

**PERSONNEL DOCUMENT**

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HEALTH PROFESSIONS  
University of Arkansas**

Approved by the Faculty: April 23, 2020  
Revised on September 27, 2022 to align with APS 1405.12

Personnel Document  
on Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for  
Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments,  
Annual and Post-tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure  
University of Arkansas  
College of Education and Health Professions

This document governs the College of Education and Health Professions in the selection, retention, promotion, granting of tenure to, and evaluation of faculty and in the selection and evaluation of non-classified staff, effective as of the date of the president's approval. It has been approved by the faculty of the College of Education and Health Professions, the Dean, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President of the University of Arkansas, as indicated by the signatures below.

These policies are required to be consistent with the policies of the university as set forth in Board of Trustees Policy 405.1 and in two campus policy statements: (1) Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual and Post-Tenure Review, Promotion, and Tenure, and (2) University and Distinguished Professor Appointments. In case of conflict, the board policy, the campus policy, the school, college, or library policy, and the department policy shall have authority in that order. Copies of these documents are available online, as referenced in the *Faculty Handbook*, at the University of Arkansas web site <https://provost.uark.edu/faculty-handbook>.

It is the policy of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville to provide equal employment opportunity to all qualified persons; to prohibit discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, sexual orientation, marital or parental status, veteran's status, or disability, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program of affirmative action.

**APPROVALS**



09-27-2022

Dean

Date

Provost

Date

Chancellor

Date

President

Date

## **I. Committees: Responsibilities and Service**

### **A. College Tenure and Promotion Committee**

The College Tenure and Promotion Committee makes recommendations on all applications for promotion and/or tenure in the College. Each department shall elect one tenured faculty member to serve on the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. This individual can be either a tenured associate or full professor. Up to two non-tenure-track faculty members at the associate or full professor ranks will also be elected to serve on the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. The non-tenure-track committee members will be elected by departments that have at least two or more non-tenure-track faculty members eligible to serve. If there are more than two departments with two or more eligible faculty members, representation of non-tenure-track faculty members will be staggered by department. A non-tenure-track member of the Committee will only have voting privileges on non-tenure-track faculty applications for promotion. Faculty who hold full-time administrative appointments are not eligible to serve on the Committee.

Members of the Committee shall not vote on any candidate for promotion to a rank higher than their own rank, except tenured full professors shall vote on applications for promotion to Distinguished and University Professor ranks. A minimum of three members of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee must vote on each application for tenure or promotion. If there are not enough eligible members on the committee to vote on any application, additional eligible members shall be elected by the respective departmental faculty to serve as ad hoc members of the Committee. Positive recommendation from the Committee requires a majority "Yes" vote. In case of a tie vote, the committee's recommendation will be "do not recommend". All voting shall occur by secret ballot.

Members of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee serve for three-year terms. Elections to fill these committee assignments will take place in the beginning of the academic year by department. Elections can be held at the first Fall semester departmental meeting or electronically following the meeting and must be completed by the end of August. All full-time faculty members at the rank of assistant professor or higher (excluding visiting faculty and faculty who have received notice of non-reappointment) are eligible to elect the members of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. To the extent possible, consideration should be given to having diverse representation on the Committee.

The chair is responsible for ensuring that committee members are informed of the University, College, and department specific criteria for promotion and/or tenure, only relevant matters are discussed during meetings, and proper procedures and deadlines are followed. A chair-elect of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee is selected each academic year by the committee members at their first meeting of the year. The individual selected as chair-elect must have at least one more year of service left on the Committee and will serve as chair the following year.

#### B. Departmental Personnel Committee

The Departmental Personnel Committee makes recommendations on all applications for promotion and/or tenure in the department. The Committee is also responsible for reviewing progress toward tenure for all third-year review candidates in the department. The Committee also reviews all multi-year initial appointments and subsequent reappointments of non-tenure-track faculty in the department.

Each department shall elect a minimum of five tenured faculty members holding the rank of associate or full professor to serve three-year staggered terms on the Departmental Personnel Committee. If the department does not have enough eligible faculty members or if eligible faculty members are not willing to serve or are not elected, the department will elect faculty from related disciplines or departments to serve on their Departmental Personnel Committee. Faculty who hold full-time administrative appointments are not eligible to serve on the Committee.

The Department will also elect at least one non-tenure-track faculty member at the rank of associate or full professor to serve a three-year term on the Departmental Personnel Committee (if the department has two or more non-tenure track faculty members eligible to serve). A non-tenure-track member of the Committee will only have voting privileges on non-tenure-track faculty applications for promotion.

Members of the Committee shall not vote on any candidate for promotion to a rank higher than their own rank, except tenured full professors shall vote on applications for promotion to Distinguished and University Professor ranks. A minimum of three members of the Departmental Personnel Committee must vote on each application for tenure and promotion. If there are not enough eligible members on the committee to vote on any application, additional eligible members shall be elected by the departmental faculty to serve as ad hoc members of the Committee. Positive recommendation from the committee requires a majority "Yes" vote. In case of a tie vote, committee's

recommendation will be “do not recommend”. All voting shall occur by secret ballot.

Members of the Departmental Personnel Committee serve for three-year terms. Elections to fill these committee assignments will take place in the beginning of the academic year. Elections can be held at the first Fall semester departmental meeting or electronically following the meeting and must be completed by the end of August. All full-time faculty members at the rank of assistant professor or higher (excluding visiting faculty and faculty who have received notice of non-reappointment) are eligible to elect the members of the Departmental Personnel Committee. To the extent possible, consideration should be given to having a diverse representation on the committee.

The chair is responsible for ensuring that committee members are informed of the University and departmental criteria for promotion and/or tenure, only relevant matters are discussed during meetings, and proper procedures and deadlines are followed. A chair-elect of the Departmental Personnel Committee is selected each academic year by the committee members at their first meeting of the year. The individual selected as chair-elect must have at least one more year of service left on the Committee and will serve as chair the following year.

#### C. Departmental Tenured Faculty Committee

The Departmental Tenured Faculty Committee consists of all full-time tenured faculty members in the department who are not serving in appointed administrative positions (e.g., department head/chair, associate/assistant dean, dean, provost/vice provost, chancellor/vice chancellor). The Tenured Faculty Committee votes to make recommendations on all applications for tenure and promotion in the department after the Departmental Personnel Committee makes its recommendations. Members of the Departmental Tenured Faculty Committee shall not vote on any candidate for promotion to a rank higher than their own rank, except tenured full professors shall vote on applications for Distinguished and University Professor promotions. Positive recommendation from the committee requires a majority “Yes” vote. In case of a tie vote, committee’s recommendation will be “do not recommend”. All voting shall occur by secret ballot.

#### D. Departmental Promoted Faculty Committee

The Departmental Promoted Faculty Committee consists of all full-time faculty members at the associate and full professor ranks, including both tenure- and non-tenure-track faculty, and who are not serving in appointed administrative positions (e.g., department head/chair, associate/assistant dean, dean, provost/vice provost, chancellor/vice chancellor). The Promoted Faculty

Committee votes to make recommendations on applications for non-tenure-track faculty promotion in the department after the Departmental Personnel Committees makes its recommendations. Members of the Departmental Promoted Faculty Committee shall not vote on any candidate for promotion to a rank higher than their own rank. Positive recommendation from the committee requires a majority “Yes” vote. In case of a tie vote, committee’s recommendation will be “do not recommend”. All voting shall occur by secret ballot.

#### E. Departmental Peer Review Committee

The Department may choose to elect a separate Peer Review Committee to conduct annual peer reviews for all faculty in the department or designate the Departmental Personnel Committee to serve as their Peer Review Committee.

If the Department chooses to elect a separate Departmental Peer Review Committee, both tenure-track and non-tenure-track full-time associate and full professors as well as assistant professors who have completed three years of service in the department are eligible to serve on that committee. Members of the Peer Review Committee serve for three-year terms. The chair of the committee is selected each academic year by the committee members at their first meeting of the year. Elections to fill the committee assignments will take place in the beginning of the academic year. Elections can be held at the first Fall semester departmental meeting or electronically following the meeting and must be completed by the end of August. All full-time faculty members at the rank of assistant professor or higher (excluding visiting faculty and faculty who have received notice of non-reappointment) are eligible to elect the members of the Departmental Peer Review Committee.

In large departments with multiple academic programs and disciplines, the Departmental Personnel Committee, or the Departmental Peer Review Committee if a separate committee has been established, may solicit peer review feedback from Advisory Faculty Groups (comprised of at least three faculty members in the department). Each Advisory Faculty Group will provide narrative feedback on faculty member’s performance in each area of their workload assignment (teaching/advising, research, and service) and highlight the areas for improvement. They will not assign ratings/scores. The Departmental Personnel Committee, or the Departmental Peer Review Committee if one has been established, will collect feedback from the Advisory Faculty Groups, ensure fairness and consistency in the application of standards and the process for each peer review, and communicate the results of the peer review with the Department Chairperson/Head and the faculty member.

#### F. Conflict of Interest

Committee members shall not participate in any promotion and/or tenure reviews or any other personnel evaluations for any colleague where there is a personal conflict of interest as defined by University of Arkansas, Fayetteville Policies and Procedures 404.0. When any committee member believes they have a conflict of interest with regard to any candidate, they shall state in advance that such a conflict exists and recuse from all discussion and voting of that candidate.

## **II. Initial Appointment**

The College adopts the criteria and procedures outlined in II. of APS 1405.11 and APS 1405.111. Additionally, each department shall develop criteria and standards for initial appointment of all faculty ranks in the department.

Ranks and titles used by the College of Education and Health Professions, including those of non-tenure-track faculty, are defined by the Board of Trustees Policy 405.1. The title of a clinical non-tenure-track faculty member is reserved for faculty whose primary responsibilities include clinical supervision and/or clinical instruction. Non-tenure-track Professor of Practice titles are reserved for individuals who have distinguished themselves as practitioners and are appointed in their positions because of the skills and expertise acquired in nonacademic careers. They are primarily engaged in teaching and advising to enrich the practical experiences of the students and help them integrate scholarship with practice, but they can also carry some scholarship or service obligations.

### **A. Criteria for Initial Appointment at or Below the Rank of Assistant Professor**

To be awarded the initial appointment, the prospective faculty member must meet the criteria for degree and other qualifications and display the record or potential for excellence in teaching, research, and service, as outlined by the department.

### **B. Criteria for Initial Appointment at or Above the Rank of Associate Professor**

All initial faculty appointments, including non-tenure-track, at or above the rank of associate professor must be reviewed by the Departmental Personnel Committee and the Departmental Tenured Faculty or Promoted Faculty Committee, and recommendations must be submitted to the Department Chairperson/Head and the Dean.

### **C. Criteria for Initial Appointment with Tenure**



In addition to the procedures outlined in II.B. above, all initial appointments with tenure must also be reviewed by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the vote with a letter of rationale must be submitted to the Dean.

#### D. Initial and Successive Appointments of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Non-tenure track faculty are generally on appointments not to exceed one academic year. In some instances, multi-year appointments may be extended to instructors or non-tenure track faculty in professor ranks. Such appointments are generally intended for faculty hired in competitive searches or who have established a notable and consistently strong record of effective performance during their period of service to the University.

Multi-year appointments, to the extent they are utilized, must have satisfied a merit-based review process employing evaluative criteria and procedures established in this personnel document as supplemented in departmental personnel documents. These appointments require the review and recommendation of the departmental personnel committee and the department chair/head, and the approval of the Dean and the Provost. The first such merit-based appointment would usually be up to three years. If successfully completed, in accordance with the evaluation procedure set out herein, an initial merit-based term appointment may be considered for renewal for an additional appointment of up to three years. After successful completion of a second three-year term (or after a total of six years of appointment), appointments may be considered for renewal for faculty in professor ranks for periods of up to five years.

Any merit-based term appointment of more than one year shall only be recommended when the candidate has consistently demonstrated (or, for initial appointment, shown clear potential for) highly effective teaching and/or, as appropriate to the appointment, a record of highly effective research or service/administration, as well as the ability and willingness to work productively with colleagues. See APS 1405.111 for detailed procedures.

Any term of appointment in excess of one year for non-tenure-track faculty, whether an initial appointment or a renewal, shall follow merit-based procedures established in departmental and college personnel documents and outlined in APS 1405.11.II.D. and APS 1405.111. Recommendations for multi-year appointments or reappointments of any non-tenure-track faculty must include an application for such an appointment from a faculty member, review and evaluation of the application materials by the Departmental Personnel Committee and the Department Chairperson/Head, and approval of the Dean and the Provost. For initial multi-year appointments of non-tenure track faculty, the Departmental Personnel Committee will review application materials such as a

CV/resume or a letter of interest. For subsequent multi-year reappointments, the Departmental Personnel Committee will use annual reviews since the last appointment to make a recommendation. Departments may also establish any additional merit-based procedures in their departmental personnel documents. Recommendations must address the criteria for appointment or reappointment reflected in the relevant personnel documents.

### **III. Successive Appointments, Annual Review, Peer review, Third-Year Review, and Post-Tenure Review**

#### **A. Successive Appointments for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty**

The College adopts III.A. of APS 1405.11.

#### **B. Annual Review for All Faculty**

Each department is responsible for developing criteria and procedures for annual review of all faculty consistent with their mission and goals and in accordance with the procedures outlined in III.B. of APS 1405.11.

Faculty members in the College are evaluated on an annual calendar basis. The purpose of the annual review is to encourage excellence by recognizing, rewarding, and reinforcing meritorious performance and to provide feedback that will help faculty improve performance. Annual reviews serve as the basis for reappointment and merit salary increases and are considered in tenure and promotion recommendations.

Each faculty member in the department shall submit their annual review materials using the COEHP Annual Review Report Form by the deadline determined by the Department Chairperson/Head between January 15 and 31. The faculty member may include any supporting evidence demonstrating the criteria outlined in the Departmental Personnel Document.

Annual review materials submitted by faculty are first reviewed by the Departmental Personnel Committee or the Departmental Peer Review Committee, if a separate committee has been established, followed by a Department Chairperson/Head evaluation. Consistent with APS 1405.11.B.8., the numerical ratings from student evaluations of teaching shall be made fully available to any persons conducting the annual review. Students' narrative comments from evaluations shall be made fully available to the faculty member's Department Chairperson/Head.

Each annual review conducted by the Department Chairperson/Head should provide both narrative evaluative feedback and the numerical rating scores. The Department Chairperson/Head's annual review of faculty eligible for promotion must also provide feedback on the faculty member's progress towards promotion and/or tenure and offer recommendations for improvement and/or next steps. The Department Chairperson/Head shall provide a draft of the evaluation and recommendations to the faculty member and meet with the faculty member to discuss the results. Tenured and promoted non-tenure-track faculty at the rank of associate professor or higher may waive this meeting, but the rest of the faculty members are required to meet with the Department Chairperson/Head.

After receiving the draft evaluation and discussing the evaluation results with the Department Chairperson/Head, the faculty member has an opportunity to submit a written response to the Department Chairperson/Head and request a reconsideration regarding the evaluation results. The Department Chairperson/Head should thoughtfully consider the written response from the faculty member and either adjust the annual evaluation results or inform the faculty member in writing that the evaluation remains unchanged.

The deadline for the Department Chairperson/Head to submit the final evaluation to the Dean and the faculty member is March 1. After completion of the annual reviews, the Department Chairperson/Head shall provide all faculty with a general overview of the overall evaluation results and inform them of the process for calculating merit.

All fulltime faculty in the department, including instructors, will go through the same annual review process. However, faculty in part-time lecturer or other adjunct faculty positions hired on a semester-by-semester basis will be evaluated by the Department Chairperson/Head as appropriate to make the decision for rehiring.

Except for non-reappointment, dismissal, tenure, or promotion decisions, for which other University policies and procedures are applicable, if a faculty member claims that an evaluation or recommendation resulting from the annual review process violates their rights under established University personnel regulations, policies, or practices, there is a recourse through a written appeal to the Dean. The College of Education and Health professions has established the following appeals process.

- Within 5 working days of receiving the Department Chairperson/Head's final evaluation results, a faculty member may submit a written appeal of their annual evaluation to the Dean, based on specific, articulated concerns.

- Within 5 working days of the appeal, if the Dean desires, an ad hoc committee of four COEHP faculty members, two appointed by the Dean and two appointed by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee chair, will be established. These faculty members should be individuals familiar with the complexity of faculty evaluations, with at least two tenured and no more than two from the appellant's department. The consideration should also be given to having a diverse representation on the committee.
- Within 10 working days, the committee should make a recommendation regarding the faculty member's annual evaluation to the Dean. The committee may be provided with relevant evaluations of other departmental faculty members.
- Within 5 working days of receiving the committee's recommendation, or within 10 working days of receiving the appeal if no ad hoc faculty committee is established, the Dean will either adjust the annual evaluation score or deny the appeal. The Dean is the final level for appeal for annual evaluations.

#### C. Peer Review for All Faculty

The College adopts III.C. of APS 1405.11. Additionally, each department will establish procedures for conducting the peer reviews. As outlined in I.E. of this document, departments may choose to have their Departmental Personnel Committee serve as the Peer Review Committee or elect a separate Departmental Peer Review Committee for annual peer reviews. In departments with multiple disciplines and academic programs, the Departmental Personnel Committee, or the Departmental Peer Review Committee if one has been established, may also solicit feedback from Advisory Faculty Groups comprised of at least three faculty members. Each department shall establish the process for selecting the Advisory Faculty Groups. These Advisory Faculty Groups will conduct peer reviews and submit their report to the Departmental Personnel Committee or the Peer Review Committee if one has been established. Each peer review will provide narrative comment about the level and quality of the faculty member's performance that will serve as feedback to faculty and as advisory input to the Department Chairperson/Head. Peer reviews will not include ratings or scores. The Departmental Personnel Committee, or the Departmental Peer Review Committee if one has been established, has the responsibility for reviewing documentation prior to submission to the Department Chairperson/Head and assuring, to the extent possible, consistency and fairness in the peer review process and application of standards.

#### D. Third Year Review for Tenure Track Faculty

Tenure-track faculty members participate in a comprehensive third-year review to evaluate their professional performance and progress toward tenure. Each third-year candidate will prepare a dossier in the same manner as promotion and tenure candidates using the Faculty Review Checklist. This review process includes an examination of progress toward tenure by the Departmental Personnel Committee, the Department Chairperson/Head, and the Dean. The review may result in reappointment, fourth-year review, or non-reappointment in accordance with the procedures specified under III.D. of APS 1405.11.

The process of the third-year review is described in detail below. The review shall be conducted in the second semester of the third year of tenure-track appointments.

- The third-year candidate submits a dossier detailing work accomplished on tenure-track by the third Friday in January.
- The Departmental Personnel Committee will review the candidate's dossier and progress toward earning tenure and promotion and make their recommendation. They submit a letter of review and recommendation to the Department Chairperson/Head by the second Friday in February. Their letter should address each major area of the candidate's work assignment and offer recommendations for improvement where appropriate. Specifically, they are to recommend continuation, need for improvement and fourth-year review, or non-reappointment of the candidate.
- The Department Chairperson/Head submits an independent written assessment of candidate's progress toward earning tenure and promotion along with the Committee's recommendation to the Dean of the College of Education and Health Professions by the third Friday in February. The Department Chairperson/Head is to recommend continuation, need for improvement and fourth-year review, or non-reappointment of the candidate.
- The Dean conducts an independent evaluation of the candidate's dossier, considers the recommendations of the Department Chairperson/Head and the Departmental Personnel Committee, and makes a recommendation for continuation of appointment, for improvement and the need for a fourth-year review, or for non-reappointment. The Dean's recommendation is due to the candidate by the second Friday in March.
- If the recommendation is for non-reappointment, the Dean shall issue a notice of non-reappointment to the candidate as provided for in Board of Trustees Policy 405.1.IV.B, and the process outlined in that policy shall be followed. Otherwise, the process concludes with a conference between the Dean (or designee), the Department Chairperson/Head, and the candidate to

formalize the reappointment and any areas for improvement. This meeting should take place prior to the end of March.

#### E. Post-Tenure Review

Post-Tenure Review will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of III.E. of APS 1405.11. Each department is responsible for developing and communicating with faculty the criteria for unsatisfactory performance. A tenured faculty member who receives an overall unsatisfactory performance rating will be placed on a remediation plan. Consistent with APS 1405.11, overall unsatisfactory performance means that the faculty member's performance as a whole is unsatisfactory, taking into consideration the faculty member's assigned workload (teaching/professional practice, scholarship, service) and overall contributions to the academic unit. Before making a determination of overall unsatisfactory performance, the Department Chairperson/Head considers evidence of relevant, documented efforts and outcomes within the context of the faculty member's assigned workload, including the faculty member's assigned annual evaluation score. At a minimum, any overall score of less than 1.0 or a 0.0 in any substantial area of faculty responsibility would constitute overall unsatisfactory performance, and makes the faculty member ineligible for a merit salary increase.

The remediation plan will be developed by the Department Chairperson/Head and the Departmental Personnel Committee in consultation with the faculty member and the Dean. The remediation plan will include recommendations to correct the deficiencies and identify specific outcomes the faculty member has to achieve to improve performance. The progress on achieving the outcomes of the remediation plan in the next calendar year will be assessed by the Departmental Personnel Committee, the Department Chairperson/Head, and the Dean. In the event that a faculty member fails either to attain an overall satisfactory performance rating or to demonstrate meaningful progress in remediating the overall performance deficiencies (as assessed in accordance with the outcomes specified in the remediation plan) in the next calendar year, the faculty member may be issued a notice of dismissal subject to procedures specified in Board Policy 405.1.IV.C.

Unsatisfactory performance for a non-tenure track faculty member is addressed in APS 1405.111.

#### F. Criteria for Assessing Faculty Performance for All Faculty

Annual faculty evaluations are based on performance in the areas of teaching and advising, research, and service and weighted by the proportions assigned to each area. One three-credit hour class is the equivalent of 10% of a faculty member's annual workload. A tenure-track faculty member typically carries a

40% teaching workload, which is equivalent to teaching four three-credit hour courses over an academic year. Additionally, the standard research assignment for tenured and tenure-track faculty is 40%. The typical teaching assignment for non-tenure track teaching faculty is eight three-credit hour courses over an academic year, equivalent to an 80% teaching workload. The Department Chairperson/Head has the authority to adjust workload assignments and percentages of workload distribution to fulfill the educational mission of the University and in the best interest of each unit. However, deviations from a typical workload assignment shall generally be based on externally funded research, major service obligations, or other extenuating circumstances. All work assignments for faculty members shall be approved by the Department Chairperson/Head on an annual basis. Faculty members who disagree with their workload assignment, as determined by the Chairperson/Head, may seek a review by the Dean. If such a review is requested, the Dean's decision shall be final.

Faculty members' performance in each assigned area will be assessed using a four-point scale: 3.0 = exceeds expectations; 2.0 = meets expectations; 1.0 = partially meets expectations, and 0.0 = does not meet expectations. The Department Chairperson/Head should use decimals to delineate faculty performance on the rating scale. 3.0 is the highest rating that could be given in any category. Overall evaluation score is a weighted sum of the component evaluations in the areas of teaching and advising, research, and service. The Department Chairperson/Head shall provide an explanatory narrative statement analyzing the faculty member's performance in each area as well as their overall contributions to the academic unit. For faculty eligible for promotion, the Department Chairperson/Head shall also provide feedback on their progress towards promotion and include any remedial steps, if any, that are recommended.

- A rating of "Exceeds Expectations" indicates that the faculty member consistently exceeded expectations of their work assignment.
- A rating of "Meets Expectations" indicates that the faculty member fully met all expectations of their work assignment.
- A rating of "Partially Meets Expectations" indicates that the faculty member did not consistently meet all expectations or failed to meet some expectations of their work assignment.
- A rating of "Does not Meet Expectations" indicates that the faculty member performed consistently below expectations, failed to provide materials for annual evaluation, or did not meet minimum requirements of their job assignment.

Each department shall develop specific evaluative criteria and measures for each rating level. These criteria should reflect the mission and goals of the department as well as disciplinary norms. These criteria and measures should be specified as clearly as possible by the departments; however, faculty should recognize that a significant amount of professional judgment will always be necessary in applying such criteria and measures to individual faculty performance.

#### **IV. Promotion for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above**

##### **A. Criteria for Promotion**

The College adopts promotion criteria outlined in IV.A. of APS 1405.11. Additionally, each department in the College is responsible for developing criteria for promotion to each rank for both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty in accordance with IV.A. of APS 1405.11. Promotion from Professor to University or Distinguished Professor rank will follow Board Policy 470.1 and APS 1405.13.

##### **B. Procedures for Promotion**

The College adopts procedures outlined in IV.B. of APS 1405.11. Additionally, the College of Education and Health Professions establishes additional provisions to ensure unbiased and objective external review of the candidate's work.

To assist in maintaining reviewer confidentiality, the candidate and the Departmental Personnel Committee will each identify a minimum of 5 external reviewers (without any overlap between the two lists). External reviewers must be from peer or aspiring institutions and must hold the rank and tenure status to which the candidate is applying for. After the candidate is given an opportunity to review the combined list, strike up to two names, and disclose any potential conflict of interest, the Department Chairperson/Head will contact the reviewers to secure a minimum of 3 but preferably 5 reviewers for each candidate who will agree to conduct the review. At least one reviewer will come from the candidate's list and at least one from the committee's list.

Each external reviewer will be provided access to the candidate's complete dossier except the annual evaluation and third-year review materials (if applicable). Appropriate criteria for promotion and/or tenure will also be sent to each external reviewer. The candidate is still responsible for including the annual review reports from the Department Chairperson/Head and third-year review materials, including recommendations from the Department Chairperson/Head,



Departmental Personnel Committee, and the Dean, in the T&P dossier. Since peer review feedback is considered advisory, the candidate does not have to include the peer review feedback in the T&P dossier; however, the candidate must furnish all annual review reports from the Department Chairperson/Head.

The College has developed two letter templates for external review requests (see below). Minor modifications and changes in the template are allowed depending on the nature of the appointment and rank, but the main elements of the letter should be maintained to ensure consistency.

*External Review Letter Templates:*

Initial request to secure external reviewers sent in May

Dear Dr. \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ is being considered for promotion to the rank of \_\_\_\_\_ and (tenure) in the Department of \_\_\_\_\_ at the University of Arkansas. As a part of the promotion process, we seek evaluations of the candidate's suitability from experts outside the University. I respectfully ask for your assistance in providing an assessment of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s professional accomplishments.

If you are willing to assist, we will provide you with Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s complete dossier and evaluative criteria via e-mail by \_\_\_\_\_, and we ask that you complete your evaluation by no later than \_\_\_\_\_ and send us your assessment along with your curriculum vita via e-mail attachment. Please let us know if you have any apparent or actual conflict of interest that may prevent you from completing an impartial, qualified review.

We sincerely hope that you will agree to review Dr. \_\_\_\_\_'s dossier. We recognize that writing evaluations of this type is time consuming and, therefore, are most grateful for your assistance. Your review will be an important component of our evaluation process.

*The University of Arkansas makes every effort to maintain the anonymity of external reviewers. Under University policy, candidates for promotion and/or tenure will consider a list of potential reviewers from which final reviewers are selected (but remain unknown to the candidate). Additionally, candidates for tenure and/or promotion may read the external letters of review, but identifying information, such as the letterhead and signature, will be redacted. In the event a candidate requests a copy of an external review letter under the Arkansas Freedom of Information Act, s/he would be entitled to receive a copy of the unredacted recommendation as a part of their personnel file.*

Please let me know via email (\_\_\_\_\_) if you are able to assist in this review process as soon as possible, but no later than \_\_\_\_\_. Thank you for your consideration and assistance in this important matter. I look forward to your reply.

Follow-up e-mail sent to the reviewers no later than August 17

Dear Dr. \_\_\_\_

Thank you for your willingness to serve as an external reviewer for Dr. \_\_\_\_, (rank

Attached to this e-mail are Dr. \_\_\_\_' curriculum vitae and the documents required as part of the University of Arkansas Faculty Review Checklist. If you would like

Likewise, if you prefer to have the materials delivered in any other format, let me know. The Departmental Criteria Document is attached to this e-mail, and the University Evaluative Criteria, Procedures, and General Standards can be found at: <https://provost.uark.edu/policies/140511.php>.

Please forward your evaluation to me, either electronically or in paper form, no later than \_\_\_\_\_. We also ask that you send the copy of your CV along with your evaluation and disclose the nature of any relationship you have had with the candidate in your letter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mail \_\_\_\_ or by phone \_\_\_\_\_.

*The University of Arkansas makes every effort to maintain the anonymity of external reviewers. Under University policy, candidates for promotion and/or tenure will consider a list of potential reviewers from which final reviewers are selected (but remain unknown to the candidate). Additionally, candidates for tenure and/or promotion may read the external letters of review, but identifying information, such as the letterhead and signature, will be redacted. In the event a candidate requests a copy of an external review letter under the Arkansas Freedom of Information Act, s/he would be entitled to receive a copy of the unredacted recommendation as a part of their personnel file.*

We recognize that writing evaluations of this type is time consuming and, component of our evaluation process.

### C. Procedures for Endowed Chair and Professorship Reviews

The College adopts APS 1405.12.

Each Endowed Chair and Professorship appointment in the College will be reviewed every five years. The College of Education and Health Professions has established the following process for Endowed Chair and Professorship reviews.

2<sup>nd</sup> Friday in September – A meeting occurs with the Dean, Department Chairperson/Head, and Endowed Chair or Professorship holder seeking renewal of the Endowed Chair or Professorship appointment. If an Endowed Chair or Professorship holder serves in the Department Chairperson/Head role, the Dean will identify a designee in consultation with the Endowed Chair or Professorship holder.

4<sup>th</sup> Friday in September – The Endowed Chair or Professorship holder works with the Department Chairperson/Head (or designee) to identify five external reviewers. After the external reviewers are identified, the Department Chairperson/Head (or designee) forwards the names to the Dean.

1<sup>st</sup> Friday in October – The College Tenure and Promotion Committee identifies five additional external reviewers and forwards the names to the Dean. To maintain the reviewer confidentiality, the names should not overlap with the candidate's list.

2<sup>nd</sup> Friday in October – The Endowed Chair or Professorship holder reviews the complete combined list of potential reviewers and can strike up to any 2 reviewers and disclose any potential conflict of interest within 5 business days.

2<sup>nd</sup> Friday in October – The Endowed Chair or Professorship holder submits review materials, consisting of up-to-date curriculum vitae, 3-4 sample academic products, a report of accomplishments related to the goals of the Endowed Chair or Professorship appointment during the past five years, and a tentative plan for the next five years if renewed.

4<sup>th</sup> Friday in October – The Dean submits review materials to a minimum of three external evaluators selected by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee from the combined accepted lists of reviewers. for review. At least one reviewer will come from the candidate's list and at least one from the committee's list.

2<sup>nd</sup> Friday in December – The external evaluations are due to the Dean.

4<sup>th</sup> Friday in January – The Department Chairperson/Head (or designee) submits a written recommendation on Endowed Chair or Professorship renewal/non-renewal to the Dean.

2<sup>nd</sup> Friday in February – Tenured members of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee provide a recommendation by way of vote on Endowed Chair or Professorship renewal/non-renewal to the Dean.

2<sup>nd</sup> Friday in March – The Dean completes the review, meets with the Endowed Chair or Professorship holder, and briefs the Provost on the review findings and conclusions.

March 31 – Following consultation with the Provost, the Dean notifies the Endowed Chair or Professorship holder in writing whether they will be reappointed to the Endowed Chair or Professorship, as well as the duration of the reappointment term and any applicable conditions.

#### **V. Tenure**

The College adopts criteria and procedures outlined under V. of APS 1405.11. Additionally, each department in the college shall articulate any additional criteria and standards for attainment of tenure in the department as consistent with the university policies and disciplinary norms. Attainment of tenure is not based merely on good or satisfactory performance but requires outstanding achievement projected to continue over the course of a career.

#### **VI. Dismissal of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**

The College adopts procedures specified under VI. of APS 1405.11.

#### **VII. Dismissal of Multi-Year Appointed Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**

The College adopts procedures specified under VII. of APS 1405.11.

#### **VIII. Review of Personnel Documents**

The College and Departmental Personnel Documents shall be reviewed at least every five years by College Tenure and Promotion or respective Departmental Personnel Committees, Department Chairperson/Head, and the Dean. The review will ensure that the provisions in the documents are consistent with the University and Board policies, advance the mission of the College and the departments, and reflect the standards and expectations of respective disciplines/fields. All amendments to the documents shall be submitted to faculty for approval and in turn approved by the Dean, Provost, Chancellor, and the President.