of someone in a pure area. Publications that result from consulting may be in books or journals of the mathematical sciences, or they may be in books or periodicals devoted to the subject matter of the consultee. These latter publications are regarded as scholarly work but, alone, would not be judged as satisfactory evidence of scholarship. Publication in refereed books or journals of the candidate's field is necessary as well. The above list of scholarly activities is not intended to be all-inclusive. All scholarly endeavors that contribute to the intellectual growth of the individual as a professional, to the intellectual development of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, and to the advancement of the disciplines within the area of mathematical sciences will constitute evidence of scholarship. At each level, the Department has the following expectations:

- (C1) At least part of the dissertation should be submitted for publication. The candidate should have additional research projects in progress.
- (C2,C3) The candidate should show evidence of ability to perform as an independent scholar through published work or articles submitted for publication. There should also be a research program that exhibits a clear sense of direction and promises continued contributions in the future. The candidate should also be contributing to the scholarly life of the Department through collaboration, consultation, or seminar activity, as appropriate.
- (C4,D) The record should show fulfillment of the candidate's research potential through high quality work and evidence of continued productivity as a research scholar through published work, as well as a solid position in the intellectual life of the Department.

- (I) The record should firmly establish the candidate as a scholar in the chosen area of research, as evidenced by the quality of publications, the recognition that has been achieved, and the leadership role that the candidate plays in the scholarly life of the Department.

To assist the Department in assessing the candidate's scholarly activities, the Personnel Committee will solicit letters from outside scholars in the candidate's field who will be made familiar with the research record. The candidate will provide the Personnel Committee with the names of and brief biographical data for at least one outside evaluator for the (C1) and (C2) review and at least two names for all other reviews. In consultation with the candidate, the Personnel Committee will supplement the list of outside evaluators that are to be contacted so that at least two outside letters are solicited for the (C1) and (C2) review and at least four letters are solicited for all other reviews. Those persons inside the Department who are knowledgeable about the candidate's scholarly activities will also be invited to write letters to include in the dossier. Letters from some co-authors and consultees may also be solicited.

Although support for mathematical research by external agencies is difficult to obtain, the Department nevertheless strongly encourages the submission of proposals by its faculty. The submitting of grant proposals and especially the obtaining of outside funding will be recognized in the review process.

Instruction. Since the instructional role of the Department is a broad one, candidates at all levels may demonstrate effective teaching ability in many ways. Beginning faculty members are typically assigned courses within their area of expertise or within the confines of the standard undergraduate mathematics and statistics curriculum. As time passes, they may be called upon to teach a wider variety of courses in areas outside their immediate expertise and should exhibit a willingness to do so. At the same time, candidates are not to be penalized if the instructional needs of the Department require that they teach a limited range of courses. Effective teaching ability is mainly demonstrated in classroom instruction; it can also be evidenced in such areas as seminar and colloquium activity, individual student projects, student advising, curriculum and course development, textbook authorship, and the coordination of multi-section courses. This list is not intended to be all-inclusive and individual faculty members will undoubtedly be involved more heavily in some of these areas than others, depending on their individual tastes and abilities and the needs of the Department.

To assess the effectiveness of a candidate in the classroom, the Department will rely on colleague as well as student evaluations. Peer evaluations provide evidence of a candidate's teaching effectiveness. Especially important in this regard are colleague evaluations that are obtained as the end result of a systematic process that involves several faculty who have directly observed the candidate's classroom performance on a number of occasions and examined course materials provided by the candidate. The students' perception of the candidate's performance in the classroom will be gathered from end-of-term questionnaires as well as mail questionnaires (for reviews other than C1).

Finally, there are many ways that faculty contribute to the overall teaching mission of the Department outside of the classroom. The dossier will include a statement summarizing the candidate's contributions to the overall teaching mission of the Department.

The Appendix describes the processes by which the above information is obtained and presented.

Service. Service consists of professional activities, both within and outside the University, that contribute to the support, maintenance and growth of the academic environment in which teaching and scholarship can prosper. Examples of such activities include departmental administrative service, organization and coordination of curricular programs, committee service at all levels, participation in governing bodies and programs outside the Department that may contribute to the development and governance of the University, support of other departmental members in the process of carrying out their responsibilities and willingness to share ideas and competencies, administrative service for professional organizations, extra-University activities in which professional skills and competencies as either a mathematical scientist and/or university professor are used to enhance the public's knowledge and awareness of the mathematical sciences and/or the profession.

While instructional and scholarly activities are present at all stages in a faculty member's career, there is considerable variation in the extent of the service role, both within an individual's career and across individuals.

The service responsibilities of a beginning faculty member are not typically expected to require a major commitment of the person's time. A beginning faculty member is expected to grow as a teacher and scholar. In addition, s/he has generally had little prior training for the service role, may not know where his/her interests lie or what his/her expertise might be, and is unfamiliar with Oakland University. As a result, beginning faculty members are expected to play only a small service role, probably confined to departmental activities. It is expected that the person demonstrate an active and concerned interest in departmental programs and operations and that the person perform his/her Department duties competently and conscientiously. The Department has an extensive service responsibility within the University and values the contributions made by all its members in these areas.

As time goes on, within the Department, a faculty member is expected to play an increasingly broad service role, to play a leadership role in areas to which s/he is assigned, and to take initiatives in helping the Department to do its work.

The development of a faculty member's service role outside the Department is a function of his/her interest, competence, ability to be elected or appointed to committees and representative bodies, and other factors. It is not an easy role to evaluate. Nevertheless, it is expected that, particularly after one achieves tenure, s/he will become a citizen of the University and the larger community in a more active sense and will perform any assigned tasks competently, conscientiously, and willingly.

To evaluate a faculty member's service work, the Department looks first to the chairpersons of the committees on which the person has served; this holds for both departmental and other committees. The Department is interested in the role played by the person on the committee, his/her attendance record, attitude, and contributions. The Department also receives information from other members of these committees, especially in the case of departmental committees.

Early tenure decisions: Early promotion to associate professor with tenure or early reappointment with tenure for a non-tenured associate professor will be recommended for any candidate exceeding the C4 criteria before the mandated (C4 or D) review.

Promotion to professor: There are no time requirements for promotion to professor; any

associate professor with tenure is eligible for promotion to professor as soon as the criteria under (I) above are satisfied.

## **F. Criteria and Procedures for Employment and Re-employment of Visiting and Part-Time Faculty:**

### **1. *Criteria for Employment:***

#### *a. Visiting Faculty:*

The criteria used for hiring visiting faculty are the same as those for faculty who are hired on a regular basis. The rank assigned conforms to the usual qualifications for it; e.g., Visiting Instructor — at least the M.A. but not the Ph.D. — some teaching experience desirable; Visiting Assistant Professor — Ph.D. plus research interest and capability — some teaching experience desirable.

Comment: Visiting faculty are given teaching loads in accordance with their defined duties. They may participate in departmental activities, but do not have voting rights and are not generally assigned a service role.

#### *b. Part-Time Faculty:*

Part time faculty are employed on the basis of need and availability of funds. They are employed on a semester by semester basis and are paid on a per credit basis in accordance with the Faculty Agreement.

They are expected to have at least a Master's degree in Mathematics or Statistics. Their educational backgrounds and teaching experience are taken into account. References and recommendations are required and are checked.

### **2. *Procedures and Criteria for Re-employment:***

#### *a. Visiting Faculty:*

Teaching is evaluated by the usual Department procedures. Scholarship is evaluated by competent internal faculty or, if necessary, by appropriate outside evaluators. Compatibility with departmental interests is necessary, as is a positive attitude toward departmental goals and objectives.

#### *b. Part-Time Faculty:*

Part-time faculty play only a teaching role in the Department. Their teaching is evaluated based on available feedback such as end-of-term evaluations, faculty visitation reports, and any other relevant means established by the Personnel Committee.

## **G. Criteria and Procedures for Employment and Re-employment of Full-Time Adjunct Faculty:**

The purpose of appointing Adjunct Professors is to enable the Department to benefit from researchers, scholars, and professionals not affiliated with the University. Adjunct Professors must have a Ph.D. or equivalent, or experience and demonstrated success in research, scholarship, and/or teaching. The goals and expectations of such appointments should reflect the needs of the Department as laid out in its overall mission. The Department has no plan to make appointments at the Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, or Adjunct Instructor levels.

***1. Method of Appointment:***

The Department initiates the appointment process by sending a position request to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The letter of request shall include the goals and expectations of the appointment, a recommendation on the term of the appointment, the specific duties to be performed by the appointee, and the procedures for evaluation and reappointment. The Department will provide the appointee with an initial written set of goals and expectations as well as the specific duties to be performed by the appointee.

***2. Terms of Appointment:***

The appointment may be renewed at the expiration of the term by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The appointment may be terminated within the term by mutual consent. Tenure and job security as defined in the Oakland University Faculty Agreement do not apply to this position.

***3. Rights and Responsibilities:***

- a. The Adjunct Professor may supervise/co-supervise graduate students enrolled in the Department.
- b. The Adjunct Professor may be appointed to departmental committees.
- c. The Adjunct Professor is responsible for maintaining a high level of scholarly activity during his/her appointment.

***4. Evaluation/Review:***

It is the responsibility of the Chairperson in consultation with the Personnel Committee to supervise and monitor the work of an Adjunct Professor. A contractual review (see paragraph D, 2 above) will be held in the fall semester of the final year of the appointment. Evaluation of an appointee shall be based on the current written set of goals and expectations established between the individual and the Department. At the conclusion of the review, the Department will provide the candidate with an updated set of goals and expectations, which will be valid for the next appointment period.

## **H. Appeal Procedures:**

In the case of a negative departmental recommendation, all appeal procedures will be made known to the individual by the Chairperson. The faculty member involved will be given:

1. reasons for the recommendation in writing. This shall precede notification to the Dean or CAP.
2. an opportunity to request and to obtain a reconsideration of the recommendation at the Department level. This includes a hearing before the Voting Committee of the Department. Only after this hearing has been held should the Chairperson forward the recommendation to the Dean or CAP. In that recommendation assurance must be given that the hearing has been held, if so requested by the individual, and its results must be stated.

All other appeal routes are stipulated in pertinent sections of the Faculty Agreement.

## **I. Department Procedures for the Evaluation of Instruction**

Instruction is evaluated on the basis of reports obtained as follows:

- a. Student input in the form of the Department's end-of-term questionnaire.
- b. Student input through responses to the Department's mail questionnaire (for reviews past the C1).
- c. A written statement resulting from classroom visitations obtained through the process of 2.a. below.
- d. Course materials and reports provided by the candidate.
- e. Letters from faculty who have had close contact with the candidate in seminars and common teaching assignments.

These items will be included in the dossier, either in the main dossier or in the support file.

### **1. *Student input:***

- a. A mail questionnaire is to be administered to a representative sample of students from elementary courses as well as advanced courses. The format of this instrument will require a response related to teaching effectiveness. The sample is to be selected at random, but must include students from the top half as well as the bottom half of the classes that are included. The students should be selected from the class lists of the most recent two years. The Personnel Committee will prepare a summary of the comments obtained in this manner. The candidate may supply an additional list of students to receive the mail questionnaire.
- b. The Personnel Committee will prepare a summary of student responses of all end-of-term departmental questionnaires since the last review.

### **2. *Faculty input:***

- a. The Department conducts a class visitation program so that each faculty member below the rank of professor is observed in the classroom on a regular basis. At the beginning of each academic year, the Chairperson appoints a committee to carry out the class visitation program.

Faculty below the rank of professor are observed at least once each semester for their first four years in a tenure-track position within the Department, and at least once each year thereafter. After each visitation, the observer writes a report on his/her observations. This report is based on classroom visits and examination of course materials. The report is discussed with the faculty member being observed, and then submitted to the Chairperson for inclusion in the faculty member's teaching file. [The check list in the next section (for reviewing part-timers) may help the visitors in their observations.]

The Personnel Committee writes a statement that summarizes the class visitation reports for each faculty member under review.

- b. Department faculty will be requested to evaluate each colleague who is being reviewed. Those faculty who have had the opportunity to observe the candidate's teaching or have first-hand knowledge of his/her teaching effectiveness through joint teaching assignments are expected to respond.
- c. The Personnel Committee prepares a statement that summarizes the candidate's contributions to the overall teaching mission of the Department in such areas as individual student projects, student advising, curriculum and course development, textbook authorship, coordination of multi-section courses, and seminars and colloquia.

**3. Student Mail Questionnaire for Reviews:**

Date Sent \_\_\_\_\_

Code No. \_\_\_\_\_

Date Returned \_\_\_\_\_

STUDENT MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE

Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ is being reviewed for  
(name)

to \_\_\_\_\_. You were a student in his/her class  
(reappointment/promotion)

in \_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_.  
(course) (term)

Please write a statement of your perceptions of his/her performance. You might wish to comment on his/her strengths and weaknesses as you perceive them in any one or more of the following dimensions: knowledge of the material, ability to motivate, clarity of lectures, attitude toward students, and overall teaching ability. You may, of course, comment on other areas of the instruction, as you wish. Of particular interest are your long-range reflections on his/her instructional capabilities in that course. Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please try to return this questionnaire by \_\_\_\_\_.

**4. Faculty Colleague Evaluation Form:**

FACULTY EVALUATION

Our colleague \_\_\_\_\_ will have a \_\_\_\_\_ review this year. Your input concerning this colleague's performance would be very useful. Please comment on the following areas with which you are familiar: a) teaching (perceptions of the teaching from joint teaching efforts, seminar talks, colloquium talks, advising students, etc.); b) scholarship (particularly if you work in areas of common interest, participate in seminars together, do joint consulting, etc.); c) service (committee work, joint teaching, leadership role, etc.).