

PERSONNEL DOCUMENT



**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HEALTH PROFESSIONS
ELEANOR MANN SCHOOL OF NURSING**

Approved by the Faculty: 05/06/2020

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
Eleanor Mann School of Nursing (EMSON)

This document governs EMSON 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, the College of Education and Health Professions 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) Guidelines on 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.

APPROVAL

<i>Susan Patton</i>	<u>5/6/2020</u>
	Date
	<u>05/15/2020</u>
Dean	Date
<hr/>	<hr/>
Provost	Date
<hr/>	<hr/>
Chancellor	Date
<hr/>	<hr/>
President	Date

I. Committees: Responsibilities and Service

EMSON adopts the procedures outlined in I.A.-C. of APS 1405.11 and the COEHP Personnel Document.

Consistent with the COEHP Personnel Document, EMSON elects a five-member Departmental Personnel Committee to conduct tenure and/or promotion and third-year reviews. If there are not enough tenured faculty members eligible to serve on the EMSON Personnel Committee, faculty will elect tenured faculty from related disciplines to serve on the Personnel Committee. Additionally, one non-tenure track faculty member at the associate rank or higher will be elected to serve on the committee when the department has at least two eligible faculty members to serve.

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 EMSON Personnel Committee. Elections to fill these committee assignments will take place in the beginning of the academic year. The chair of the Departmental Personnel Committee is selected each academic year by the committee members at their first meeting of the year.

The EMSON Personnel Committee will also serve as the EMSON Peer Review Committee and provide oversight for the annual peer review process in the department. Considering the size of the department, the EMSON Personnel Committee will designate peer review advisory sub-committees to assist with peer reviews as described in section III.C. of this document. The EMSON Personnel Committee has the responsibility for reviewing peer review reports completed by peer review advisory sub-committees and assuring to the greatest extent possible, consistency and fairness in the application of standards.

II. Initial Appointment

A. Criteria for Initial Appointment at the Rank of Assistant Professor

In addition to II.A. of APS 1405.11, EMSON has the following criteria:

Tenure-Track Assistant Professor:

- Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
- Evidence of exemplary performance and promise of success in research/scholarship/creative activity.
- Evidence of and/or promise of effective teaching.
- Evidence of performance and/or potential to contribute to productive service to the department, institution, and profession.
- Potential to meet Associate Professor expectations.

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

In addition to II.B. of APS 1405.11 and COEHP Personnel Document, EMSON has adopted the following criteria:

Tenured Associate Professor:

- Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
- Record of sustained exemplary performance in research/scholarship/creative activity consistent with high national standards.
- Record of highly effective teaching.
- Record of productive service to the department, institution, and profession.
- Potential to meet Professor expectations.

Tenured Professor:

- Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
- International and/or national recognition for a substantial and sustained record of distinguished accomplishments in research/scholarship consistent with high national standards.
- Record of sustained highly effective teaching.
- Record of significant productive service to the department, the institution, and the profession.

C. Criteria for Initial Appointment with Tenure

EMSON adopts II.C. of APS 1405.11 and COEHP Personnel Document.

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.

In addition to criteria and processes stipulated in II.D. of APS 1405.11, APS 1405.111, and the COEHP Personnel Document, the EMSON has the following additional criteria:

Instructor:

- Master's degree from an accredited institution in the area of specialization or related field
- Evidence and/or promise of effective classroom or clinical teaching.

Teaching/Clinical Assistant Professor:

- Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
- Knowledge and skills necessary for and record of highly effective classroom and/or clinical teaching
- Knowledge and skills in course development, teaching, and evaluation
- Evidence of high-quality impact in both teaching and scholarship

Teaching/Clinical Associate Professor:

- Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
- Knowledge and skills necessary for and record of continuous highly effective classroom and/or clinical teaching
- Leadership in course and curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation
- Evidence of sustained high-quality impact in both teaching and scholarship

Teaching/Clinical Professor:

- Doctoral degree from an accredited university in the area of specialization or related field.
- Evidence of substantial knowledge and skills necessary for and record of continuous highly effective classroom and/or clinical teaching
- Evidence of high-quality impact in both teaching and scholarship
- Leadership in course and curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation
- Leadership in program planning, implementation, and evaluation
- Evidence and ability to effectively mentor faculty in areas of classroom or clinical teaching

E. Required Notification

EMSON adopts I.I.E. of APS 1405.11 and the COEHP Personnel Document.

F. Conflict of Interest

EMSON adopts the COEHP Personnel Document.

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

A. Successive Appointments for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

EMSON adopts III.A. of APS 1405.11.

B. Annual Review

Each continuing faculty member in EMSON shall be evaluated by the Director of EMSON on an annual basis in accordance with the following procedures as relevant to their assigned activities. This annual review contributes to personnel decisions such as reappointment and merit salary increases, and annual review results are also considered in making recommendations for promotion and/or tenure.

- Faculty member submits completed Annual Faculty Report by January 15.
- Peer review advisory sub-committees complete peer reviews and forward the reviews to the chair of the EMSON Personnel Committee.
- The EMSON Personnel Committee reviews the peer review reports submitted by the peer review advisory sub-committees to ensure consistency and fairness in the application of standards.
- The Chair of the EMSON Personnel Committee submits the peer review reports to the EMSON Director by February 15.
- The EMSON Director completes the faculty evaluations using a four-point scale described in Section F below, meets with each faculty member to discuss overall progress toward goals, and forwards the evaluation reports to the College of Education and Health Profession's (COEHP) Dean's office by March 1.
- Each faculty member will be rated based on a scale of 0.0 (i.e., does not meet expectations) to 3.0 (i.e., exceeds expectations).
- Annual evaluation of faculty eligible for promotion shall provide feedback on the progress towards promotion and discuss any remedial steps that are recommended.

EMSON is responsible for developing, maintaining, and distributing evaluative criteria for work assignment areas (teaching, research, and service). These criteria must be conveyed on a timely and an annual basis to all faculty members who will be evaluated. See Attachment 1.

The Director assesses whether each faculty member's performance for the year has been satisfactory. 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 Director 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 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.

Unsatisfactory performance for a non-tenure track faculty member is addressed in APS 1405.111. Post-tenure review based on overall unsatisfactory performance for tenured faculty is outlined in III.E. of APS 1405.11.

C. Peer Review

In addition to III.C. of APS 1405.11 and COEHP Personnel Document, EMSON has the following processes for peer review.

The purpose of the peer review is to provide feedback to faculty and input to the Director of EMSON.

The EMSON Personnel Committee provides the oversight for the peer review process and ensures consistency and fairness. EMSON Personnel Committee members will also assume the responsibility for conducting peer reviews of all tenure-track and tenured faculty in the department.

To assist with non-tenure track faculty and instructor peer reviews, the EMSON Personnel Committee will solicit assistance from two peer review advisory sub-committees. The peer review advisory sub-committees include Non-Tenure Track Peer Review Sub-Committee and Instructor Peer Review Sub-Committee. These peer review advisory sub-committees will conduct peer reviews and submit their findings to the EMSON Personnel Committee.

The Non-Tenure Track Peer Review Sub-Committee will consist of five elected non-tenure-track faculty members at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher and will be responsible for peer evaluation of all non-tenure track faculty members at the rank of Assistant Professor and higher in the department. Members of this committee will be elected by non-tenure track faculty members in Nursing.

The Instructor Peer Review Sub-Committee will consist of five elected instructors with at least two years of experience as an EMSON nursing instructor and will be responsible for instructor peer evaluations. Members of this committee will be elected by all instructors in Nursing.

Each peer review advisory sub-committee will elect a Chair. The Chair is responsible for scheduling a timeline to complete peer reviews in a timely manner and submit the peer review reports to the Chair of the EMSON Personnel Committee.

D. Third Year Review

EMSON adopts III.D. of APS 1405.11 and COEHP Personnel Document.

E. Post-Tenure Review

EMSON adopts III.E. of APS 1405.11 and COEHP Personnel Document.

F. Criteria for Assessing Faculty Performance

EMSON adopts III.F. of APS 1405.11 and COEHP Personnel Document. In addition, EMSON has the following processes.

All EMSON faculty members are evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas of (a) teaching (b) research and scholarly activities, and (c) service. Faculty performance in each assigned area is evaluated 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) and weighted by the workload proportions assigned to each area.

The standard assignment for tenured and tenure-track faculty in EMSON is 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% service. The standard assignment for non-tenure-track faculty is 90% teaching with the remaining 10% allocated to service. The EMSON Director works with the faculty member to determine these percentages of workload distribution. To fulfill the educational mission of the University and in the best interest of EMSON, the Director may later modify a faculty member's workload assignment and evaluation criteria, if necessary.

Criteria for each rating are provided below. The table in the Attachment 1 provides further details and examples for expectations of faculty for each assigned area, including teaching, research, and service.

1. Evidence of Achievement in Teaching or Professional Performance

Exceeds Expectations (3.0)

Indicates excellence in teaching

Meets Expectations (2.0)

Indicates competence in teaching

Partially Meets Expectations (1.0)

Indicates progress towards competence in teaching

Does Not Meet Expectations (0.0)

Indicates marginal teaching performance and failure to meet most personal teaching goals or make improvements in teaching for the calendar year.

2. Evidence of Achievement in Research and Scholarship

Exceeds Expectations (3.0)

Indicates excellence in research/scholarship for the calendar year.

Meets Expectations (2.0)

Indicates satisfactory performance in research/scholarship for the calendar year.

Partially Meets Expectations (1.0)

Indicates progress towards satisfactory performance in research/scholarship for the calendar year.

Does Not Meet Expectations (0.0)

Indicates marginal research/scholarship performance for the calendar year.

3. Evidence of Academically-Related Service.

Exceeds Expectations (3.0)

Indicates excellence in service for the calendar year.

Meets Expectations (2.0)

Indicates satisfactory performance in service for the calendar year.

Partially Meets Expectations (1.0)

Indicates progress towards satisfactory performance in service for the calendar year.

Does Not Expectations (0.0)

Indicates marginal service performance for the calendar year.

IV. Promotion

A. Criteria for Promotion

In addition to IV.A. of APS 1405.11, EMSON has adopted the following criteria for promotion:

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

- Record of sustained exemplary performance in research/scholarship/creative activity consistent with high national standards.
- Record of highly effective teaching.
- Record of productive service to the department, institution, and profession.

- Potential to meet Professor expectations.

Criteria for Promotion to Professor

- International and/or national recognition for a substantial and sustained record of distinguished accomplishments in research/scholarship consistent with high national standards.
- Record of sustained highly effective teaching.
- Record of significant productive service to the department, the institution, and the profession.

Criteria for Promotion to Teaching/Clinical Associate Professor

- Evidence of knowledge and skills necessary for and record of continuous highly effective classroom and/or clinical teaching
- Leadership in course and curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation
- Evidence of sustained high-quality impact in both teaching and scholarship

Criteria for Promotion to Teaching/Clinical Professor

- Evidence of substantial knowledge and skills necessary for and record of continuous highly effective classroom and/or clinical teaching
- Leadership in course and curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation
- Leadership in program planning, implementation, and evaluation
- Evidence of sustained high-quality impact in both teaching and scholarship
- Evidence and ability to effectively mentor faculty in the areas of classroom and/or clinical teaching

B. Procedures for Promotion of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

EMSON adopts IV.B. of APS 1405.11 and the COEHP Personnel Document.

V. Tenure

A. Criteria for Awarding Tenure

EMSON adopts V.A. of APS 1405.11 and COEHP Personnel Document. In EMSON, criteria for tenure include excellence in teaching and outstanding performance in research with high-quality impact in the field and/or clinical practice.

B. Procedures for Awarding Tenure

EMSON adopts V.B. of APS 1405.11.

C. Procedures for Suspending Probationary Period

The department adopts V.C. of APS 1405.11.

D. Mandatory Sixth Year Review - Terminal Appointment

The department adopts procedures specified under V.D. of APS 1405.11.

VI. Dismissal of Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

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

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

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

Attachment 1. EMSON Evaluative Criteria for Annual Review

For Calendar Year _____

<p>Teaching: Percentage from workload form _____. Evidence of achievement in teaching should take into account the level and type of courses taught, the course delivery method, and the percentage of faculty time devoted to teaching and/or advising. Faculty must provide numerical ratings from student evaluations of teaching and any other evaluations completed from sources of evidence listed in Academic Policy Series 1405.11 section III.F.1. Once the base score is determined, additional evidence will be considered to add decimals to the base score, not to exceed 0.6.</p>				
Base Score	Minimum Evidence for Achievement	Evidence of Effective Teaching and/or Development Activities to reach base score.	Additional Evidence to improve base score. See III.F.1. of APS 1405.11.	Earned Score
0	No evidence of teaching performance. Derelict performance such as not holding class, refusing a reasonable teaching assignment. Student evaluation scores ≤ 2.5 average on University, College, and Department core.			
1	Student evaluation scores average 2.6 – 3.2 on University, College, and Department core.	In addition, evidence of achievement from the list under section III.F.1. (a) of APS 1405.11.		
2	Student evaluation scores average 3.3 – 4.0 on University, College, and Department core.	In addition, evidence of achievement from the lists under sections III.F.1. (a) and (b) of APS 1405.11.		
3	Student evaluation scores average ≥ 4.1 on University, College, and Department core.	In addition, evidence of achievement from all three sections – III.F.1. (a), (b), and (c) of APS 1405.11.		

Research/Scholarship: Percentage from workload form _____. Achievement in research/scholarship is essential, and quality and impact are of the essence. In every case, it is the responsibility of the reviewers to arrive at a judgment of the importance, originality, influence, sustained, and future promise of the candidate’s body of work. Assessments of scholarly contributions should consider the varying levels of depth, complexity, competitive rigor, and impact of achievement. Once the base score is determined, additional evidence can be considered to add decimals to the base score not to exceed 0.6. The criteria are based on 40% research workload assignment for tenured or tenure-track faculty. Appropriate adjustments should be made for varying research workload.

Base Score	Minimum Evidence for Achievement	Evidence of Scholarly Activities to improve base score. Refer to III.F.2. of APS 1405.11.	Additional Evidence to improve base score	Earned Score
0	Zero will be given when no evidence for achievement in research and scholarship is presented for review.			
1	1 peer reviewed nursing publication as first author or 2 peer reviewed published works as 2nd or 3rd author*			
2	1 peer reviewed, nursing publication or multiple non-peer reviewed published works or book chapters*			
3	1 peer reviewed nursing publication as sole author or 3 peer reviewed published works as 2nd or 3rd author (works must align with research trajectory), AND presentation at national or international conference attended by professionally licensed peers*			

*Indicators of quality and impact will be factored in the rating by adding additional decimal points to the base score. Section III.F.2. of APS 1405.11. provides examples of evidence that can be used to demonstrate the quality of scholarship:

- a. Publication by respected academic journals and publishing houses that accept work only after review and approval by experts.
- b. Published reviews by experts.
- c. Citations in research publications and other evidence of significance.
- d. Awards for excellence, especially from national or international academic organizations.
- e. Significance of completed performances, presentations, exhibitions, workshops, recitals, or lectures.
- f. Awards of grants and contracts that indicate recognition of creative work and research achievement or capability.
- g. Economically significant commercialized patents, ideas, or discoveries.
- h. Impact on public policy or practice.

Academically Related Service: Percentage from workload form _____. A faculty member's academic service to the community or to the profession beyond the campus may confirm stature in scholarship and teaching, enliven the intellectual climate on campus, and improve opportunities for students and faculty colleagues Once the base score is determined, additional evidence will be considered to add decimals to the base score not to exceed 0.6.				
Base Score	Minimum Evidence for Achievement	Evidence of Service Activities to improve base score. Refer to III.F.3. of APS 1405.11.	Additional Evidence to improve base score	Earned Score
0	Zero will be given when no evidence of service is presented for review. Examples are failure to carry out assigned duties or refuse to accept reasonable committee assignments.			
1	Some committee involvement at the department level; little contributions provided during meetings; limited evidence provided to show contribution to the work of the assigned committees.			
2	Participates (e.g. scribing, presenting supporting data to committee, revising documents) on multiple committees within the department, or demonstrates leadership in regional or state professional organizations, or chairs department committee; completes committee assignments in a timely manner.			
3	Participates on a committee at the department, college, and university level; chairs or co-chairs college or university committee; shows evidence of exceptional impact of committee work (e.g. participates in a research study or publishes with committee or council); or demonstrates leadership in a professional organization at the national or international level.			

Total score earned= (teaching score x percentage of workload) + (research/scholarship score x percentage of workload) + (service score x percentage of workload)

(____x____) + (____x____) + (____x____) = _____ overall score

Signature of the Director _____ Date _____

Signature of the Faculty Member _____ Date _____