

**MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF NURSING**

POLICY # E-1

Adopted in 2008 and Affirmed in 2015

TITLE: EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR ANNUAL AND FORMAL REVIEWS

POLICY:

The faculty shall be evaluated annually and for formal reviews according to evaluation criteria and standards established by Montana State University and supplemented by the faculty of the College of Nursing. The process for formal review shall be revised, if necessary, and reaffirmed annually by the College of Nursing faculty.

RATIONALE:

The purpose of this document is to provide statements of criteria and evaluative standards for faculty that are supplemental to those described in the [MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY HANDBOOK \[FH\]](#) and are consistent with the mission of the College of Nursing. The policy was developed by the Nursing Formal Review Committee [NFRC] to clarify the College of Nursing's application of the university policy for faculty review as described in the MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY HANDBOOK and to facilitate evaluation and specific formal reviews of faculty members.

These criteria and standards, essential for the selection, recognition and retention of faculty, are derived from the mission statement of the College of Nursing.

The annual review process will (1) assist the faculty member plan activities congruent with the mission, role and scope of the College of Nursing (2) help the faculty member examine strengths and focus on potential growth areas, (3) provide a written basis for salary recommendations, and (4) serve as part of the data base for other reviews.

Retention, promotion and/or tenure review of a faculty member's performance is required to determine whether his/her qualifications merit the awarding of continued employment, promotion and/or tenure at Montana State University.

DEFINITIONS:

The following relevant definitions were derived from the MSU Promotion and Tenure policy May, 2004, per the MSU Faculty Handbook. A complete listing of definitions can be found in the MSU Faculty Handbook. [FH 602.0 & 802]

"Criteria and Standards": "Criteria" are the variables examined in an evaluation. "Standards" are the levels or degrees of performance which measure the success in meeting the accomplishing criteria.

"Effectiveness": means meeting or exceeding the standards of the department and college, discipline or profession as appropriate for the individual's assignment.

"Excel/Excellence": means achieving substantial recognition from students, clients, colleagues and/or peers in the profession, appropriate to the activity.

"Research/Creative endeavors": is a form of scholarship which involves discovery, application and/or integration of new knowledge and the dissemination of that knowledge. This work includes conducting specific research projects; supervising research staff and postdoctoral associates; securing and administering grants and contracts; writing/editing books, articles, and other research-based materials representing one's or collaborative research ; developing new clinical practice models, presentations at scholarly conferences.

"Service": assists individuals or organizations in solving problems through consultation and information transfer. Service activities fall into three categories: professional service such as holding office in a professional society, serving on an editorial board and reviewing manuscripts for professional journals; public service which means serving the general public rather than students, the institution or the profession; and University service which facilitates the effective operation of the institution.

"Teaching": fosters critical thinking, develops creativity and promotes citizenship and professional competency. It includes all of the following activities: class preparation; scheduled and unscheduled instruction in classes, seminars, and workshops, both on and off campus, informal meetings, help session, individual instruction and office hours; laboratory and studio or clinical-based teaching and training; course and curriculum development; thesis and professional project assistance and participation in the presentation and defense of theses and projects; grading and assessment of student work; academic and career advising of undergraduate and graduate students; supervision of student teachers, teaching assistants, and professional interns; and for library faculty, any tasks that contribute to the overall academic enterprise.[FH 602.0]

E-1 Document Used for Retention Review and for Tenure and Promotion Review

E-1 document which reviewee uses for retention review:

This is the E-1 policy in effect the year the reviewee began on tenure track.

Example: If the reviewee began on tenure track Aug 2003, the E-1 document used for retention review is the one in effect for the academic year 2003-2004.

E-1 document which reviewee uses for tenure and promotion:

This is the E-1 policy in effect the next academic year after faculty was reviewed for retention.

Example: If the faculty was reviewed successfully for retention in year 2005-2006, they begin as 'retained' faculty the next academic year. The document under which they began as retained faculty and which is used for tenure and promotion review would be the document in effect 2006-2007.

ATTACHMENT #1: Candidate's Cover Sheet Sample

ATTACHMENT #2: College Role, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures Documents

Reviewed/Approved by:

Level I: Nursing Formal Review Committee (May, 2008)

Level II: Elizabeth Nichols (May, 2008) & Faculty (May, 2008)

**POLICY #E-1
ATTACHMENT #1**

CANDIDATE'S COVER SHEET
See Provost's web site for cover sheet.

<http://www.montana.edu/wwwprov/PTDocs/index.html>

POLICY #E-1
ATTACHMENT #2

COLLEGE ROLE, SCOPE, CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES DOCUMENTS
(follows)

ROLE AND SCOPE STATEMENTS (COLLEGE OF NURSING E1)	11
100 APPROVALS REQUIRED	11
110 UNIVERSITY ROLE AND SCOPE	11
111 COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT ROLE AND SCOPE STATEMENTS	11
112 ROLE AND SCOPE	11
112.1 Role and Scope of the College	11
112.2 Role and Scope of the Department	12
113 ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	12
113.1 Academic Programs of the College	12
113.2 Academic Programs of the Department	12
114 RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY	12
114.1 Special Areas of College Research and Creative Activity	12
114.2 Special Areas of Department Research and Creative Activity	12
115 OUTREACH/PUBLIC SERVICE	12
115.1 Special Areas of College Outreach/Public Service	12
115.2 Special Areas of Department Outreach/Public Service	12
116 DEFINITIONS	13
116.1 Campus Director	13
116.2 Clinical Competence	13
116.3 Clinical Teaching	13
116.4 Period of Review	13
116.5 Outside Employment	13
SECTION 200 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS	14
200 CRITERIA FOR THE FORMAL REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE	14
210 UNIVERSITY CRITERIA	14
211 TEACHING CRITERIA	14
211.1 University Teaching Criteria	14
211.2 College and Clinical Teaching Criteria	14
211.3 Department Teaching Criteria	15
212 RESEARCH CRITERIA	16
212.1 University Research/Creative Activity Criteria	16
212.2 College Research/Creative Activity Criteria	16
212.3 Department Research Criteria	16
213 OUTREACH/PUBLIC SERVICE CRITERIA	17
213.1 University Criteria	17
213.2 College Criteria	17
213.3 Department Criteria	18
220 GENERAL UNIVERSITY STANDARDS	18
220.1 Criteria for Faculty with Instructional Expectations	18
220.2 Criteria for Faculty with Professional Practice Expectations	18

221	EFFECTIVENESS IN TEACHING	18
221.1	University Standard of Effectiveness in Teaching	18
221.2	College Standard(s) of Effectiveness in Teaching	18
221.3	Department Standard(s) of Effectiveness in Teaching	19
222	EFFECTIVENESS IN RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY	19
222.1	University Standard of Effectiveness in Research/Creative Activity	19
222.2	College Standard(s) of Effectiveness in Research/Creative Activity	19
222.3	Department Standard(s) of Effectiveness in Research/Creative Activity	19
223	EFFECTIVENESS IN OUTREACH/PUBLIC SERVICE	19
223.1	University Standard of Effectiveness in Outreach/Public Service	19
223.2	College Standards of Effectiveness in Outreach/Public Service	19
223.3	Department Standard(s) of Effectiveness in Outreach/Public Service	19
230	STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE	20
231	EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING	20
231.1	University Standard of Excellence in Teaching	20
231.2	College Standard(s) of Excellence in Teaching	20
231.3	Department Standard(s) of Excellence in Teaching	20
232	EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY	20
232.1	University Standard of Excellence in Research/Creative Activity	20
232.2	College Standard(s) of Excellence in Research/Creative Activity	20
232.3	Department Standard(s) of Excellence in Research/Creative Activity	20
233	EXCELLENCE IN SERVICE	20
233.1	University Standards of Excellence in Outreach/Public Service	20
233.2	College Standards of Excellence in Outreach/Public Service	21
233.3	Department Standards of Excellence in Outreach/Public Service	21
240	DEMONSTRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS AND EXCELLENCE	21
241	DEMONSTRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS AND EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING	21
241.1	University Policy and Procedures	21
241.2	College Policies and Procedures	21
242	DEMONSTRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS AND EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY	26
242.1	University Policy and Procedures	26
242.2	College Policies and Procedures	26
243	DEMONSTRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS AND EXCELLENCE IN OUTREACH/PUBLIC SERVICE	30
243.1	University Policy and Procedures	30
243.2	College Policies and Procedures	30
243.3	Department Policies and Procedures	33
SECTION 300 STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, RETENTION AND TENURE		34
300	RESPONSIBILITY TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS	34
310	RETENTION AND SPECIAL REVIEW	34
310.1	University Standards for Retention	34
310.2	College Standards for Retention	34
310.3	Department Standards for Retention	34
320	TENURE	34

321	STANDARDS FOR TENURE	35
321.1	Standards for Faculty with Instructional Expectations	35
321.2	Standards for Faculty with Professional Practice Expectations	35
330	APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION	36
331	STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	36
331.1	Standards for Faculty with Instructional Expectations	36
331.2	Standards for Faculty with Professional Practice Expectations	37
332	STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	37
332.1	Standards for Faculty with Instructional Expectations	37
332.2	Standards for Faculty with Professional Practice Expectations	38
333	STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF PROFESSOR	39
333.1	Standards for Faculty with Instructional Expectations	39
333.2	Standards for Faculty with Professional Practice Expectations:	39
	SECTION 400 PROCEDURES FOR FORMAL REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE	41
400	GENERAL PROCEDURES	41
401	REVIEW BASED ON EVALUATION OF TOTAL PERFORMANCE	41
402	MANDATED CONTENTS OF DOCUMENTS	41
410	PROCEDURES FOR THE CONDUCT OF FORMAL REVIEWS OF FACULTY	42
411	MANDATORY CONSIDERATIONS AT ALL LEVELS OF REVIEW	43
<i>B.</i>	<i>THE UNIVERSITY CRITERIA AND STANDARDS DESCRIBED ABOVE,</i>	43
412	RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COLLEGE DEAN	43
413	RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PRIMARY REVIEW COMMITTEE (NFRC)	44
413.1	Membership and Procedures for Selection	44
413.2	Procedures of the Committee	45
413.3	Procedures for Electing College Representatives to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee	49
414	RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PRIMARY ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWER (Campus Director at the College of Nursing)	49
415	RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE INTERMEDIATE REVIEW COMMITTEE	51
<i>B.</i>	<i>Conducting the election for faculty representatives to the college and UPT Committees.</i>	51
<i>C.</i>	<i>Preparing a written recommendation, with vote tally, concerning the retention, tenure, and/or promotion of each candidate for review. [FH 815.00]</i>	51
415.1	Membership	51
415.2	Procedures	51
421	RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CANDIDATE TO SUBMIT DOSSIER	52
<i>A.</i>	<i>Curriculum vitae listing all teaching, research/creative activities and outreach/public service activities.</i>	52

<i>B. A narrative self-evaluation or personal statement.</i>	52
<i>C. Documentation of role, assignments, and performance including the letter or hire, any subsequent role statements or reassignments, and annual reviews and ratings.</i>	52
<i>D. INFORMATION AS TO PERFORMANCE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN TEACHING, RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY, OUTREACH/PUBLIC SERVICE, AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, APPROPRIATE TO THE ASSIGNMENT.</i>	52
<i>E. CANDIDATES SUBMIT ALL THE LETTERS CONVEYING MSU-BOZEMAN ADMINISTRATORS' AND COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE MOST RECENT FORMAL REVIEW (IS SUCH HAS OCCURRED WITHIN THE PAST 7 YEARS.) [FH 812.00]</i>	52
421.1 Area of Excellence/Promise of Excellence	53
421.2 Requests for Additional Documentation	54
421.3 Alterations to the Dossier	54
<i>B. RESPONDING TO A REVIEW COMMITTEE'S OR REVIEWING ADMINISTRATOR'S REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL MATERIALS OR NOTICE THAT MATERIALS IN ADDITION TO THOSE REQUIRED BY THE ROLE, SCOPE, CRITERIA, STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES DOCUMENT HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THE DOSSIER, (SEE 471.05, 471.06 AND 812.03, OR</i>	54
<i>C. RESPONDING TO A NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE PRIMARY REVIEW COMMITTEE AND/OR THE PRIMARY ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWER AS SET FORTH IN 812.04. [FH 812.02]</i>	54
421.4 Procedures for Obtaining External Peer Reviews	54
421.5 Procedures for Obtaining Internal Reviews	55
421.6 Deadline for the Submission of Dossiers	55
422 CANDIDATE'S RIGHT TO GRIEVE	55
<i>B. THE CANDIDATE MAY ALSO RESPOND TO PEER REVIEWS. WITHIN THREE WORKING DAYS FROM THE DATE OF RECEIPT OF THE NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION, THE CANDIDATE MAY SUBMIT A WRITTEN REQUEST TO THE PRIMARY ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWER FOR A SUMMARY OF ALL PEER REVIEWS CONTAINED IN THE DOSSIER. THE PRIMARY ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWER SHALL HAVE FIVE WORKING DAYS FROM THE DATE OF RECEIPT OF THE CANDIDATE'S WRITTEN REQUEST TO COMPILE THE SUMMARY AND FORWARD IT TO THE CANDIDATE. THE SUMMARY SHOULD CONVEY THE SUBSTANCE OF THE PEER REVIEW BUT MUST PROTECT THE IDENTITIES OF THE REVIEWERS (SEE 471.04).</i>	55
<i>C. THE CANDIDATE MUST SUBMIT HIS OR HER RESPONSE TO THE NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION(S) WITHIN FIVE WORKING DAYS FROM THE DATE OF RECEIPT OF THE NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION(S) OR PEER REVIEW SUMMARY, WHICHEVER IS LATER.</i>	55
<i>D. THE CANDIDATE'S RESPONSE TO A NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE NEXT REVIEW COMMITTEE OR ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWER.</i>	55

E. RESPONSES SHALL BE COPIED TO THE PRECEDING LEVEL(S) OF REVIEW AND ADDED TO THE DOSSIER IF RECEIVED WITHIN THE TIME FRAME SET FORTH ABOVE. [FH 812.04] 55

SECTION 500 ANNUAL REVIEW	56
500 PURPOSE OF ANNUAL REVIEW	56
501 LETTER OF HIRE/FACULTY ROLE STATEMENT	56
510 PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING ANNUAL REVIEWS	56
510.01 College Procedures	56
510.02 Department Procedures	57
511 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD	58
511.1 Procedures for Making Salary Recommendations	58
512 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SALARY REVIEW COMMITTEE	58
513 CANDIDATE'S RIGHTS RELATIVE TO ANNUAL REVIEW	59
513.1 Right to Timely Review	59
513.2 Right to Appeal Annual Performance Evaluation	59
514 POST TENURE REVIEW OF FACULTY	59
ADDENDUM FOR ADJUNCT/CONTRACT FACULTY REVIEW	60

SECTION 100

ROLE AND SCOPE STATEMENTS (College of Nursing E1)

100 APPROVALS REQUIRED

Role, scope, criteria, standards and procedures documents shall be approved by the department faculty, department head, the college review committee, the college dean, the UPT Committee, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. [FH 622.]

110 UNIVERSITY ROLE AND SCOPE

Montana State University is committed to “undergraduate and graduate education, research of both a basic and applied nature, and professional and public service to the state, region and nation” (MSU Role and Scope Statement, 1990). [See FH 603.00.] Faculty dedicated to this mission produce substantial benefits for society, including advances in fundamental and applied knowledge, technological innovation, new aesthetic experiences, improved health and well-being, and a broadly educated citizenry. Outreach is a fundamental component of this mission and is affirmed as an appropriate and laudable faculty activity. [FH 603.00]

Each department and college shall develop and annually update a document describing its role and scope, defining its responsibilities and obligations in furtherance of the mission of the University, and setting forth the criteria, standards and procedures for review of faculty members. If the document is not updated annually, the last updated and approved document shall be effective. [FH 620.00]

111 COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENT ROLE AND SCOPE STATEMENTS

The role and scope statement of the department and college defines the responsibilities of the unit and guides the department in developing the criteria, standards and procedures for the review of faculty members. The role and scope statement of each college identifies how each department contributes to meeting the responsibilities of the college and forms the basis for the approval of departmental role and scope statements and for the review and approval of department criteria, standards and procedures. [FH 621.00]

112 ROLE AND SCOPE

112.1 Role and Scope of the College

Montana State University is a land grant institution; therefore, the College of Nursing recognizes its responsibility to provide education, service, and research toward meeting the health care needs of the citizenry. The faculty of Montana State University College of Nursing accepts as its primary mission the preparation of persons for the practice of professional nursing at the baccalaureate and master’s degree level. The University provides a foundation in liberal arts and sciences. Baccalaureate nursing education builds on that foundation in the development of nursing’s unique art and science. The master’s degree program builds on baccalaureate education and provides for the refinement of existing skills, expansion of knowledge, and development of competencies in a specific area of nursing practice.

Montana State University College of Nursing assumes the responsibility through its baccalaureate program to prepare persons for beginning positions in professional nursing. Graduates of the baccalaureate program have

the knowledge, skills, and competencies necessary for assuming responsibility for practicing professional nursing in any health care agency. The master's degree program prepares graduates for leadership positions in professional nursing with special emphasis in identifying and meeting the health needs of persons in rural areas. The educational and research programs of the College of Nursing are responsive to the evolving health needs of the people of Montana and the nation. Nursing education and nursing research enhance nursing practice as knowledge is advanced and social values change. The faculty of Montana State University College of Nursing accepts responsibility to serve as leaders in nursing; to educate knowledgeable, skilled, competent persons in nursing; to generate knowledge through research; to disseminate knowledge through scholarly writing and presentations; and to serve the community by providing expert consultation and education as well as leadership regarding health care issues.

112.2 Role and Scope of the Department

Not Applicable

113 ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

113.1 Academic Programs of the College

The College of Nursing offers undergraduate education leading to the Bachelor of Science in Nursing (B.S.N.) degree and graduate education leading to the Master of Nursing (M.N.) degree.

113.2 Academic Programs of the Department

Not Applicable

114 RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

114.1 Special Areas of College Research and Creative Activity

The College of Nursing has been nationally recognized for excellence in rural nursing practice, theory development, and research. The College's research and scholarship focus is on the assessment and management of health needs and the delivery of health care services in sparsely populated areas.

114.2 Special Areas of Department Research and Creative Activity

Not Applicable

115 OUTREACH/PUBLIC SERVICE

115.1 Special Areas of College Outreach/Public Service

Service includes assisting individuals, organizations, or communities in solving problems and/or fulfilling their mission or purpose through leadership, consultation, and information dissemination. Consultative activities include public and professional service and continuing education to rural health, community service providers, and professional organizations in Montana.

115.2 Special Areas of Department Outreach/Public Service

Not Applicable

116 DEFINITIONS

116.1 Campus Director

The Campus Director in the CON functions in an administrative capacity within the College. She/he is responsible for the management of the faculty, student, and facility affairs of the local campus. The Campus Director is responsible for evaluation of faculty members. The four campuses within the CON are each administered by a Campus Director upon assignment of the dean.

116.2 Clinical Competence

Faculty members are prepared through education, experience, and professional development to deliver effective nursing care.

116.3 Clinical Teaching

Clinical teaching is the usual, expected activity of nursing faculty members consistent with their clinical area of expertise including teaching; application of classroom content; psychomotor skill development and evaluation; development, maintenance, and evaluation of clinical sites; and facilitation of clinical agency multi-disciplinary team interaction.

116.4 Period of Review

The official period of review is the time between hiring and the review. The CV, however, relates to the entire career and some of the reviewee's "best work" prior to hire may be included in the current review.

116.5 Outside Employment

Outside employment, except as consultation, is not included in the dossier but may be listed in the CV.

SECTION 200 CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

“Criteria” are the variables examined in an evaluation. “Standards” are the levels or degrees of performance which measure success in meeting criteria. [FH 602.00]

200 CRITERIA FOR THE FORMAL REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

Montana State University is served by a faculty with a wide range of skills, interests, and responsibilities. Thus, different faculty members may have very different expectations in terms of teaching, research/creative activity and service. The Criteria and Standards portion of this document [FH 630.00 to 633.03] carries forth this principle by distinguishing two general categories of academic faculty as defined in FH602.0, those with “instructional expectations” and those with “professional practice expectations” who have responsibilities in any sub-set of these three areas. Faculty with professional practice expectations are not expected to meet the criteria and standards in any area in which they are not assigned responsibilities. Each faculty member’s letter of hire or subsequently negotiated role statement shall specify which category of expectations apply.

Differences in expectations [must] be recognized, valued and respected at all levels during the review of faculty performance. Faculty review must take into account the resources available to accomplish the faculty member’s assignment including release time for scholarly activities, library support, and the availability of computing facilities and technical support staff. As an integral part of their assignments, faculty may be expected to seek available extramural funds, appropriate to their field of study. [FH 603.03]

210 UNIVERSITY CRITERIA

The criteria on which a faculty member with instructional expectations will be evaluated shall be the three areas of responsibility: teaching, research/creative activity, and service. A faculty member with professional practice expectations will be evaluated in the area or areas of responsibility (teaching, research/creative activity, or outreach/appropriate to his or her specific assignment.

Departments and colleges will establish specific standards for the review of faculty performance. [FH 632.00]

211 TEACHING CRITERIA

211.1 University Teaching Criteria

Teaching, the imparting of knowledge, skills, and abilities to learners, is the heart of the University’s mission. Faculty performance in teaching must be evaluated in terms of a wide range of criteria including course content and objectives, classroom effectiveness, student learning and achievement and student advising. This document challenges faculty and administrators to adopt rigorous strategies for the assessment of teaching performance, including peer, student and self-evaluations and student outcomes. [FH 603.02]

211.2 College and Clinical Teaching Criteria

Criteria to be examined relate to teaching that fosters critical thinking, develops creativity, and promotes socialization into the professional nursing role, including the development of professional competence and the acquisition of professional values. Teaching activities include classroom and clinical teaching, independent

study, academic advisement, graduate thesis/project advising, and the mentoring of students. Teaching criteria will be evaluated in terms of:

- A. Course Development
 - 1. Development of course outline/syllabus
 - 2. Organization of learning activities
 - 3. Provision of resource materials
 - 4. Planning of teaching strategies
 - 5. Planning of learning activities
 - 6. Preparation of classroom/clinical teaching
 - 7. Development of objectives and standards
 - 8. Development of evaluation tools
 - 9. Revision and upgrading of courses

- B. Implementation of Course
 - 1. Orientation of students to courses
 - 2. Development of learning climate
 - 3. Content presentation
 - 4. Delivery of learning activities
 - 5. Recognition of level and needs of learner
 - 6. Coordination of clinical learning environment
 - 7. Role modeling of clinical behaviors
 - 8. Enthusiasm for student learning
 - 9. Risk-taking for student learning activities

- C. Evaluation of Students
 - 1. Utilization of clinical and classroom evaluation tools
 - 2. Feedback to students

- D. Student-Teacher Relationships
 - 1. Appropriate and professional student/faculty relationships including respect for students and demeanor conducive to student learning
 - 2. Emphasis on student accountability
 - 3. Promotion of independent thinking appropriate to curricular level
 - 4. Professional role modeling

- E. Advisement
 - 1. Communication of correct information
 - 2. Assistance with student self-assessment
 - 3. Appropriate and timely referral of students
 - 4. Availability to students
 - 5. Recognition of students' own responsibilities

- G. Ability to Work as a Member of a Teaching Team
 - 1. Respectful collegial relationships
 - 2. Timely and appropriate communication with colleagues

211.3 Department Teaching Criteria

Not Applicable

212 RESEARCH CRITERIA

212.1 University Research/Creative Activity Criteria

Research and creative activity, the means through which society increases its understanding of the natural world and the human condition, is a fundamental responsibility of the University community. In submitting documentation for tenure and promotion, faculty are expected to submit for review their scholarly works which have advanced their discipline or profession. [FH 603.02]

212.2 College Research/Creative Activity Criteria

Criteria to be examined relate to research and creative activity that involve discovery, application, and/or integration of new knowledge. Criteria also relate to the presentation/modeling of that knowledge for review and evaluation by peers in the academic, scientific, and practice communities of nursing. Research and creative activity can be evaluated in terms of:

- A. Development of research proposals
- B. Implementation of research projects
- C. Acquisition of funds for research projects
- D. Collaboration, support, or consultation in relation to the research of other faculty members and other professional colleagues
- E. Dissemination of scholarly work:
 - 1. Publication in books and/or journals (refereed)
 - 2. Paper/poster presentations (refereed)
- F. Utilization of reviewee's research by other scholars
- G. Acquisition of funds for scholarly projects
- H. Development and dissemination of scholarly material such as:
 - 1. the study of crucial issues in the nursing field,
 - 2. technologically oriented teaching modalities,
 - 3. innovative practice strategies and models, or
 - 4. innovative teaching strategies and models.

212.3 Department Research Criteria

Not Applicable

213 OUTREACH/PUBLIC SERVICE CRITERIA

213.1 University Criteria

Outreach and public service, the strategies through which the practical impacts of scholarship are made available to the state and nation, are essential to the University's Land Grant mission. This document calls upon faculty and their departments to revitalize their commitments to outreach and public service and challenges them to reward effectiveness and excellence in these activities. Departments and colleges shall establish procedures, criteria and standards for the evaluation of service, outreach, and consulting activities submitted for faculty review. [603.02]

213.2 College Criteria

Criteria to be examined relate to outreach and public service that assist individuals, organizations, or communities in solving problems and/or fulfilling their mission or purpose through leadership, consultation, and information transfer. Service activities fall into three categories: (1) professional service, (2) public service, and (3) College and University service.

Documentation of service will include evidence of the faculty member's effectiveness in fulfilling service obligations as well as ability to work collaboratively with others. Outreach/public service criteria can be evaluated in terms of:

- A. Professional Service
 - 1. Contributions to the advancement of nursing and health care organizations--national, state, and local
 - 2. Consultation to nursing and health care groups
 - 3. Continuing education offerings
- B. Public/Community and Government Service
 - 1. Contributions to the advancement of health-related organizations
 - 2. Consultation to nursing and health care groups
 - 3. Health-related program development
 - 4. Contributions to the advancement of community organizations
 - a) Advocating health-related agendas
 - b) Implementing health-related projects
 - 5. Participation or leadership in:
 - a) Political activities related to national, state, and local issues associated with health and nursing education
 - b) Legislative activities that affect health and nursing education
- C. University/College
 - 1. Participation or leadership in University committees and functions
 - 2. Active participation and/or leadership in the College's Faculty Organization, committees, and specialty groups
 - 3. College service in the faculty role through consulting, guest lecturing, orienting, and/or mentoring

213.3 Department Criteria

Not Applicable

220 GENERAL UNIVERSITY STANDARDS

The University standards on which faculty performance will be reviewed are effectiveness and excellence.

“Effectiveness” means meeting or exceeding the standards of the department and college, discipline or profession as appropriate for the individual’s assignment. “Excel/Excellence” means achieving substantial recognition from students, clients, colleagues, and/or peers in the profession, appropriate to the activity. [FH 602.00]

***Sustained effectiveness in all areas** of a faculty member’s assignment is a University-wide requirement for retention, tenure and promotion. [FH 603.04]*

*In addition, **the promise of excellence** is required for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor rank; **a record of excellence** is required for promotion to Professor rank. [FH 603.04]*

The University criteria and standards defined herein are the minimum acceptable standards for the university; departments and colleges are expected to develop criteria and standards based on, and no less rigorous than, those described herein. [FH 622.00]

Each faculty member must meet the following University-wide standards for appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion as well as the standards of her or his department and college. [FH 633.00]

220.1 Criteria for Faculty with Instructional Expectations

Faculty with instructional expectations will be evaluated in the three areas of responsibility: teaching, research/creative activity, and service missions of the University. [FH 632.00]

220.2 Criteria for Faculty with Professional Practice Expectations

Faculty with professional practice expectations will be evaluated in the areas of responsibility (teaching, research/creative activity, or outreach) appropriate to their specific assignments. [FH 632.00]

221 EFFECTIVENESS IN TEACHING

221.1 University Standard of Effectiveness in Teaching

Faculty performance in teaching will be judged effective if it meets or exceeds the standards of the candidate’s department and college. [FH 633.01]

221.2 College Standard(s) of Effectiveness in Teaching

Based upon the criteria given in Section 211.2, teaching will be judged effective if it is consistent over time and of high quality. (See 241.2 for the method of conducting an in-depth assessment and the specific materials required to document effectiveness in teaching.)

221.3 Department Standard(s) of Effectiveness in Teaching

Not Applicable

222 EFFECTIVENESS IN RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

222.1 University Standard of Effectiveness in Research/Creative Activity

Faculty performance in research/creative activity will be judged effective if it meets or exceeds the standards of the candidate's department and college. [FH 633.01]

222.2 College Standard(s) of Effectiveness in Research/Creative Activity

Effectiveness in research and creative activity is evidenced by work which is meritorious, appropriately focused, and of high quality. (See 242.2 for the method of conducting an in-depth assessment and the specific materials required to document effectiveness in research/creative activity.)

222.3 Department Standard(s) of Effectiveness in Research/Creative Activity

Not Applicable

223 EFFECTIVENESS IN OUTREACH/PUBLIC SERVICE

223.1 University Standard of Effectiveness in Outreach/Public Service

Faculty performance in outreach and public service will be judged effective if it meets or exceeds the standards of the candidate's department and college. [FH 633.01]

223.2 College Standards of Effectiveness in Outreach/Public Service

Effectiveness in outreach and public service is evidenced by meritorious, appropriately focused contributions to the College, University, profession and community. (See 243.2 for the method of conducting an in-depth assessment and the specific materials required to document effectiveness in outreach and public service.)

223.3 Department Standard(s) of Effectiveness in Outreach/Public Service

Not Applicable

230 STANDARDS OF EXCELLENCE

231 EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

231.1 University Standard of Excellence in Teaching

Faculty performance in teaching will be judged excellent if it receives substantial recognition from peers and colleagues as well as current and former students. [FH 633.02]

231.2 College Standard(s) of Excellence in Teaching

Excellence in teaching means that a faculty member has received substantial recognition from colleagues, students, and/or peers in the profession. Excellence is usually achieved by the faculty member exhibiting unusual creativity and exemplary professional commitment and leadership. (See 241.2 for the method of conducting an in-depth assessment and the specific materials required to document excellence in teaching.)

231.3 Department Standard(s) of Excellence in Teaching

Not Applicable

232 EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

232.1 University Standard of Excellence in Research/Creative Activity

Faculty performance in research/creativity activity will be judged excellent if it receives substantial, international, or national recognition from peers and clients as having made a substantial contribution to the body of knowledge and creativity germane to the candidate's discipline or profession. [FH 633.02]

232.2 College Standard(s) of Excellence in Research/Creative Activity

Excellence in research and creative activity is evidenced by a significant record of research and publications, invited papers, or refereed presentations. (See 242.2 for the method of conducting an in-depth assessment and the specific materials required to document excellence in research and creative activity.)

232.3 Department Standard(s) of Excellence in Research/Creative Activity

Not Applicable

233 EXCELLENCE IN SERVICE

233.1 University Standards of Excellence in Outreach/Public Service

Faculty performance in service will be judged excellent if it receives substantial recognition by colleagues and peers outside the University. [FH 633.02]

233.2 College Standards of Excellence in Outreach/Public Service

Excellence in outreach and public service is evidenced by contributions, including leadership roles at the College, University, state and national levels which are significant, appropriately focused and of high quality. (See 243.2 for the method of conducting an in-depth assessment and the specific materials required to document excellence in outreach and public service.)

233.3 Department Standards of Excellence in Outreach/Public Service

Not Applicable

240 DEMONSTRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS AND EXCELLENCE

Department and college criteria for retention, tenure and promotion may recognize differential staffing and allow for individual uniqueness in faculty assignments. Standards should not make all faculty perform alike, but commensurate quality must be expected for all equivalent reviews. [FH 622.00]

241 DEMONSTRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS AND EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

241.1 University Policy and Procedures

Effectiveness, excellence, and potential for excellence in teaching may be demonstrated in the following ways: evaluation by peers and colleagues within the University, and in-depth assessment of teaching performance that draws upon current and former students, graduated, colleagues and clients. Both peer evaluation and an in-depth assessment of teaching are required for promotion and tenure reviews. Candidates shall follow the methods for in-depth assessment of teaching performance established by the department. [FH 633.03]

241.2 College Policies and Procedures

Section 241.2 addresses documentation required to demonstrate effectiveness and excellence in the area of teaching appropriate to each level of review. Performance criteria are found in section 211. Performance standards related to “effectiveness” and “excellence” are found in sections 220, 221 and 231. The standards for appointment, promotion, retention, and tenure are given in section 300. The established procedure for obtaining internal and external written evaluative input must be followed and is given in section 413.2. When preparing data for demonstration of effectiveness and excellence in teaching, all review letters from students, faculty, peers, and professional colleagues must be requested by the Chair of the College of Nursing Formal Review Committee (NFRC) and must not be solicited by the reviewee.

A. Retention Reviews at the Ranks of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor

Evaluative Category: Teaching

Standards for retention of faculty members in their third year of service include “effectiveness in the performance of their responsibilities, promise of continuing effectiveness, and, if appropriate to the level of review (Associate Professor), the promise of attainment of the standards for tenure and promotion, as demonstrated by a clear progression of accomplishment.” [FH 640.00].

Documentation Category: Effectiveness in Teaching

To determine a faculty member's effectiveness in teaching, the NFRC will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee's teaching and advising activities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of effectiveness in teaching.
2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from three faculty colleagues that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to teaching criteria and standards of effectiveness. Overall, the input must address both classroom and clinical teaching and at least one of the faculty colleagues providing input must be in the same clinical specialty area as the faculty member.
3. Student evaluations of courses taught at MSU during the two years preceding the review. In those instances when the individual has done a substantial amount of guest lecturing, evaluative data which have been solicited appropriately and anonymously from students may be included [FH 610].
4. Student evaluations of advising during the previous two years.
5. In depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee's strengths and limitations in relation to teaching and advising; analyzes previous evaluative input from student, peers, colleagues, and supervisor; discusses rationale for any identified teaching problems; and identifies specific strategies to improve areas of weakness in teaching. Include a "vision" statement of the reviewee's teaching with a specific plan for sustaining effectiveness in teaching.

B. Review for Tenure and/or Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Evaluative Category: Teaching

Standards for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are "(a) demonstrated and sustained effectiveness in the performance of their responsibilities in the three areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service appropriate to the assignment as set forth in the letter of hire and role statements, (b) demonstrated potential for sustained effectiveness in each of these areas in the future, and (c) demonstrated potential for achieving excellence in teaching and/or research/creative activity." (FH 651).

Documentation Category: Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching

To determine a faculty member's effectiveness in teaching, the NFRC will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that address the reviewee's teaching and advising activities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in teaching.

2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from three faculty colleagues that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in teaching. Overall, the input must address both classroom and clinical teaching as appropriate to the reviewee's teaching assignment. At least one of the faculty colleagues providing input must be in the same clinical specialty area as the faculty member.
3. Written evaluative input from three professional colleagues outside the College of Nursing that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in teaching and should address competence in clinical teaching if appropriate to the reviewee's assignment.
4. Student evaluations of courses taught at MSU during all years preceding the review. In those instances when the individual has done a substantial amount of guest lecturing, evaluative data which has been solicited appropriately and anonymously from students may be included.
5. Student evaluations of advising during all years prior to the review.
6. Written evaluative reviews from three students (internal review letters) or graduates taught or advised by the reviewee that address the reviewee's teaching abilities.
7. In-depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee's strengths and limitations in relation to teaching and advising; analyzes previous evaluative input from students, peers/colleagues, and supervisor; discusses rationale for any identified teaching problems; and identifies specific strategies to improve areas of weakness in teaching. Include a "vision" statement of the reviewee's teaching with a specific plan for continuing effectiveness or promise of excellence in teaching.

Documentation Category: Excellence/Potential for Excellence in Teaching

To determine a faculty member's excellence/potential for excellence in teaching, the NFRC will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee's teaching and advising activities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of excellence/potential for excellence in teaching.
2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from four faculty colleagues that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to teaching criteria and standards of excellence or potential for excellence. Overall, the input must address both classroom and clinical teaching as appropriate to the reviewee's teaching assignment. At least one of the faculty colleagues providing input must be in the same clinical specialty area as the faculty member.
3. Written evaluative input from four professional colleagues outside the College of Nursing that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to teaching

criteria and standards of excellence or potential for excellence and should address competence in clinical teaching if appropriate to the reviewee's assignment.

4. Student evaluations of courses taught at MSU during all years preceding the review. In those instances when the individual has done a substantial amount of guest lecturing, evaluative data which have been solicited appropriately and anonymously from students may be included.

5. Student evaluations of advising during all years prior to the review.

6. Written evaluative reviews from six students (internal review letters) or graduates taught or advised by the reviewee that address the reviewee's teaching abilities.

7. In-depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee's strengths and limitations in relation to teaching and advising; analyzes previous evaluative input from students, peers/colleagues, and supervisor; discusses rationale for any identified teaching problems; and identifies specific strategies to improve areas of weakness in teaching. Include a "vision" statement of reviewee's teaching with a specific plan for continuing excellence in teaching.

C. **Review for Tenure and/or Promotion to the Rank of Professor**

Evaluative Category: Teaching

Standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are (a) a record of demonstrated and sustained effectiveness in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and creative activity and service appropriate to the assignment and (b) a record of excellence in teaching and/or research and creative activity.

Documentation Category: Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching

To determine a faculty member's sustained effectiveness in teaching, the NFRC will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee's teaching and advising activities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of effectiveness in teaching.

2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from three faculty colleagues that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to teaching criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness. Overall, the input must address both classroom and clinical teaching as appropriate to the reviewee's teaching assignment. At least one of the faculty colleagues providing input must be in the same clinical specialty area as the faculty member.

3. Written evaluative input from three professional colleagues outside the College of Nursing that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to teaching criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness and should address competence in clinical teaching if appropriate to the reviewee's assignment.

4. Student evaluations of courses taught at MSU during all years following the candidate's previous formal review. In those instances when the individual has done a substantial amount of guest lecturing, evaluative data which have been solicited appropriately and anonymously from students may be included.
5. Student evaluations of advising during all years following the candidate's previous formal review.
6. Written evaluative reviews from five students (internal review letters) or graduates taught or advised by the reviewee that address the reviewee's teaching abilities.
7. In-depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee's strengths and limitations in relation to teaching and advising; analyzes previous evaluative input from students, peers/colleagues, and supervisor; discusses rationale for any identified teaching problems; and identifies specific strategies to improve areas of weakness in teaching. Include a "vision" statement of reviewee's teaching with a specific plan for continuing effectiveness in teaching.

Documentation Category: Excellence in Teaching

To determine a faculty member's excellence in teaching, the NFRC will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee's teaching and advising activities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of excellence in teaching.
2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from four faculty colleagues that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to teaching criteria and standards of excellence. Overall, the input must address both classroom and clinical teaching as appropriate to the reviewee's teaching assignment. At least one of the faculty colleagues providing input must be in the same clinical specialty area as the faculty member.
3. Written evaluative input from four professional colleagues outside the College of Nursing that addresses the reviewee's teaching abilities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of excellence and should address competence in clinical teaching if appropriate to the reviewee's assignment.
4. Student evaluations of courses taught at MSU during all years following the candidate's previous formal review. In those instances when the individual has done a substantial amount of guest lecturing, evaluative data which have been solicited appropriately and anonymously from students may be included.
5. Student evaluations of advising during all years following the candidate's previous formal review.
6. Written evaluative reviews from six students (internal review letters) or graduates taught or advised by the reviewee that address the reviewee's teaching abilities.

7. In-depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee’s strengths and limitations in relation to teaching and advising; analyzes previous evaluative input from students, peers/colleagues and supervisor; discusses rationale for any identified teaching problems; and identifies specific strategies to improve areas of weakness in teaching. Include a “vision” statement of reviewee’s teaching with a specific plan for sustaining excellence in teaching.

242 DEMONSTRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS AND EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

242.1 University Policy and Procedures

Effectiveness, excellence and potential for excellence in research/creative activity shall be demonstrated through evaluation by on-campus review committees and administrators and external reviewers. Candidates shall list all publications, presentations, exhibits, and performances in their dossiers and, in addition, shall submit for review a set of articles, publications, creative endeavors, and other evidence that, in their judgment, represents their best efforts to advance the discipline or profession [FH 633.03]

242.2 College Policies and Procedures

Section 242.2 addresses documentation required to demonstrate effectiveness and excellence in the area of research and creative activity appropriate to each level of review. The performance criteria for research and creative activity are found in section 212.2. Performance standards related to “effectiveness” and “excellence” are found in sections 200, 222 and 232. The standards for appointment, retention, promotion, and tenure are given in section 300. The established procedure for obtaining internal and external written evaluative input must be followed and is given in section 413.2. When preparing data for demonstration of effectiveness and excellence in research and creative activity, all review letters from students, faculty, peers, and professional colleagues must be requested by the Chair of the College of Nursing Formal Review Committee and must not be solicited by the reviewee.

A. Retention Reviews at the Ranks of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor

Evaluative Category: Research/Creative Activity

Retention standards for retention of faculty members in their third year of service include “effectiveness in the performance of their responsibilities, promise of continuing effectiveness, and, if appropriate to the level of review (Associate Professor), the promise of attainment of the standards for tenure and promotion, as demonstrated by a clear progression of accomplishment.” [640.00]

Documentation Category: Effectiveness in Research/Creative Activity

To determine a faculty member’s effectiveness in research/creative activity the NFRC will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee’s research and creative activities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of effectiveness in research and creative activity.

2. At least one externally peer-reviewed scholarly product published or accepted for publication in a refereed journal, or two submitted grant proposals or one funded grant, or one invited regional, national, or international presentation shall be included in the candidate's dossier. Candidates shall submit for review a set of articles, publications, proposals submitted or funded, or other creative endeavors that, in their judgment, represents their best efforts to advance the profession.

3. Written evaluative input from one faculty colleague (internal review letter) that addresses the reviewee's research and creative activities. Input must be related to the College criteria and standards of effectiveness in research and creative activity. (See 413.2 for the established procedure for obtaining internal reviews).

4. In-depth self-evaluation that addresses the candidate's effectiveness and promise of continuing effectiveness. The self-evaluation should include a discussion of strengths and limitations and a statement of the reviewee's "vision" for a sustained program of research and creative activity and progress toward achievement of the vision.

B. Review for Tenure and/or Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Evaluative Category: Research/Creative Activity

Standards for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are "(a) demonstrated and sustained effectiveness in the performance of their responsibilities in the three areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service appropriate to the assignment as set forth in the letter of hire and role statements, (b) demonstrated potential for sustained effectiveness in each of these areas in the future, and (c) demonstrated potential for achieving excellence in teaching and/or research/creative activity." (FH 651).

Documentation Category: Sustained Effectiveness in Research/Creative Activity

To determine a faculty member's sustained effectiveness in research/creative activity, the NFRC will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee's research and creative activities. This input must be related to College criteria for research and creative activities and the standard of sustained effectiveness in research and creative activity.

2. A cumulative record of (a) at least two externally peer-reviewed scholarly products published in refereed journals, (b) two submitted grant proposals or one funded grant, and (c) one invited regional, national, or international presentation shall be included in the candidate's dossier. In addition, candidates shall submit for review a set of articles, publications, proposals submitted or funded, or other creative endeavors that, in their judgment, represents their best efforts to advance the profession.

3. Written evaluative input from one faculty colleague (internal review letter) that addresses the reviewee's research and creativity record. Input must be related to College

criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in research and creativity. (See 413.2 for the established procedure for obtaining internal reviews).

4. In-depth self-evaluation that addresses the candidate's sustained effectiveness and promise of continuing effectiveness. The self-evaluation should include a discussion of strengths and limitations in relation to research/creative activity and a "vision" statement of the reviewee's research/creative activities with a specific plan for sustaining effectiveness in this area.

5. Written evaluative input from three external peer reviewers (external review letter that addresses the candidate's sustained effectiveness and excellence or potential for excellence in research activity. This input must relate to College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in research and creative activity.

Documentation Category: Excellence/Potential for Excellence in Research and Creative Activity

To determine a faculty member's excellence/potential for excellence in research/creative activity, the NFRC will consider

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee's research and creative activities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of excellence or potential for excellence in research and creative activity.

2. A cumulative record of (a) at least three externally peer-reviewed scholarly products published in refereed journals, (b) one funded grant, and (c) one invited regional, national, or international presentation shall be included in the candidate's dossier. Candidates shall submit for review a set of articles, publications, proposals submitted or funded or other creative endeavors that, in their judgment, represents their best efforts to advance the profession.

3. Written evaluative input from at least one faculty colleague (internal review letter) that addresses the candidate's activities in research and creativity. Input must be related to College criteria and standards of excellence or potential for excellence in research and creativity. (See 413.2 for the established procedure for obtaining internal reviews).

4. In-depth self-evaluation that addresses the candidate's excellence or potential for excellence. The self-evaluation should include a discussion of strengths and limitations and a "vision" statement of the reviewee's research/creative activities with a specific plan for achieving and/or sustaining excellence in this area.

5. Written evaluative input from three external peer reviewers (external review letter) that addresses the candidate's record of research and creative activity. Input must relate to College criteria and standards of excellence or potential for excellence. (See 413.2 for the established procedure for obtaining external reviews).

C. Review for Tenure and/or Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Evaluative Category: Research/Creative Activity

Standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are “(a) demonstrated and sustained effectiveness in each of the three areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service appropriate to the assignment as set forth in the letter of hire and role statements, (b) a record of excellence in teaching and/or research and creative activity.” (FH 651).

Documentation Category: Sustained Effectiveness in Research/Creative Activity

To determine a faculty member’s sustained effectiveness in research/creative activity, the NFRC will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee’s research and creative activities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in research and creative activity.
2. A cumulative record of (a) at least six externally peer-reviewed scholarly products published or accepted for publication in refereed journals, (b) two funded grants, and (c) two invited regional, national, or international presentations shall be included in the candidate’s dossier. Candidates shall submit for review a set of articles, publications, proposals submitted or funded, or other creative endeavors that, in their judgment, represents their best efforts to advance the profession.
3. Written evaluative input from at least three faculty colleagues (internal review letters) that addresses the reviewee’s record of research and creative activity. Input must relate to the criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness for research and creative activity. (See 413.2 for the established procedure for obtaining internal reviews).
4. In-depth self-evaluation that addresses the candidate’s sustained effectiveness in research/creative activity. The self-evaluation should include a discussion of strengths and limitations and a “vision” statement of the reviewee’s research/creative activities with a specific plan for achieving and/or sustaining excellence in this area.
5. Written evaluative input from three external peer reviewers (external review letter) that addresses the candidate’s record of research and creative activity. Input must relate to College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in research and creative activity. (See 413.2 for the established procedure for obtaining external reviews).

Documentation Category: Excellence in Research/Creative Activity

To determine a faculty member’s excellence in research/creative activity, the NFRC will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that addresses the candidate’s research and creative activity. Input must be related to College criteria and standards of excellence in research and creative activity.

2. Evidence of an extensive and meritorious program of research and creative activities must be reflected in the candidate's dossier, including a consistent record of publication in refereed journals and a consistent record of peer-reviewed presentations at major national and/or international meetings.
3. Written evaluative input from at least three faculty colleagues (internal review letters) that addresses the reviewee's record of research and creative activity. Input must be related to College criteria and standards of excellence in research and creative activity. (See 413.2 for the established procedure for obtaining internal reviews).
4. In-depth self-evaluation that addresses the candidate's record of excellence in research and creative activity. The self-evaluation should include a discussion of strengths and limitations and a "vision" statement of the reviewee's research and creative activities with a specific plan for sustaining excellence in this area.
5. Written evaluative input from three external peer reviewers (external review letters) that addresses the candidate's record research and creative activity. Input must be related to College criteria and standards of excellence in research and creative activity. (See 413.2 for the established procedure for obtaining external reviews).

243 DEMONSTRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS AND EXCELLENCE IN OUTREACH/PUBLIC SERVICE

243.1 University Policy and Procedures

Effectiveness in service/outreach shall be demonstrated through evaluation by peers and colleagues within the University. Excellence and potential for excellence in service shall be demonstrated through evaluation of professional and public service activities by peers outside the University. Candidates shall list all service activities in their dossiers and, in addition, shall submit for review a set of articles, publications, professional endeavors or other evidence that, in their judgment, represents their best efforts to contribute to and advance the University, public and profession. [FH 633.03]

243.2 College Policies and Procedures

Section 243.2 addresses documentation required to demonstrate effectiveness and excellence in the area of outreach and public service appropriate to each level of review. Performance standards related to "effectiveness" and "excellence" are found in sections 220, 221 and 231. The standards for appointment and promotion, retention, and tenure are given in section 300. The established procedure for obtaining internal and external written evaluative input must be followed and is given in section 413.2.

When preparing data for demonstration of effectiveness and excellence in outreach and public service, all review letters from students, faculty, peers, and professional colleagues must be requested by the Chair of the College of Nursing Formal Review Committee and must not be solicited by the reviewee.

A. Retention Reviews at the Ranks of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor

Evaluative Category: Outreach/Public Service

Retention standards for retention of faculty members in their third year of service are “(a) effectiveness in the performance of their responsibilities, promise of continuing effectiveness, and if appropriate to the level of review, the promise of attainment of the standards for tenure and promotion, as demonstrated by a clear progression of accomplishment” [FH 640].

When preparing data for demonstration of effectiveness and excellence in outreach and public service, all review letters from students, faculty, peers, and professional colleagues must be requested by the Chair of the College of Nursing Formal Review Committee and must not be solicited by the reviewee.

Documentation Category: Effectiveness in Outreach/Public Service

To determine a faculty member’s effectiveness in outreach/public service, the NFRC will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that address the reviewee’s contributions and/or potential for future contributions in outreach and public service. Input must be related to the College criteria and standards of effectiveness in outreach and public service.
2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from two faculty colleagues that addresses committee work or work in the faculty organization. Input must be related to service criteria and standards of effectiveness in outreach and public service.
3. Written evaluative input from professional colleagues (internal or external review letters) that addresses the reviewee’s outreach and public service. Input must relate to the College criteria and standards of effectiveness in outreach and public service.
4. In-depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee’s strengths and limitations in relation to outreach and public service. Include a “vision” statement of reviewee’s outreach/public service activities with a specific plan for sustaining effectiveness in outreach and public service.

B. Review for Tenure and/or Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor

Evaluative Category: Outreach/Public Service

Standards for tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are “(a) demonstrated and sustained effectiveness in the performance of their responsibilities in the three areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service appropriate to the assignment as set forth in the letter of hire and role statements, (b) demonstrated potential for sustained effectiveness in each of these areas in the future, and (c) demonstrated potential for achieving excellence in teaching and/or research/creative activity.” (FH 651).

Documentation Category: Sustained Effectiveness in Outreach/Public Service

To determine a faculty member's sustained effectiveness in outreach/public service, the NFRC will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee's contributions and/or potential for future contributions in outreach and public service. This input must be related to the College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in outreach and public service.
2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from two faculty colleagues that addresses the reviewee's leadership in the College of Nursing and/or University through committee work and/or participation in related work of the faculty organization.
3. Written evaluative input from two professional colleagues (internal or external review letters) that addresses the reviewee's contribution to a professional organization and the community. Input must be related to College criteria and standards of sustained effectiveness in outreach and public service.
4. In-depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee's strengths and limitations in relation to outreach/public service. Include a "vision" statement of reviewee's outreach/public service activities with a specific plan for sustaining effectiveness in outreach and public service.

Documentation Category: Excellence/Potential for Excellence in Outreach/Public Service

To determine a faculty member's excellence/potential for excellence in outreach/public service, the NFRC will consider:

1. Written evaluative annual reviews from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee's contributions and/or potential for future contributions in outreach and public service. Input must be related to College criteria and standards of excellence or potential for excellence in outreach and public service.
2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from three faculty colleagues that addresses the reviewee's leadership in the College of Nursing and/or University through committee work and/or participation in related work of the faculty organization. Input must be related to College criteria and standards of excellence or potential for excellence in outreach and public service.
3. Written evaluative input from two professional colleagues (internal or external review letters) that addresses the reviewee's leadership roles and significant contributions to a professional organization at state and national levels. Input must be related to College criteria and standards of excellence or potential for excellence in outreach and public service.

--OR--

Internal or external review letters from two professional colleagues that address the reviewee's leadership and significant contributions to public/community or government service or potential for leadership and significant contributions. Input must be related to College

criteria and standards of excellence or potential for excellence in outreach and public service. (See 413.2 for the established procedure for obtaining internal and external reviews).

4. In-depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee's strengths and limitations in relation to outreach/public service. Include a "vision" statement of reviewee's outreach/public service activities with a specific plan for achieving and/or sustaining excellence in outreach and public service.

243.3 Department Policies and Procedures

Not Applicable

SECTION 300 STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, RETENTION AND TENURE

300 RESPONSIBILITY TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS

Departments and colleges will establish specific criteria for the review of faculty performance. [FH 632.00]

Departments and colleges shall establish standards for retention, tenure and/or promotion that are no less rigorous than those described below. [FH 633.00]

310 RETENTION AND SPECIAL REVIEW

Faculty members are formally reviewed for retention in their third year of appointment.

Faculty may also be reviewed at times other than those required for third year, tenure, and promotion. A special review may be recommended to the President by the department review committee, department head, college review committee, college dean, University Promotion and Tenure Committee or the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

If the recommendation is accepted by the President, he or she shall initiate a special review by sending a written notice to the faculty member. The notice of special review shall set forth the nature of the review and identify appropriate deadlines for its conduct. A special review shall be conducted by the departmental review committee or by a special review committee composed of academic faculty. [FH 615.00]

310.1 University Standards for Retention

The University-wide standards for retention of faculty members are:

- A. effectiveness in the performance of their responsibilities,*
- B. promise of continuing effectiveness, and*
- C. if appropriate to the level of review, the promise of attainment of the standards for tenure and promotion, as demonstrated by a clear progression of accomplishment. [FH 640.00]*

310.2 College Standards for Retention

The College standards for retention are the same as the University standards.

310.3 Department Standards for Retention

Not Applicable

320 TENURE

Faculty members will be reviewed for tenure in their sixth year (or equivalent year if credited for prior service) of full-time service in a tenurable position. No more than three (3) years of full-time service at another institution may be credited toward determining the sixth year of service. The amount of creditable

prior service is determined at the time of initial appointment and must be confirmed in writing by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

A faculty member's tenure review scheduled for the sixth year may be extended for good cause under exigent circumstances upon the approval of the faculty member's department head, college dean, and Provost. Extension may be granted for no more than two years and must be agreed to in writing by all parties. [FH 613.00]

321 STANDARDS FOR TENURE

321.1 Standards for Faculty with Instructional Expectations

A. University Standards

The University-wide standards for the award of tenure to faculty with instructional expectations are:

- 1. demonstrated and sustained effectiveness in the performance of their responsibilities in the three areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service, appropriate to the assignment as set forth in the letter of hire and role statements,*
- 2. demonstrated potential for sustained effectiveness in each of these areas in the future, and*
- 3. demonstrated potential for achieving excellence in teaching and/or research/creative activity. [FH 651.00]*

B. College Standards

The College standards for tenure are the same as the University standards.

C. Department Standards

Not Applicable

321.2 Standards for Faculty with Professional Practice Expectations

A. University Standards

The University-wide standards for tenure for faculty with professional practice expectations are:

- 1. demonstrated and sustained effectiveness in the performance of the responsibilities of the assignment as set forth in the letter of hire and the role statements,*
- 2. demonstrated potential of sustained effectiveness in the future, and*
- 3. demonstrated potential for achieving excellence in at least one of the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, or service, appropriate to the responsibilities of the assignment. [FH 652.00]*

B. College Standards

Not Applicable

C. Department Standards

Not Applicable

330 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION

Faculty members may be appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor depending upon their qualification, thus University-wide standards for appointment and promotion vary by rank. [FH 660.00]

Normally, promotion is awarded after the completion of no fewer than five (5) years of service, which is generally considered the minimum time needed to meet the standards for promotion described in 660.00 and in the college and department documents.

Faculty who believe they have met the department, college, and University criteria and standards for promotion and wish to be considered for promotion should submit a formal request for consideration to the department head and department review committee. The department head may also request a faculty member to submit materials for promotion. Since promotion, except in cases of automatic review with tenure, is optional, a faculty member may withdraw his or her materials from further consideration at any time during the review process. [FH 614.00]

331 STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

331.1 Standards for Faculty with Instructional Expectations

A. University Standards

To be appointed as an Assistant Professor, a faculty member with instructional expectations shall, at a minimum, have:

- 1. a terminal degree appropriate to the field or department,*
- 2. demonstrated potential to teach at the undergraduate and/or graduate levels, and*
- 3. qualifications to conduct research/creative activity in a specialized field. [FH 661.01]*

B. College Standards

In addition to the University standards, the College requires:

- 1. a master's degree in nursing and a doctoral degree in nursing or related field,*
- 2. a Montana professional nursing license in good standing obtained prior to assuming teaching responsibilities,*
- 3. if appropriate to assignment per letter of hire, evidence of clinical competence to deliver effective nursing care as documented in the candidate's record of education, experience, and professional development, and*
- 4. qualifications to conduct research and creative activity that is relevant to nursing.*

C. Department Standards

Not Applicable

331.2 Standards for Faculty with Professional Practice Expectations

A. University Standards

To be appointed as an Assistant Professor, a faculty member with professional practice expectations shall, at a minimum, have:

1. *a terminal degree appropriate to the field or department, and*
2. *demonstrated potential to carry out the primary duties of his or her assignments.* [FH 661.02]

B. College Standards

Not Applicable

C. Department Standards

Not Applicable

332 STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

A candidate of Assistant Professor rank shall be expected to be approved for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor simultaneously, unless Associate Professor rank has been previously awarded. [FH 662.00]

332.1 Standards for Faculty with Instructional Expectations

A. University Standards

To be appointed as an Associate Professor, a faculty member with instructional expectations shall, at a minimum, have:

1. a terminal degree appropriate to the field or department,
2. a record of demonstrated and sustained effectiveness in each of the three areas of teaching, research/creative activity and service, appropriate to the assignment as set forth in the letter of hire and role statements, and
3. demonstrated potential for achieving excellence in teaching and/or research/creative activity. [FH 662.01]

B. College Standards

In addition to the University standards, the College requires:

1. a master's degree in nursing and a doctoral degree in nursing or related field,
2. a Montana professional nursing license in good standing obtained prior to assuming teaching responsibilities,
3. if appropriate to assignment per letter of hire, evidence of clinical competence to deliver effective nursing care as documented in the candidate's record of education, experience and professional development and
4. qualifications to conduct research and creative activity that is relevant to nursing.

C. Department Standards

Not Applicable

332.2 Standards for Faculty with Professional Practice Expectations

A. University Standards

To be appointed as an Associate Professor, a faculty member with professional practice expectations shall, at a minimum, have:

1. *a terminal degree appropriate to the field or department,*
2. *a record of demonstrated and sustained effectiveness in the primary responsibilities of the assignment as set forth in the letter of hire and role statements,*
3. *demonstrated potential for the achievement of excellence in at least one of the three areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service. [FH 662.02]*

B. College Standards

Not Applicable

C. Department Standards

Not Applicable

333 STANDARDS FOR APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF PROFESSOR

333.1 Standards for Faculty with Instructional Expectations

A. University Standards

To be appointed as a Professor, a faculty member with instructional expectations shall, at a minimum, have:

1. *a terminal degree appropriate to the field or department,*
2. *a record of demonstrated and sustained effectiveness in each of the three areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service, appropriate to the assignment, and*
3. *a record of excellence in teaching and/or research/creative activity. [FH 663.01]*

B. College Standards

In addition to the University standards, the college requires:

1. a master's degree in nursing and a doctoral degree in nursing or a related field,
2. a Montana professional nursing license in good standing obtained prior to assuming teaching responsibilities,
3. if appropriate to assignment per letter of hire, evidence of clinical competence to deliver effective nursing care as documented in the candidate's record of education, experience, and professional development, and
4. qualifications to conduct research and creative activity that is relevant to nursing.

C. Department Standards

Not Applicable

333.2 Standards for Faculty with Professional Practice Expectations:

A. University Standards

To be appointed as a Professor, a faculty member with professional practice expectations shall, at a minimum, have:

1. *a terminal degree appropriate to the field or department,*
2. *a record of demonstrated and sustained effectiveness in the primary duties of their assignment,*
3. *a record of excellence in at least one of the three areas of teaching, research/creative activity, or service as demonstrated by recognition of the outstanding nature of the*

candidate's contributions to the public, the discipline and/or profession from peers outside the University. [FH 663.02]

B. College Standards

Not Applicable

C. Department Standards

Not Applicable

SECTION 400 PROCEDURES FOR FORMAL REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

“Substantive review” means weighing all of the evidence in the dossier, including the rationales provided by preceding reviews, and making a retention, promotion, and/or tenure decision based upon the criteria and standards of the candidate’s department (if applicable) and college, and the university. Beyond this, substantive review has different implications at the various levels of review. [FH 802.00]

400 GENERAL PROCEDURES

The review of individual faculty is initiated at the primary level, where the relevant disciplinary expertise is located, and is then carried to the college and University levels, where successively broader perspectives are employed. [FH 603.05]

401 REVIEW BASED ON EVALUATION OF TOTAL PERFORMANCE

Third year, tenure and promotion reviews are based upon cumulative performance in each area (teaching, research/creative activity, and service) over the total period preceding review. In contrast, annual reviews assess the faculty member’s performance averaged over all areas within a year. Thus, a record of having met performance expectations as indicated by Annual Reviews does not necessarily guarantee the candidate has assembled and demonstrated a cumulative record that meets the standards for retention, tenure or promotion. [FH 611.00]

402 MANDATED CONTENTS OF DOCUMENTS

The criteria, standards and procedures documents of the department and college shall, at a minimum, contain the following information:

- A. The criteria and standards used to assess faculty members’ contributions to the role of the department and evaluate their performance (effectiveness, excellence, promise of excellence) in their assigned responsibilities and in teaching, research/creative activity, and service, according to the type and level of review. (See Section 200 above.)*
- B. Any quantitative and qualitative expectations in terms of job performance, teaching, research/creative activity, and/or service. (See Section 300 above.)*
- C. The procedures used in selecting the membership of review committees. (See Sections 413.1 and 415.1 below.)*
- D. The department’s designation as to courses and presentations which are to be evaluated using student evaluation forms and the evaluation instruments to be used. (See 241 above.)*
- E. A description of the methods, in addition to student evaluations, to be used to obtain formal, in-depth assessment of a faculty member’s teaching performance. (See 241 above.)*
- F. The type of materials accepted or required in the documentation of research and creative activities and of outreach and public service. (See 242 above.)*

- G. *The dates and times of review. (See 412 below.)*
- H. *The procedures for obtaining outside peer reviews and soliciting internal letters of support/evaluation. (See 243. above and 415.3 below.)*
- I. *The methods for designating and handling confidential materials. [See 415.2 below.] [FH 623.00]*

410 PROCEDURES FOR THE CONDUCT OF FORMAL REVIEWS OF FACULTY

The formal review of academic faculty supports the mission and goals of Montana State University-Bozeman and assists faculty in meeting the expectations of the institution. Formal review for retention, tenure and/or promotion shall be conducted according to the procedures outlined in this section.

Third year, tenure, promotion, and, unless otherwise specified, special reviews are conducted on the following levels:

Primary Level of Reviews

Primary Review Committee [NFRC] and Primary Administrative Reviews [Campus Director]

These reviews include reviews by a department committee and department head except in the case of colleges without department, then the college review committee and dean perform the primary reviews.

Intermediate Level of Reviews

There is always a college review committee and college dean. But, when a college has no department, there is no intermediate level of review.

Final Level of Reviews (FH 810:00)

Final Review Committee (UTP Committee), Provosts and President's Review

These specific definitions are in section [FH 802:00]

“Primary Level of Review”. The reviewers at the primary level are charged with the responsibility of evaluating the quality and significance of the candidate’s teaching, research and/or creative works, and service. The reviewers base their evaluations on their own knowledge of the field and the input provided by the internal and external peer reviewers. They communicate the results of their evaluation to later reviewers through their written rationale.

“Intermediate Level of Review”. The rationales provided by primary reviewers and the input from internal and external peer reviewers serve as the primary evidence used to determine the quality and significance of the candidate’s research and/or creative works. The reviewers at the intermediate level are further charged with making equitable retention, promotion, and tenure decisions across all departments, given the departmental and college standards.

“Final Level of Review”. The rationales provided by previous reviewers and the input from internal and external peer reviews serve as the primary evidence used to determine the quality and significance of the candidate’s research and/or creative works. The reviewers at the final level are further charged with making equitable retention, promotion, and tenure decisions across all colleges and departments, given the departmental, college and university standards. [FH 802.00]

411 MANDATORY CONSIDERATIONS AT ALL LEVELS OF REVIEW

In conducting the review, [promotion and tenure committees of the college and department] shall at a minimum, consider the following:

- A. *the dossier submitted by the candidate and the recommendations of each preceding level of review,*
- B. *the University criteria and standards described above,*
- C. *the previously approved role and scope, criteria and standards document of the department and college,*
- D. *the letter of hire and any subsequent faculty role statements, including any differential staffing/differential assignment, and*
- E. *in cases of review for promotion and tenure, the written evaluations of external and internal peer reviewers if applicable. [FH 811.00]*

412 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COLLEGE DEAN

The college dean, when serving as the administrative reviewer at the intermediate level of review, shall review all submitted materials, provide any required materials, conduct an independent and substantive review of the candidate’s dossier and make recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and/or promotion in accordance with [FH 811.00.] The recommendation shall include a written rationale or statement of concurrence. If the intermediate level administrator’s recommendation does not concur with those of the primary review committee or the primary administrative reviewer, the administrator’s rationale must explain the point(s) of difference, i.e., the reason for the nonconcurrence. [FH816.00]

The college dean is also responsible for:

- A. Informing faculty members, committee members, and department heads of the applicable time lines for review.
- B. Providing the intermediate review committee with information and materials essential to their deliberations, according to college and University policies and procedures. [E-1]
- C. Forwarding the candidate’s dossier, with her or his recommendations, to the UPT Committee and sending a copy of the written recommendation to the candidate. [FH 816.00]

- D. The dean will announce the deadlines for submission of retention and/or promotion material with sufficient lead time to begin preparing documentation, ordinarily by the end of Spring semester. [E-1]

Retention reviews occur in the fall of the third year of employment and are based upon no fewer than three (3) preceding semesters' activities [FH 610].

Review for tenure occurs in the Autumn of the faculty member's sixth year ("or equivalent year if credited for prior service") of full-time service in a tenurable position [FH 613].

All review materials are due to the Nursing Formal Review Committee in early Autumn. Exact dates are provided in advance. Deadlines are strictly enforced.

Nursing Formal Review Committee (NFRC)

- A. Reviews will be concluded no later than 45 days preceding the published dates for submission of College and Dean's materials to the office of the Provost. The NFRC Chair will be responsible for publishing College review dates and informing reviewees and reviewers of deadlines for submission of materials. [E-1]

413 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PRIMARY REVIEW COMMITTEE (NFRC)

"Each department or college without departments shall establish a "primary review committee" to consider the dossier submitted by each candidate for review and formulate its recommendation for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. Primary review committees shall conduct a fair, objective, independent, and substantive review of the candidates' dossiers based on department, college, and university criteria and standards.

413.1 Membership and Procedures for Selection

Each department (or college) shall establish the policies and procedures for appointing and/or electing the primary review committee. The college review committee shall be composed only of tenured or tenurable faculty, at least a majority of whom shall be elected by college faculty. A department head may serve on the committee only if elected by the department (or college). The committee shall have twenty-five (25%) female and/or minority representation whenever possible. [FH813]

No faculty member shall serve on the committee during the review of her or his own dossier.

The primary administrative reviewer may be present at committee meetings, at the discretion of the committee. The administrator may present data that is essential to the committee's deliberations but shall not be present when the committee votes. [FH 813.01]

The College of Nursing Faculty Organization Bylaws establishes the membership and procedures for selection of the Nursing Formal Review Committee.

- A. The NFRC will consist of three (3) faculty members elected from the tenured faculty and two (2) tenured faculty appointed by the Dean. The Dean, in consultation with the Chair of the Nursing Formal Review Committee (NFRC), appoints two additional tenured faculty members for each person being reviewed. The Dean's appointments will attempt to achieve a broad representation of faculty in the College, as well as representation of the specialty of the

reviewee (if not represented among the elected members). The Dean's appointments shall be announced following selection.

- B. No faculty member shall serve for more than two consecutive terms.
- C. The Chair is selected by the elected members of NFRC.
- D. The Chair of the previous year is responsible for orienting the incoming Chair.
- E. Elections for NFRC are held annually.
- F. No faculty member may serve on the NFRC during the year of the review of his or her own dossier.
- G. The Campus Director may be present at NFRC meetings, at the discretion of the committee, to present data that is essential to the committee's deliberations but shall not be present when the committee votes.

(From College of Nursing Bylaws, Article IX, Nursing Formal Review Committee)

413.2 Procedures of the Committee

The primary review committee shall review all submitted materials, provide any required materials, and solicit and obtain additional materials it deems necessary to make a fair, objective, independent, thorough and substantive review of the candidate's qualifications in accordance with 811.00. The committee shall prepare its written recommendation concerning retention, tenure, and/or promotion of each candidate. This recommendation shall include a rationale explaining the reasons for the decision, vote tally, and will be forwarded to the primary administrative reviewer with a copy sent to the candidate. The recommendation becomes a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel files maintained in the department or college offices. [FH 813.00]

Confidentiality is maintained by all those involved throughout the review process.

- A. All materials related to the formal review process are submitted to the Dean's Administrative Assistant.
 - < A reviewee's dossier may be sent to the primary and secondary reviewers from NFRC prior to the review meeting.
 - < A reviewee's supplemental materials are kept in the office of the Dean's Administrative Assistant and can be signed out to NRFC members the day before and day of the review meeting.
- B. All data submitted by the reviewee are returned following completion of all levels of review.
- C. One copy of the dossier with review materials is retained by the College of Nursing Dean's Office. Review materials include:
 - UPTC recommendation (letter from Provost)
 - Dean's recommendation
 - Campus Director's review and recommendations
 - Nursing Formal Review Committee (NFRC) recommendation (letter from NFRC Chair)
 - NFRC justification
 - Curriculum vitae
 - Self-evaluation by reviewee

- Summarized student course evaluation data
- Letters submitted for the review

- D. Internal and external review letters are maintained separately and confidentially in the Dean's Office after the review is completed.
- E. The chair of the NFRC submits a full list of solicited internal and external reviewer names as a preamble to the "Peer Review" section of the dossier at the time of the committee review meeting. This list indicates those letters submitted for specific solicitation and the area of review requested. Letters from "general faculty solicitation" are also identified.
- F. The review material, except for letters, is available to the reviewee upon request.
- G. Access to the complete set of review materials is limited to the Campus Director, Dean of the College of Nursing, Provost, and President, and appropriate review committees (NFRC and the UPTC) based on need to know.
- H. Letters are released to appropriate parties in a summary or other form that satisfies confidentiality, if necessitated by grievance and/or legal procedure.

Establishing Procedures for Obtaining External Peer Reviews

Each department (or college) shall establish the specific procedures by which external peer reviews shall be conducted. When required, peer reviews shall be obtained from no fewer than three (3) external reviewers, the majority of whom shall be recommended by the department committee, the minority of whom shall be recommended by the candidate. [FH 813.03]

The reviewee submits a list of five individuals who are appropriate to serve as external peer reviewers, based on type of review and rank, to the Chair of NFRC no later than 60 days prior to the date of review. The reviewee provides the address, e-mail address, and telephone number for each individual and specifies 2 of the 5 as preferred external reviewers. The reviewee also identifies the specific area for which each reviewee is qualified (i.e. Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, or Outreach/Public Service). The Committee selects at least one individual preferred by the reviewee. The NFRC selects additional external reviewers from the list provided by the reviewee or from persons deemed appropriate by the committee. One individual may address more than one area of review.

The NFRC Chair contacts potential external reviewers to ascertain their commitment to completing the proposed review in one or more areas within the specified timeframe. The Chair of the NFRC solicits a commitment from external reviewers with a standard message (letter or e-mail) which includes the request for a commitment to do the review and the specified area(s), the date the criteria and materials will be sent to the reviewer, and the completion date for the review. After an external reviewer has agreed to complete a review, the NFRC Chair notifies the Dean's Administrative Assistant to send the review materials for the designated area(s) to the reviewer.

Establishing Procedures for Obtaining Internal Reviews

Each department (or college) shall establish the specific procedures by which letters of support and/or internal reviews by students, staff, and other faculty shall be obtained. Candidates shall not solicit letters of support or internal reviews for themselves. [FH 813.04]

Internal Review Letters (including clinical agency/professional colleagues):

The reviewee submits a list of five individuals who are appropriate to serve as internal peer reviewers, based on type of review and rank, to the Chair of NFRC no later than 45 days prior to the date of review. The list includes the name, e-mail address, and telephone number for each individual and specifies the area of review (i.e. Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, or Outreach/Public Service). The reviewee submits at least 1 individual for each category (Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Outreach/Public Service) and identifies 2 of the 5 as her/his preferred reviewers. The NFRC selects at least one individual preferred by the reviewee and selects additional internal reviewers from the list provided by the reviewee or from persons deemed appropriate by the committee. One individual may address more than one area of review.

The NFRC Chair contacts potential internal reviewers to ascertain their commitment to completing the proposed review in one or more areas within the specified timeframe. The Chair of the NFRC solicits a commitment from internal reviewers with a standard message (letter or e-mail) which includes the request for a commitment to do the review and the specified area(s), the date the criteria and materials will be sent to the reviewer, and the completion date for the review. After an internal reviewer has agreed to complete a review, the NFRC Chair notifies the Dean's Administrative Assistant to send the review materials for the designated area(s) to the reviewer.

The reviewee should identify the specific category for which each reviewee is qualified (e.g., teaching--faculty, teaching--students, clinical agency colleagues, community-based professionals, etc.) The NFRC selects internal reviewers, clinical agency reviewers, and other professional colleague reviewers from the names provided by the reviewee or from persons deemed appropriate by the committee. (The committee may consult with the reviewee's Campus Director or the Dean regarding this selection process.) At least one reviewee-recommended reviewer will be included for each category.

Student Evaluative Input: The reviewee is to submit student evaluative data from each course taught in which the faculty member had a major role (i.e., lead faculty, greater than or equal to one third of didactic course content, or supervisor of one or more clinical groups). These data should include both quantitative scores and qualitative comments from the Knapp teaching evaluation form. The reviewee is expected to summarize these evaluative data by means of tables, graphs, narratives, etc., and to provide all raw data. Guest lecture evaluations may also be addressed (see section 240).

Campus Director Annual Administrative Reviews: The Campus Director prepares annual administrative reviews (See Section 500) which the candidate places in the dossier prior to its submission for NFRC review.

Additional Solicitation: No later than 45 days prior to the date of the College review, the Chair of the Nursing Formal Review Committee will solicit input from faculty members in the College (general solicitation) by means of a notice of all individuals being considered for review and the type of review (retention, tenure, or promotion). Faculty within the College may submit written input regarding any reviewee. The input provided must specifically address the College's published criteria for teaching, research, and/or service and must be objective and based upon direct observation or experience.

Additional College Review Procedures (See Addendum Flow chart)

- A. The Nursing Formal Review Committee (NFRC) Chair appoints the primary and secondary reviewers. An attempt will be made to have either a primary or secondary reviewer in the same specialty area as the reviewee.

- B. The NFRC collects material for the dossier in the area of “in-depth assessment of teaching.” The NFRC identifies such evidence to solicit from peers, students, alumni or colleagues which will provide sufficient evidence for substantive review. (See 413.2.C)
- C. The Chair informs the reviewee of the committee’s recommendations.
- D. Materials shall be reviewed by committee members prior to the NFRC review meeting. Primary and secondary reviewers may have early access to the materials in order to write a substantive report.
 - 1. All materials are to be considered in strict confidence. Committee members are not to discuss reviewees with non-committee members or with committee members outside of formal proceedings.
 - 2. All review materials are to be returned to the Dean’s Administrative Assistant at the conclusion of the review process.
- E. The report by the primary reviewer shall commence the discussion. The secondary reviewer adds further commentary. All comments must be based upon submitted written data. Any inference, hearsay, or unfounded statements shall be retracted by the speaker. Other committee members comment following these individual reports. Following discussion, additional information may be requested from the Campus Director or Dean if present.
- F. After the discussion is completed, the primary reviewer makes a recommendation. The chair will distribute ballots to the voting members. Voting occurs by closed written ballot. After each member has voted, the Chair and one other committee member will tabulate the vote and report the tally to the committee. The Chair destroys the ballots.
- G. *In the event of a split vote on a recommendation, the written rationale from NFRC should provide supporting information for both the favorable and unfavorable votes. If a reviewer’s recommendation does not concur with the recommendation for the primary review committee (NFRC) or recommendation of the primary administrative reviewer, the rationale must explain the point(s) of difference, i.e. the reason for the non-concurrence. [FH 802]*
- H. On the first working day following the committee’s decision, the Chair notifies the reviewee orally of the committee’s recommendation. The written recommendation, justification, and vote tally are forwarded by the Chair to the reviewee and the Campus Director in a timely manner (within two weeks) and added to the candidate’s dossier.
- I. The Campus Director reviews the candidates dossier, the NFRC’s recommendation and justification and forwards her/his recommendation and justification to the reviewee on the first working day following this the CD’s review. The Dean and the reviewee receive the written recommendation and justification in a timely manner (within two weeks), and the review is added to the candidate’s dossier.
- J. The Dean reviews the NFRC’s and the Campus Director’s recommendations and justification and conducts an independent review. If the Dean does not concur with these recommendations, the reasons for nonconcurrence, based on the College Criteria and Standards, shall be provided to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Provost, the Campus Director, the

Nursing Formal Review Committee and the reviewee.

413.3 Procedures for Electing College Representatives to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee

Election will be conducted in compliance with College of Nursing Bylaws.

- A. The Nominating Committee shall prepare a slate of candidates for the offices to be filled at the annual meeting.
- B. Nominees will be solicited to fill positions requested by the MSU Faculty Council.
- C. The Faculty President shall set dates of elections annually.
- D. The Faculty President shall appoint the tellers.
- E. Officers will be determined by a majority of those faculty members present and voting. There shall be no absentee or proxy votes.
- F. In the event of a no-majority vote, the run-off will be among the top three. The run-off vote will be determined by plurality.
- G. In the event the College's representative to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee resigns, College Council will appoint a tenured faculty member (Associate or Full Professor) to assume the vacancy until the next regular election.

(From College of Nursing Bylaws, Article VII, Nominating Committee/Elections)

NOTE: THE COLLEGE OF NURSING DOES NOT HAVE DEPARTMENTS. THE FOLLOWING RESPONSIBILITIES ARE THOSE OF THE COLLEGE DEAN, CAMPUS DIRECTOR, OR NURSING FORMAL REVIEW COMMITTEE.

414 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PRIMARY ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEWER (Campus Director at the College of Nursing)

The primary administrative reviewer shall review all submitted materials, provide any required materials, and conduct an independent and substantive review of the candidate's dossier and make recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and/or promotion, in accordance with 811.00. The recommendation shall include a written rationale. If the administrator's recommendation does not concur with that of the primary review committee, the administrator's rationale must explain the point(s) of difference, i.e., the reason of nonconcurrence.

The primary administrator is also responsible for:

- A. Accurately describing, in the initial letter of hire, the primary duties, responsibilities and conditions of employment, including the instructional or professional practice expectations of the appointment and years of credit toward tenure, of the faculty member.
- B. Informing the faculty member of the University, college, and department role and scope, criteria and standards documents which form the basis of formal review.
- C. Ensuring that each faculty member has a copy of the University, college, and department documents related to annual review, retention, tenure, and promotion.

Retention reviews are conducted in accordance with the criteria and standards in effect at the time of hire. Tenure and tenure-associated promotion reviews are conducted in accordance with the criteria and standards in effect at the start of the retention contract (i.e. the Fall semester following the award of retention).

The Campus Director insures that faculty receive a copy of the Role, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures for Formal Review of Faculty and is responsible for facilitating and orienting the candidate to the review process. This might include the suggestion of appropriate mentors as additional resources.

- D. Preparing role statements, after negotiation with the faculty member that accurately describe the faculty member's current responsibilities, including any agreement regarding differential assignments which have been approved by the dean and Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- E. Informing faculty members of the applicable time lines for review.

(Refer to section 412 for specific information on time lines for review.)

- F. Providing the department review committee with information and materials essential to their deliberations, according to department, college and University procedures.

The Campus Director performs formal annual reviews (See Section 500) which are placed in the dossier for deliberations by the NFRC. The Campus Director then performs an independent review as the first level of administrative review, immediately following the NFRC's peer review (See 413.2), and prior to the Dean's administrative review.

- G. Forwarding the candidate's dossier, including recommendation(s), to the college dean and sending a copy of the recommendation(s) to the candidate.
- H. Maintaining complete, accurate and up-to-date files on each faculty member including a copy of any dossier submitted for formal review. Primary administrators shall ensure that peer review letters have been removed from the dossier before placing it in the employee's personal file. [FH 814.00]

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING SECTION IS NOT APPLICABLE TO THE COLLEGE OF NURSING.
(See section 413 for the College of Nursing's review process.)

415 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE INTERMEDIATE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Each college that is not the primary level of review shall establish an "intermediate review committee" to consider the dossier submitted by each candidate and formulate its recommendation for retention, tenure, and/or promotion. The intermediate review committee shall review all submitted materials, provide any required materials, conduct a fair, objective, independent, and substantive review of the candidate's dossiers based on department, college, and University criteria and standards and make recommendations regarding retention, tenure or promotion, in accordance with 811.00. The recommendation shall include a written rationale. If the intermediate review committee's recommendation does not concur with those of the primary review committee or the primary administrative reviewer, the committee's rationale must explain the point(s) of difference, i.e., the reason for the nonconcurrency.

The intermediate review committee is also responsible for:

- A. Reviewing, making suggestions for modification, and approving the role and scope, criteria and standards documents of the departments.*
- B. Conducting the election for faculty representatives to the college and UPT Committees.*
- C. Preparing a written recommendation, with vote tally, concerning the retention, tenure, and/or promotion of each candidate for review. [FH 815.00]*

415.1 Membership

Each college shall establish the policies and procedures by which the membership of the committee shall be established. The intermediate review committee shall be composed only of tenured faculty, at least a majority of whom shall be elected by college faculty. A department head may serve on the committee only if elected by the college faculty. Whenever possible, the committee shall have at least 25% female and/or minority representation. If that representation is not achieved by elections the dean shall appoint such additional members as may be necessary to achieve that representation. No faculty member shall serve on the committee during the review of her or his own dossier.

The college dean may be present at committee meetings, at the discretion of the committee, to present data that is essential to the committee's deliberations; but shall not be present when the committee votes. [815.01]

415.2 Procedures

A department representative to an intermediate review committee shall not vote when a candidate from his or her department is reviewed. The representative may provide background information about the department but shall not express personal opinions about the candidate or the candidate's qualifications or experience.

The intermediate review committee:

- A. Prepares a written recommendation, with vote tally, concerning the retention, tenure, and/or promotion of each candidate, and*

- B. *Forwards the recommendation to the department head, sending a copy to the candidate. The recommendation becomes a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel files maintained in the dean's office. [FH 815.02]*

421 RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CANDIDATE TO SUBMIT DOSSIER

The candidate is responsible for preparing the dossier and making her or his case for retention, tenure, promotion, or favorable special review. Candidates shall submit to the primary review committee or primary administrative reviewer, a dossier, which shall include:

- A. *Curriculum vitae listing all teaching, research/creative activities and outreach/public service activities.*
- B. *A narrative self-evaluation or personal statement.*
- C. *Documentation of role, assignments, and performance including the letter or hire, any subsequent role statements or reassignments, and annual reviews and ratings.*
- D. *Information as to performance and accomplishments in teaching, research/creative activity, outreach/public service, and professional development, appropriate to the assignment.*
- E. *Candidates submit all the letters conveying MSU-Bozeman administrators' and committee's recommendations from the most recent formal review (is such has occurred within the past 7 years.) [FH 812.00]*

If appropriate to the assignment, the dossier shall also include a set of articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence that, in the candidate's judgment, represents his or her best efforts to advance the discipline or profession. This set of materials shall be sent to external peer reviewers.

The candidate should also provide supporting documentation including but not limited to publications, video and audio tapes, student-teacher evaluations, and other material separate from the dossier. During the review period, this supporting documentation shall be retained by the college dean and transmitted to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee upon request.

*The "Cover Sheet–Candidate's Dossier," available from the office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, shall be used as the cover page of the dossier.
[FH 812.00]*

Retention reviews are conducted in accordance with the criteria and standards in effect at the time of hire. Tenure and tenure-associated promotion reviews are conducted in accordance with the criteria and standards in effect at the start of the retention contract (i.e. the Fall semester following the award of retention). Ask your campus director for the most recent, approved and applicable version of the RoSCSaP document. When you submit your dossier, you must provide this document in the front pocket of the binder.

The aforementioned "Cover Sheet..." lists the material that should be included in the dossier submitted by the faculty candidate and sent to the Dean's office, namely:

- I. Review documents
 - II. Peer Reviews
 - III. In-depth Assessments (this section prepared by the NFRC)
 - IV. Curriculum vitae
 - V. Self-Evaluation
 - VI. Role, Assignment and Performance (include letter of hire)
 - VII. Teaching
 - VIII. Research and Creative Activity
 - IX. Outreach and Service
 - X. Professional Development
- Appendix. Supporting documentation (if provided, list on the reverse of the cover sheet)

Notebooks containing the materials for the dossier presented by the candidate are sent to the Dean's office. The material should include the dossier and additional documents such as solicited confidential letters.

At each level of review, the person responsible for the review signs and dates the cover sheet in the appropriate place.

Once the notebooks have been submitted to the Dean's office, no materials may be added or deleted except as requested by the NFRC.

All files are confidential.

The candidate should assemble the dossier in the form of a loose-leaf notebook containing a detailed table of contents that describes the contents of each section. Section dividers should be used to allow reviewers to locate specific sections easily. Appendices (in separate notebooks) may be used for supporting documentation that is voluminous or not essential for deliberations by the college committee. A summary page for such material should be included in the dossier and identified in the Table of Contents. Each appendix should be clearly labeled with the candidate's name and the general contents. Such material should be made available by the Dean's secretary on request of the UPT committee.

Faculty must limit their material to the binder specified as follows: Binder should be dark blue and 2 inches wide with white dividers. Tabs shall be clearly titled on the dividers. The notebook and divider tabs are available from the MSU Bookstore. Candidates must leave enough room in the binder for the subsequent review documents to be inserted. If adequate room in the binder is not provided for the addition of these materials or if the candidate submits material in a larger binder, the primary review committee should return the materials to the candidate for compliance with these guidelines. Supplementary materials are provided in a notebook or notebooks separate from the dossier.

421.1 Area of Excellence/Promise of Excellence

The candidate, in consultation with his or her primary administrator or primary review committee, is responsible for identifying the area of excellence/promise of excellence on which he or she will be evaluated and for including this information on the dossier cover sheet and in the Self-Evaluation/Personal Statement. The area of excellence/promise of excellence will normally be in whichever area (teaching or research) represents the candidate's greatest responsibilities. [FH 812.01]

The candidate is to submit to the Dean and the Chair of the NFRC the selected level of review as either “effectiveness” or “promise of excellence” or “excellence” as appropriate to the standards and criteria for the specific review. This notification is to occur no later than 60 days prior to the date of the NFRC review.

The reviewee is expected to prepare and submit an in-depth self-evaluation which addresses the reviewee’s teaching (including advising), research and creativity, and outreach and public service according to the college criteria and standards pertinent to the review.

421.2 Requests for Additional Documentation

A review committee or reviewing administrator requesting that additional materials be added to a candidate’s dossier shall notify the candidate of the request in writing and send copies of the request to all preceding review committees and reviewing administrators. If the request requires re-review of the candidate’s dossier with the additional materials, the notice shall so specify.

Any review committee or reviewing administrator may respond to the request for additional materials in writing within five days of receiving notice of the request. The responding committee or administrator shall send copies of the response to the candidate and preceding level(s) of review. Responses received within the specified time frames shall be added to the dossier and transmitted to the next level of review.

The candidate’s rights to respond are delineated in 471.05, 471.06, and 812.03. [FH 811.01]

421.3 Alterations to the Dossier

The candidate may not add to, alter, modify, delete or remove documents from his or her dossier once it has been submitted except by:

- A. updating the status of materials in support of tenure unknown at the time the dossier was submitted,*
- B. responding to a review committee’s or reviewing administrator’s request for additional materials or notice that materials in addition to those required by the role, scope, criteria, standards and procedures document have been added to the dossier, (See 471.05, 471.06 and 812.03, or*
- C. responding to a negative recommendation from the primary review committee and/or the primary administrative reviewer as set forth in 812.04. [FH 812.02]*

421.4 Procedures for Obtaining External Peer Reviews

Each department (or college) shall establish the specific procedures by which external peer reviews shall be conducted. When required, peer reviews shall be obtained from no fewer than three (3) external reviewers, the majority of whom shall be recommended by the primary review committee, the minority of whom shall be recommended by the candidate. [FH 813.03]

421.5 Procedures for Obtaining Internal Reviews

Each department (or college) shall establish the specific procedures by which letters of support and/or internal reviews by students, staff, and other faculty shall be obtained. Candidates shall not solicit letters of support for internal reviews for themselves. [FH 813.04]

421.6 Deadline for the Submission of Dossiers

Each candidate shall submit the dossiers by the dates established by the Provost, dean, and department head. Materials submitted after this date shall not be considered.

The candidate who fails to submit the dossier by the established deadline forfeits his or her opportunity for review. In cases of third year review, the faculty member who fails to submit a dossier shall receive notice of termination effective at the end of the academic year. In cases of tenure review or special review for retention, the faculty member shall be issued a terminal contract for the next contract term. [FH 472.02]

422 CANDIDATE'S RIGHT TO GRIEVE

- A. *A candidate who receives a negative recommendation from the primary review committee and/or the primary administrative reviewer may submit a response to the negative recommendation (See 471.04).*
- B. *The candidate may also respond to peer reviews. Within three working days from the date of receipt of the negative recommendation, the candidate may submit a written request to the primary administrative reviewer for a summary of all peer reviews contained in the dossier. The primary administrative reviewer shall have five working days from the date of receipt of the candidate's written request to compile the summary and forward it to the candidate. The summary should convey the substance of the peer review but must protect the identities of the reviewers (See 471.04).*
- C. *The candidate must submit his or her response to the negative recommendation(s) within five working days from the date of receipt of the negative recommendation(s) or peer review summary, whichever is later.*
- D. *The candidate's response to a negative recommendation shall be submitted to the next review committee or administrative reviewer.*

<u>Negative Recommendation from...</u>	<u>Respond to...</u>
<i>Primary Review Committee</i>	<i>Primary Administrative Reviewer</i>
<i>Primary Administrative Reviewer</i>	<i>Intermediate Review Committee,</i>
<i>Final Review Committee</i>	<i>Provost</i>

- E. *Responses shall be copied to the preceding level(s) of review and added to the dossier if received within the time frame set forth above. [FH 812.04]*

A candidate may attempt conciliation, or proceed directly to formal grievance, once he or she receives notice of a negative retention, tenure, or promotion decision from the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. (See 1312.00) [FH 820.01]

SECTION 500 ANNUAL REVIEW

500 PURPOSE OF ANNUAL REVIEW

Annual review assesses the faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year and is based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, role statements, annual assignments, self-assessment, and the department head's evaluation of the individual's performance. Reviews must be completed by April 10 or the date specified by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The annual review with ratings and any written appeals to the review shall be included in the candidate's personal file. [FH 711.00]

501 LETTER OF HIRE/FACULTY ROLE STATEMENT

The letter of hire identifies the instructional or professional practice expectations of the faculty member's appointment. The faculty member and the department head are responsible for developing, and updating as necessary, the Role Statement which identifies the broad responsibilities each faculty member is expected to perform. Any substantive changes in the expectations and/or the role of the faculty within the department must be approved by the dean, department head and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, after negotiation with the faculty member.

Annual reviews evaluate the faculty member's success in meeting expectations identified in the letter of hire and the role statement. [FH 712.00]

510 PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING ANNUAL REVIEWS

510.01 College Procedures

Annual reviews assess the faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year and are based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, role statements (see CON Policy A-5, Attachment #8), annual assignments, self-evaluation, annual and long-term goals, and the Campus Director's evaluation of the individual's performance.

- A. Annual reviews are based upon College of Nursing criteria.
- B. Individual goals shall be established annually by each faculty member in consultation with her/his Campus Director. The annual goals statement will be signed and dated by both the Campus Director and the faculty member. In the event that the faculty member's assignment in the College changes as a result of new opportunities or unforeseen difficulties, the goals statement may be amended. Any such changes shall be noted in writing and signed by the faculty member and the Campus Director.

If there is a disagreement regarding the goals statement, this should be noted by the Campus Director and/or faculty member at the time of signing. Appeal may be made to the College Dean.

- C. The faculty member's goals shall be congruent with the College's mission, administrative assignment, and own professional development. The faculty member is responsible for developing annual goals and her/his long-term professional objectives. The annual goals should lead one toward achieving the institutional goals of teaching, research/ creative activity, and service at a level appropriate to one's rank.

- D. A concise annual self-evaluation in relation to the established goals in performance areas should address the reviewee's strengths and areas for improvement. Supporting data (e.g., course syllabi, student course evaluations, manuscripts, etc.) should accompany the annual self-evaluation as appropriate.
- E. Annual evaluations are based upon established goals and in consideration of the reviewee's rank and annual assignment.
- F. Annual reviews of all faculty in the College shall occur prior to March 1 of each year and be based on data collected from the previous fall and spring semesters (and summer, if applicable). A faculty member in the first year of employment will be evaluated on the basis of performance in the previous fall semester.
- G. The Campus Director will initiate the annual review process and establish the time table and deadlines for her/his campus.
- H. The Campus Director reviews all data submitted and may obtain other data if needed.
- I. The annual evaluation is written by the Campus Director and shall identify the reviewee's strengths and areas for improvement. This written review is discussed with the faculty member. If there is disagreement, resolution should be sought. The final document is signed and dated by both participants. (The faculty signature indicates awareness, not necessarily agreement.) The faculty member receives a copy of the evaluation. The written evaluation is forwarded to the Dean by the Campus Director.
- J. If there is a disagreement which is unresolved, the faculty member has the right to forward a defense of her/his position to the Dean. If the disagreement is not resolved, the grievance procedure of the MSU--Bozeman Faculty Handbook may be followed.
- K. Copies of all annual evaluations for an individual will be maintained on the campus by the Campus Director, and maintained in the Dean's central files.
- L. If the faculty member does not receive a written annual evaluation by March 1, s/he has a right to bring the matter to the attention of the Campus Director in writing. If the Campus Director does not provide a written annual evaluation by March 15, a written request for a written annual evaluation may be presented to the Dean, and, if necessary, to the Provost.

510.02 Department Procedures

Not Applicable

NOTE: THE COLLEGE OF NURSING DOES NOT HAVE DEPARTMENTS. THE FOLLOWING RESPONSIBILITIES ARE THOSE OF THE COLLEGE CAMPUS DIRECTOR

511 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD

The department head campus director shall assign each faculty member the specific duties and responsibilities which meet department needs and enable the faculty member to fulfill the responsibilities of the position. The department head shall ensure that, taken collectively, the assignments of the faculty shall meet the department's and college's obligations to the University. The department head and the faculty member shall annually review the faculty member's role within the department and make any modifications as may be necessary, after consultation with the faculty member. Any substantial modification of the faculty member's role within the department must be approved by the department head, dean and Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, after consultation with the faculty member. [FH 721.00]

It is the responsibility of the Campus Director to assign specific duties and responsibilities which collectively meet the obligations of the College and University.

NOTE: In the College of Nursing, salary recommendations are the responsibility of the Dean with input from the Campus Directors.

511.1 Procedures for Making Salary Recommendations

Merit increases are based on the faculty member's performance as assessed in the annual review process. Salary recommendations are not guarantees; the faculty member's actual salary may be changed by the SRC, by the President, or the Board of Regents.

The department head shall submit a proposed salary recommendation for each faculty member to the non-departmental administrator, if applicable and the college dean for the academic department

In the case of Extension faculty, the salary recommendation is also sent to the Vice Provost and Director of Extension, and both the college dean for the academic department and the Vice Provost and Dean of Extension will, together, approve or modify the salary recommendation.

The salary recommendation is then submitted to the Salary Review Committee by the established deadline. Written notice of the salary recommendation will be given to the faculty member by the college dean of the academic department. [FH 722.00]

512 RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SALARY REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Salary Review Committee shall be appointed and charged according to FH 253.00. The Committee shall review all salary recommendations for conformity in the application of the standards of the University's salary administration plan and forward them to the President. [FH 722.01]

513 CANDIDATE'S RIGHTS RELATIVE TO ANNUAL REVIEW

Tenurable faculty shall be involved in the review of administrators [FH 730]

513.1 Right to Timely Review

A faculty member who is not reviewed or does not receive a copy of the written annual review with performance rating by April 11 may bring the matter to the attention of the dean. The faculty member should inform the dean in writing, no later than April 15. (See FH 461.00.) In the special case of a faculty member receiving an annual review after an unsatisfactory rating the previous year, the new written annual review with performance rating is due to the faculty member no later than March 15; this early deadline helps expedite the lengthy post-tenure review process (See Sec. 618.00).[FH 731]

513.2 Right to Appeal Annual Performance Evaluation

A faculty member who disagrees with a performance evaluation or rating should follow the procedures outlined in FH 462.00.

514 POST TENURE REVIEW OF FACULTY

Two consecutive "unsatisfactory" performance ratings on a faculty member's annual review initiates an assessment of the faculty member's most recent annual review by the faculty member's primary formal review committee and, if deemed appropriate by this committee, a Post-Tenure Review. [\[FH 618\]](#)

Modifications to the Role and Scope document relating to the College of Nursing were approved by the general faculty on March 23, 1998 and forwarded to the UPTC and the Office of Affirmative Action for review. Additional modifications as requested by the UPTC were approved by faculty of the CON May 8, 1998.

End of Nursing Formal Review Committee Responsibilities.

The following document was established as a policy and procedure for meeting the requirements for formal review of adjunct/contract faculty. Sections from the Role and Scope document pertaining to formal review of tenured and tenure-track faculty have been modified as appropriate to address the review process of adjunct/contract faculty.

ADDENDUM FOR ADJUNCT/CONTRACT FACULTY REVIEW

CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

“Criteria” are the variables examined in an evaluation. “Standards” are the levels or degrees of performance which measure success in meeting criteria. [FH 602.00]

CRITERIA FOR THE FORMAL REVIEW OF CONTRACT FACULTY PERFORMANCE

Master’s prepared nurses are employed on term contracts as adjunct faculty. The usual term of appointment is three years. The contract may be shortened by the College of Nursing if work performance is not satisfactory. Faculty members on term contracts may compete for their positions at the end of the contract period. Renewal of term contracts is competitive as part of the search process and is contingent on positive formal peer review in the third year of their fixed term and positive annual administrative reviews. [CON C6]. In summary, Montana State University College of Nursing - Bozeman (CON), through its C6 policy, requires three-year contract adjunct faculty to complete a formal review in the third year of their fixed term if the adjunct faculty wishes to compete for their position and another contract.

UNIVERSITY CRITERIA [Role & Scope, R&S, 200]

The University criteria on which adjunct/contract faculty performance will be reviewed are teaching and service.

TEACHING CRITERIA [R&S 211]

University Teaching Criteria

Teaching, the imparting of knowledge, skills, and abilities to learners, is the heart of the University’s mission. Faculty performance in teaching must be evaluated in terms of a wide range of criteria including course content and objectives, classroom effectiveness, student learning and achievement and student advising. This document challenges faculty and administrators to adopt rigorous strategies for the assessment of teaching performance, including peer, student and self-evaluations and student outcomes. [FH 603.02]

College and Clinical Teaching Criteria

Criteria to be examined relate to teaching that fosters critical thinking, develops creativity, and promotes socialization into the professional nursing role, including the development of professional competence and the acquisition of professional values. Teaching activities include classroom and clinical teaching, independent study, academic advisement, graduate thesis/project advising, and the mentoring of students. Teaching criteria will be evaluated in terms of:

- A. Course Development
 - 1. Development of course outline/syllabus
 - 2. Organization of learning activities
 - 3. Provision of resource materials
 - 4. Planning of teaching strategies
 - 5. Planning of learning activities
 - 6. Preparation of classroom/clinical teaching
 - 7. Development of objectives and standards
 - 8. Development of evaluation tools
 - 9. Revision and upgrading of courses

- B. Implementation of Course
 - 1. Orientation of students to courses
 - 2. Development of learning climate
 - 3. Content presentation
 - 4. Delivery of learning activities
 - 5. Recognition of level and needs of learner
 - 6. Coordination of clinical learning environment
 - 7. Role modeling of clinical behaviors
 - 8. Enthusiasm for student learning
 - 9. Risk-taking for student learning activities

- C. Evaluation of Students
 - 1. Utilization of clinical and classroom evaluation tools
 - 2. Feedback to students

- D. Student-Teacher Relationships
 - 1. Appropriate and professional student/faculty relationships including respect for students and demeanor conducive to student learning
 - 2. Emphasis on student accountability
 - 3. Promotion of independent thinking appropriate to curricular level
 - 4. Professional role modeling

- E. Advisement
 - 1. Communication of correct information
 - 2. Assistance with student self-assessment
 - 3. Appropriate and timely referral of students
 - 4. Availability to students
 - 5. Recognition of students' own responsibilities

- 6. Ability to Work as a Member of a Teaching Team
 - 1. Respectful collegial relationships
 - 2. Timely and appropriate communication with colleagues

OUTREACH/PUBLIC SERVICE CRITERIA [R&S 213]

University Criteria

Outreach and public service, the strategies through which the practical impacts of scholarship are made available to the state and nation, are essential to the University's Land Grant mission. This document calls upon faculty and their departments to revitalize their commitments to outreach and public service and challenges them to reward effectiveness and excellence in these activities. Departments and colleges shall establish procedures, criteria and standards for the evaluation of service, outreach, and consulting activities submitted for faculty review. [FH 602.03]

College Criteria

Criteria to be examined relate to outreach and public service that assist individuals, organizations, or communities in solving problems and/or fulfilling their mission or purpose through leadership, consultation, and information transfer. Service activities fall into three categories: (1) professional service, (2) public service, and (3) College and University service.

Documentation of service will include evidence of the faculty member's effectiveness in fulfilling service obligations as well as ability to work collaboratively with others. Outreach/public service criteria can be evaluated in terms of:

- A. Professional Service
 - 1. Contributions to the advancement of nursing and health care organizations--national, state, and local
 - 2. Consultation to nursing and health care groups
 - 3. Continuing education offerings
 - 4. Faculty practice which is defined as part of your faculty role (#4 is not part of R&S 213)

- B. Public/Community and Government Service
 - 1. Contributions to the advancement of health-related organizations
 - 2. Consultation to nursing and health care groups
 - 3. Health-related program development
 - 4. Contributions to the advancement of community organizations
 - a) Advocating health-related agendas
 - b) Implementing health-related projects
 - 5. Participation or leadership in:
 - a) Political activities related to national, state, and local issues associated with health and nursing education
 - b) Legislative activities that affect health and nursing education

C. University/College

1. Participation or leadership in University committees and functions
2. Active participation and/or leadership in the College's Faculty Organization, committees, and specialty groups
3. College service in the faculty role through consulting, guest lecturing, orienting, and/or mentoring

DEMONSTRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS [R&S 240]

Department and college criteria for potential renewal of adjunct/contract faculty may recognize differential staffing and allow for individual uniqueness in faculty assignments. Standards should not make all faculty perform alike, but commensurate quality must be expected for all equivalent reviews. [FH 622.00]

DEMONSTRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS IN TEACHING [R&S 241]

University Policy and Procedures

Effectiveness in teaching shall be demonstrated through evaluation by peers and colleagues within the University and through in-depth assessment of teaching performance, that draws upon current and former students, graduates, colleagues and clients. Candidates shall follow the methods for in-depth assessment of teaching performance established by the department. [FH 633.03]

College Policies and Procedures

Section 241.2 addresses documentation required to demonstrate effectiveness and excellence in the area of teaching appropriate to each level of review. Performance criteria are found in section 211. Performance standards related to “effectiveness” and “excellence” are found in sections 220, 221 and 231. The established procedure for obtaining internal written evaluative input must be followed and is given in section 413.2. When preparing data for demonstration of effectiveness and excellence in teaching, all review letters from students, faculty, peers, and professional colleagues must be requested by the Chair of the College of Nursing Formal Review Committee and must not be solicited by the reviewee.

A. Formal Reviews for the Adjunct/Contract Faculty

Evaluative Category: Teaching

Standards for potential contract renewal of adjunct faculty members in their third year of service include “effectiveness in the performance of their responsibilities.” [FH 640].

Documentation Category: Effectiveness in Teaching

1. Written evaluative input from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee’s teaching and advising activities. This input must be related to College criteria and standards of effectiveness in teaching.
2. Written evaluative input (internal review letters) from three faculty colleagues that addresses the reviewee’s teaching abilities. This input must be related to teaching criteria and standards of effectiveness. Overall, the input must address both classroom and clinical teaching and at least one of the faculty colleagues providing input must be in the same clinical specialty area as the faculty member.
3. Student evaluations of courses taught at MSU during the two years preceding the review. In those instances when the individual has done a substantial amount of

guest lecturing, evaluative data which have been solicited appropriately and anonymously from students may be included [FH 610].

4. Student evaluations of advising during the previous two years.
5. In depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee's strengths and limitations in relation to teaching and advising; analyzes previous evaluative input from student, peers, colleagues, and supervisor; discusses rationale for any identified teaching problems; and identifies specific strategies to improve areas of weakness in teaching. Include a "vision" statement of the reviewee's teaching with a specific plan for sustaining effectiveness in teaching.

DEMONSTRATION OF EFFECTIVENESS IN OUTREACH/PUBLIC SERVICE [R&S 243]

University Policy and Procedures

Effectiveness in service shall be demonstrated through evaluation by peers and colleagues within the University. [FH 633.03]

College Policies and Procedures

Section 243.2 addresses documentation required to demonstrate effectiveness in the area of outreach and public service. Performance standards related to “effectiveness” and “excellence” are found in sections 220, 221 and 231. The established procedure for obtaining internal and external written evaluative input must be followed and is given in section 413.2.

When preparing data for demonstration of effectiveness in outreach and public service, all review letters from students, faculty, peers, and professional colleagues must be requested by the Chair of the College of Nursing Formal Review Committee and must not be solicited by the reviewee.

A. Formal Reviews for the Adjunct /Contract Faculty

Evaluative Category: Outreach/Public Service

Standards for the potential contract renewal for adjunct faculty members in their third year of service is effectiveness in the performance of their responsibilities [FH 640].

When preparing data for demonstration of effectiveness in outreach and public service, all review letters from students, faculty, peers, and professional colleagues must be requested by the Chair of the College of Nursing Formal Review Committee and must not be solicited by the reviewee.

Documentation Category: Effectiveness in Outreach/Public Service

1. Written evaluative input from the Campus Director that addresses the reviewee’s contributions and/or potential for future contributions in outreach and public service. Input must be related to the College criteria and standards of effectiveness in outreach and public service.
2. Written evaluative input from (internal review letters) from two faculty colleagues that addresses committee work or work in the faculty organization. Input must be related to service criteria and standards of effectiveness in outreach and public service.
3. Written evaluative input from professional colleagues (internal or external review letters) that addresses the reviewee’s outreach and public service. Input must relate to the College criteria and standards of effectiveness in outreach and public service.
4. In-depth self-evaluation that identifies the reviewee’s strengths and limitations in relation to outreach and public service. Include a “vision” statement of reviewee’s outreach/public

service activities with a specific plan for sustaining effectiveness in outreach and public service.

Approved 5/10/01 General Faculty Mtg

CHECK LIST FOR FORMAL REVIEW OF ADJUNCT/CONTRACT FACULTY

- _____ Curriculum vitae
- _____ Self-evaluation by reviewee (related to teaching **and** service)
- _____ Summarized raw student data (from previous two years)
- _____ List of names for solicited references
 - A) 3 for teaching (at least one from specialty area)
 - B) 2 for service
- _____ Written evaluative input from professional colleagues that addresses outreach and public service
- _____ Teaching effectiveness data and materials requested by Nursing Formal Review Committee (NFRC)
eg. Syllabi, peer review, etc.

cbrooks 4/13/98

ADDENDUM

Policy E-1

Following are specific suggestions for the reviewee's preparation of data.

- a. The written self-evaluation should be clearly related to the long-term goals which the reviewee has developed.
- b. Reviewees are encouraged to include relevant sample materials in relation to each performance area (e.g. course syllabi and examinations, manuscripts published or submitted for publication, evaluations of in-service or CE presentations, etc.)
- c. Summarize numerical course evaluation data in an organized fashion (for example, summary sheets by course, showing the faculty member's mean as contrasted with the appropriate overall university mean). In instances where there is a large amount of numerical data (many years of teaching), a graph or other visual presentation may also be helpful.

It is helpful to present course evaluation data in chronological order, beginning with the most recent.

- d. Reviewees should solicit letters from students, colleagues, etc., at least several weeks prior to the deadline for their submission. It is helpful to provide clear information about the criteria which the reviewee wishes the letter writer to address and to emphasize the importance of letters in the review process.

Reviewees may wish to consult with the Campus Director or the Chair of the Formal Review Committee regarding a desirable format for requesting letters.

- e. Reviewees are encouraged to avoid including trivial data (e.g. greeting cards sent or received from students, etc.) and to avoid providing information on activities that are not clearly and directly related to the faculty/professional role (e.g. work in church or civic groups that is not tied to one's role as nurse, nurse educator, etc.).
- f. The reviewee is advised to carefully review her/his Faculty Data Base/Curriculum Vitae for accuracy and completeness prior to forwarding it to the Formal Review Committee.
- g. The reviewee retains ultimate responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of all materials submitted.