1. General Departmental Policies and Procedures

1.1 Departmental Review Bodies

1.1.1 Department Salary and Promotion Committee (DSCP)

1.1.1.1 Composition of the DSCP

[Note: Please delete instructions in italics before submitting the plan to the URSTPC.]
Indicate the procedure that will be used for establishing the DSCP: the department constitutes itself, or some members thereof, as a DSCP, providing that the DSCP includes at least three tenured faculty members OR several departments combine for salary and promotion purposes (see section 6.3.4.4 (2) of the Faculty Handbook for more specific details). Names of individual members are not required for this section.

1.1.1.2 Procedure for Election of the DSCP

Outline the departmental election procedure for the DSCP.

1.1.1.3 Definition of Peer Group for Promotion and Salary Review

An individual or group (other than the DSCP) may participate in peer evaluation for purposes of promotion and salary review (for example, all full professors in the discipline may review a promotion file and provide input to the DSCP).

1.1.2 Renewal and Tenure Review Body (RTRB)

1.1.2.1 Composition of the RTRB/RTRBs and voting procedure
Define the membership of the RTRB/RTRBs (typically, all the tenured faculty members of the academic discipline); see section 6.3.4.5 (2) of the Faculty Handbook for specific details. Names of the tenured faculty members on the RTRB/RTRBs should be included. and voting procedure (see section 6.3.4.3 of the Faculty Handbook).

1.1.2.2 Composition of an Interdisciplinary RTRB and voting procedure (if applicable)

Define the membership of the interdisciplinary RTRB; see section 6.3.4.4 (2) of the Faculty Handbook for specific details. Names of the tenured faculty members on the interdisciplinary RTRB should be included. and voting procedure (see section 6.3.4.3 of the Faculty Handbook).

1.2 Procedure for Approving the Departmental RST Plan/Sub-Plans by the Department Faculty

Define the annual process for approving the departmental RST plan (and any sub-plans created in a multi-disciplinary department) by the department faculty.

1.3 Procedures for Evaluation of Department Faculty

1.3.1 Peer Evaluations

Define the evaluation techniques and procedures used by the department for peer assessment, including provisions for response by the faculty member under review; see section 6.3.5.4 (2) of the Faculty Handbook for specific detail.

1.3.2 Student Evaluations

Define the departmental guidelines for student evaluations, including provisions for response by the faculty member under review, the instrument that will be used, and how the data are to be interpreted; see section 6.3.5.4 (2) of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.
1.3.3 Additional Types of Evaluation (if applicable)

Any additional types of evaluation of teaching effectiveness (in addition to peer evaluations and student evaluations) that are required by a department or program must be clearly outlined in the departmental RST plan; see section 6.3.5.4 of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.

1.4 Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty with Non-Teaching Assignments

Performance reviews for faculty with non-teaching assignments must be based upon the major evaluation categories of job performance, research and creative activity, and professional and public service as weighted by agreement between the faculty member, the department, and, when appropriate, the college dean. Define the departmental procedures for establishing an evaluation plan for faculty with non-teaching assignments; see section 6.3.5.4 (1) of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.

2. Renewal of Probationary Faculty

2.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service

2.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

In this section of the plan, the department must include the following:

- the weight given to this category (note: teaching effectiveness must receive top priority for faculty who have teaching appointments)
- the relative weighting of ancillary activities (such as advising or supervision of independent work) in the category of teaching effectiveness
- criteria that clearly define how a faculty member meets, exceeds, or fails to meet departmental expectations for teaching effectiveness (used to complete Form 2 “Record of Peer Evaluation by RTRB”)
- criteria that clearly define how a faculty member meets, exceeds, or fails to meet departmental expectations for student evaluations (used to complete Form 3 “Record of Student Evaluation” by the department chair).

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such. See section 6.3.5.4 of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.
2.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

In this section of the plan, the department must include the following:

- the weight given to this category (note: teaching effectiveness must receive top priority for faculty who have teaching appointments)
- criteria that clearly define how a faculty member meets, exceeds, or fails to meet departmental expectations for professional, scholarly, and creative activity (used to complete Form 2).

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such. See section 6.3.5.4 of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.

2.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

In this section of the plan, the department must include the following:

- the weight given to this category (note: teaching effectiveness must receive top priority for faculty who have teaching appointments)
- a statement clarifying whether or not the two separate subcategories of service to the university and service to the community will be subdivided and the relative weighting of both subcategories if this option is taken
- criteria that clearly define how a faculty member meets, exceeds, or fails to meet departmental expectations for service to the university and to the community (used to complete Form 2).

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such. See section 6.3.5.4 of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.

2.2 Ancillary Materials required by the Department for Inclusion in the RST File (if applicable)

Define any ancillary materials required by the department for inclusion in the RST file. Materials that are only required under a sub-plan must be clearly marked as such.

3. Granting of Tenure

3.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/
Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service

3.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

Define the departmental expectations for a cumulative record of achievement in the category of teaching effectiveness that would support the granting of tenure.

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such.

3.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

Define the departmental expectations for a cumulative record of achievement in the category of professional, scholarly, and creative activity that would support the granting of tenure.

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such.

3.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

Define the departmental expectations for a cumulative record of achievement in the category of service to the university and to the community that would support the granting of tenure.

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such.

3.2 Ancillary Materials required by the Department for Inclusion in the RST File (if applicable)

Define any ancillary materials required by the department for inclusion in the RST file. Materials that are only required under a sub-plan must be clearly marked as such.

4. Promotion to Full Professor

4.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service

In this section of the plan, the department must include the following:
• the weight given to this category (note: teaching effectiveness must receive top priority for faculty who have teaching appointments)
• the relative weighting of ancillary activities (such as advising or supervision of independent work) in the category of teaching effectiveness
• criteria that clearly define how a faculty member meets, exceeds, or fails to meet departmental expectations for teaching effectiveness (used to complete Form 6 “Request for Promotion to Full Professor”)
• criteria that clearly define how a faculty member meets, exceeds, or fails to meet departmental expectations for student evaluations (used to complete Form 6).

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such. See section 6.3.5.4 and 6.3.8.4 of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.

4.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

In this section of the plan, the department must include the following:
• the weight given to this category (note: 1) teaching effectiveness must receive top priority for faculty who have teaching appointments, and 2) for purposes of promotion, the area of “university and public service” is to be given equal weight with the area of “professional, scholarly, and/or creative activities.” In all cases, individuals must demonstrate excellent performance in teaching effectiveness in order to receive favorable consideration for promotion. Individuals must also demonstrate excellent performance in one of the other two areas and satisfactory performance in the other in order to receive favorable consideration for promotion)
• criteria that clearly define how a faculty member meets, exceeds, or fails to meet departmental expectations for professional, scholarly, and creative activity (used to complete Form 6).

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such. See section 6.3.5.4 and 6.3.8.4 of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.

4.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

In this section of the plan, the department must include the following:
• the weight given to this category (note: 1) teaching effectiveness must receive top priority for faculty who have teaching appointments, and 2) for purposes of promotion, the area of “university and public service” is to be given equal weight with the area of “professional, scholarly, and/or creative activities.” In all cases, individuals must demonstrate excellent performance in teaching effectiveness in order to receive favorable consideration for promotion. Individuals must also demonstrate excellent performance in one of the other two areas and satisfactory performance in the other in order to receive favorable consideration for promotion)
• a statement clarifying whether or not the two separate subcategories of service to the university and service to the community will be subdivided and the relative weighting of both subcategories if this option is taken
• criteria that clearly define how a faculty member meets, exceeds, or fails to meet departmental expectations for service to the university and service to the community (used to complete Form 6).

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such. See section 6.3.5.4 and 6.3.8.4 of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.

4.2 Ancillary Materials required by the Department for Inclusion in the RST File (if applicable)

Define any ancillary materials required by the department for inclusion in the RST file. Materials that are only required under a sub-plan must be clearly marked as such.

5. Salary and Inequity

5.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching, Professional/Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service

5.1.1 Teaching Effectiveness

In this section of the plan, the department must include the following:
• the weight given to this category (note: teaching effectiveness must receive top priority for faculty who have teaching appointments)
• the relative weighting of ancillary activities (such as advising or supervision of independent work) in the category of teaching effectiveness
• criteria that clearly define how a faculty member meets, exceeds, or fails to meet departmental expectations for teaching effectiveness (used to complete Form 5 “Salary Review Form”)
• criteria that clearly define how a faculty member meets, exceeds, or fails to meet departmental expectations for student evaluations (used to complete Form 5).

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such. See section 6.3.5.4 of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.

5.1.2 Professional, Scholarly, and Creative Activity

In this section of the plan, the department must include the following:
• the weight given to this category (note: teaching effectiveness must receive top priority for faculty who have teaching appointments)
• criteria that clearly define how a faculty member meets, exceeds, or fails to meet departmental expectations for professional, scholarly, and creative activity (used to complete Form 5).

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such. See section 6.3.5.4 of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.

5.1.3 Service to the University and to the Community

In this section of the plan, the department must include the following:
• the weight given to this category (note: teaching effectiveness must receive top priority for faculty who have teaching appointments)
• a statement clarifying whether or not the two separate subcategories of service to the university and service to the community will be subdivided and the relative weighting of both subcategories if this option is taken
• criteria that clearly define how a faculty member meets, exceeds, or fails to meet departmental expectations for service to the university and to the community (used to complete Form 5)

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such. See section 6.3.5.4 of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.

5.1.4 Departmental Guidelines for Determining Merit or High Merit

Define the departmental guidelines and criteria for determining merit and high merit (used to complete Form 5. As a reference, the Faculty Handbook includes this information on merit review (6.3.9.6):

Meritorious performance is measured in objective as well as subjective ways that stem from assessment techniques such as observations, evaluation instruments, discussions, feedback, and written materials. The following are essential concepts and elements necessary to judge meritorious performance:

• Meritorious performance must be achievable within one’s position description.
• Meritorious performance must be attainable for each individual member, regardless of how other members have been judged in their roles.
• In addition to financial compensation, meritorious performance may be recognized and rewarded through oral and written recognition, special assignments, provision for personal growth, etc.
• The basis for performance evaluation will be (1) the degree of accomplishment of the faculty member’s individual professional objectives and (2) overall performance in relationship to professional expectations as established through the peer review process.
5.2 Ancillary Materials required by the Department for Inclusion in the RST File (if applicable)

Define any ancillary materials required by the department for inclusion in the RST file. Materials that are only required under a sub-plan must be clearly marked as such.

6. Post-tenure Review

6.1 Departmental Criteria for Evaluation

Define the departmental guidelines and criteria for determining if a faculty member’s performance on a post-tenure review is satisfactory or in need of “significant improvement” as indicated on Form 7 “Post-Tenure Review.”

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such. See section 6.3.10 of the Faculty Handbook for specific details.

6.2 Departmental Policy on Professional Development Tied to Post-tenure Review

Define the departmental policy on allocation of departmental funds in support of professional development for faculty whose post-tenure review did not meet departmental standards.

Sub-plans submitted by multi-disciplinary departments must be clearly marked as such.