



## **Conditions of Faculty Service Guidelines**

### **For Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure**

#### **History:**

Initial draft—Distributed to faculty on 04/19/2017.

Revised draft—Distributed to faculty on 04/23/2017. Further revisions distributed 4/28/2017. Additional revisions distributed 5/4/2017. Final candidate distributed 5/11/2017. Adopted on 5/17/2017 with 25 yes votes, 0 no votes, and 1 abstention.

Revisions—Revisions in consultation with the Dean on 7/19/2017 and feedback from the Provost on 9/27/2017 and 1/5/2018.

Approval—Approved by Provost and Dean on 1/9/2018.

Adoption—Adopted by faculty on 1/21/2018 with 31 YES votes, 0 NO votes, and 0 Abstentions.

Appendix revisions—Appendices revised with additional guidelines for Statement of Expectations and Professional Review File preparation on 6/27/2018.

## **1 Principles and Values**

The School of Informatics, Computing, and Cyber Systems' (SICCS) mission is to excel in research, deliver high-quality, innovative academic programs that prepare our students for productive and rewarding careers, contribute to regional and national economic growth, and promote interdisciplinary learning, research, and service in a broad range of application areas, including human health, environmental sustainability, and cyber systems.

This document describes the School's faculty evaluation process in the context of Northern Arizona University (NAU) and College of Engineering, Informatics, and Applied Sciences (CEIAS) Conditions of Faculty Service guidelines, and emphasizes the School's commitment to excellence in scholarship, student success, and interdisciplinary collaboration in parallel to substantive engagement with service to the School, College, University, profession, and our local, State, national, and global communities.

While the aim of this document is to increase clarity of expectations, support review consistency, and promote constructive feedback to faculty, it is important to recognize that developing a fully objective set of evaluative criteria is both impossible and undesirable. As in all academic units, review processes must retain flexibility in balancing efforts to promote excellence in our mission, recognizing the diversity of faculty contributions, providing accountability, and demonstrating good stewardship of School, University, and State resources. Ultimately, the value of each faculty member's contributions remains a conversation among colleagues as our shared understanding of the School's mission and the diversity of each other's work grows—this document provides a supporting framework for this conversation.

## **2 Review Process Overview**

General University and College policies and procedures (including NAU's Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS), CEIAS's COFS, and CEIAS's Work Load Definitions and Assignments) govern and inform faculty evaluations in the School. Review processes are based on each faculty member's Statement of Expectations (SOE), Annual Faculty Performance Report (AFPR), and Professional Review File (PRF), with guidelines for these appearing in the appendices. A complete description of evaluation processes

appears in the NAU COFS. A short summary of evaluation processes, scheduled according to each academic year's Personnel Action Calendar (PAC), for tenure-eligible, tenured, and non-tenure eligible faculty along with relevant terminology appears below:

- *Annual Review:* All faculty members undergo this review of the previous academic year's performance; for first-year faculty, this review is additionally conducted after their first semester. Tenured faculty may undergo an expedited version of the annual review for no longer than five review cycles. Annual reviews result in a rating of Highly Meritorious, Meritorious, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory.
- *Retention Review:* Tenure-eligible faculty undergo this review to assess their eligibility for contract renewal and progress toward tenure. This review may either appear as a standalone review or included as a section of the annual review, but must be standalone on the third year of a faculty member's pre-tenure service. Retention reviews result in either "Recommended for Retention" or "Not Recommended for Retention."
- *Renewal Review:* Non-tenure eligible faculty undergo this review annually to assess their eligibility for contract renewal, which may appear explicitly or included as a section of the annual review. Renewal reviews result in either "Recommended as eligible for Renewal" or "Not Recommended as eligible for Renewal."
- *Promotion Review:* Tenured, tenure-eligible, and non-tenure eligible faculty undergo this review to assess their progress toward attaining the next rank for their position type. Promotion reviews result in either "Recommended for Promotion" or "Not Recommended for Promotion."
- *Tenure Review:* Tenure-eligible faculty undergo this review to assess their accomplishments for purposes of attaining tenure, usually coinciding with their promotion review during their sixth year in a tenure-eligible position. Tenure reviews result in either "Recommended for Tenure" or "Not Recommended for Tenure."

### **3 Criteria for Annual Reviews**

Annual review criteria provide the foundation for assessing student-related, scholarly, and service activities with a consideration of each faculty member's relative workload allocation in each area and based on full-time regular employment status. In addition to the responsibilities outlined in the following sections, all faculty are expected to: (a) be reasonably and consistently present and accessible on-campus during regular operating hours to accommodate student, School, College, and University needs that arise unexpectedly, as appropriate to each faculty member's specific duties; (b) promptly complete all University training relevant to student-related, scholarly, or service activities; and (c) maintain professional decorum in all interactions with SICCS students, faculty, and administrators and other University personnel.

#### **3.1 Student-related Activities**

The School aims to support high-quality academic programs that foster effective learning and academic and professional success for graduate and undergraduate students. Our emphasis on continuous improvement aims to ensure that our faculty use effective pedagogical methods, while our research enriches student experiences. The student-related activities indicated as specific criteria to be used in faculty evaluations, as appropriate to specific responsibilities, define the priorities we set in pursuing these aims.

All faculty with teaching assignments are expected to fulfill all minimum student-related responsibilities, including:

- Creating, documenting, and maintaining course designs, learning materials and assignments, and syllabi that comply with all University and School format, content, and course and program learning outcome requirements;
- Attending all scheduled classes, except in cases approved by the Director;
- Providing clear and effective instruction of course material and providing feedback and graded work to students in a timely manner;
- Improving courses with updated material that is current with the profession and responsive to student evaluations and other assessments;

- Deploying instructional methods and technology consistent with current pedagogical best practices;
- Creating a professionally conducted classroom and educational environment, supportive of student learning and success;
- Effectively identifying, documenting, and managing academic integrity violations;
- Analyzing student evaluations and making resulting improvements to course content, design, or delivery;
- Effectively supervising and assessing graduate teaching assistants, lab aides, graders, and other instructional staff to support student learning;
- Maintaining accurate grade records that support the assignment of midterm and final grades;
- Promptly completing program assessment activities associated with assigned courses for course and program improvements, University assessment, and external program accreditation;
- Holding an appropriate number of weekly formal office hours, required to be half the total number of credit hours assigned to the faculty member, and holding meetings with students as needed;
- Maintaining familiarity with School curricular programs and the profession, and effectively advising students on course selection and career advancement.

Beyond these minimum student-related responsibilities, faculty are also expected to engage in one or more additional areas of highly-desirable activity, including but not limited to:

- Leading or collaborating in the development of new courses and curricular pathways, such as certificates and degree programs, or interdisciplinary curricular elements;
- Demonstrating a high quality of instruction supported through expert- or peer-observation reports or other evidence of effectiveness;
- Effectively mentoring doctoral, masters, and/or undergraduate students in the context of active research or design projects;
- Effectively advising students in their professional and career preparation, providing letters of recommendation for scholarships, graduate school, and employment, and writing nomination letters for student awards;
- Leveraging professional development events primarily targeted toward instruction to improve student learning.

### **3.1.1 Annual Review Criteria for Student-related Activities**

For faculty members of all ranks and position type with a student-related workload allocation, the overall merit rating in this category is based on evidence demonstrating substantive involvement, effectiveness, achievement, and contribution in the areas and activities outlined in the preceding section. The responsibility for presenting clear and convincing evidence that establishes the grounds for each merit rating lies solely with the faculty being evaluated and the material provided in their Annual Faculty Performance Report. While the following scale will be used as a guide, review committees may adjust ratings (upward or downward) based on various relevant factors, such as lack of convincing evidence of substantive involvement, effectiveness, achievement, and contribution; the specific composition of faculty course and other work assignments; and the relative workload distribution in this area:

- *Unsatisfactory*  
Does not fulfill minimum student-related responsibilities.
- *Satisfactory*  
Fulfills minimum student-related responsibilities.
- *Meritorious*  
Fulfills criteria for satisfactory student-related responsibilities and exhibits substantial evidence of effectiveness in one or more highly-desirable student-related activities.
- *Highly Meritorious*  
Fulfills criteria for satisfactory student-related responsibilities and exhibits substantial evidence of effectiveness in multiple highly-desirable student-related activities.

## **3.2 Scholarly Activities**

The School aims to excel in research and scholarship in areas including, but not limited to, those that improve human health, support environmental sustainability, innovate in the design of cyber systems, and

improve pedagogy. Our emphasis on disseminating scholarship results and external funding, as appropriate to specific responsibilities, define the high expectations we set in pursuing these aims.

### **3.2.1 Scholarly Products**

One key measure of success in scholarly dissemination activities is the publication of manuscripts and other impactful products, as appropriate to each faculty member's discipline and research. Generally, a scholarly product is considered to be one of the following:

- Peer-reviewed manuscripts appearing in journals;
- Manuscripts appearing in peer-reviewed conference proceedings sponsored by reputable professional organizations;
- Books, book chapters, and textbooks;
- Awarded patents or other licensed intellectual property products, particularly if earning royalties;
- Other selectively peer-reviewed disseminations.

For purposes of annual review, combinations of other scholarly products that would normally not merit equal consideration may, in aggregate, receive similar weight. These include, but are not limited to:

- Conference presentations with no associated paper;
- Conditionally accepted manuscripts pending revision;
- Submitted manuscripts awaiting decision;
- Provisional patent and patent applications;
- Self-published data sets and software products; and
- Manuscripts in mature stages of preparation.

In support of the review process, each faculty member should appropriately document and contextualize their work to provide information and evidence on cross-cutting factors that may impact the merits of their work. These factors may influence the weight given to the scholarly products outlined above during annual reviews, including but not limited to the:

- Prominence and impact of the dissemination venue;
- Degree of originality;
- Strength of the venue's peer review process;
- Extent of the faculty member's individual contributions;
- Faculty member's career stage;
- Relative workload distribution in scholarly activities;
- Pattern of prior success in dissemination-related activities; and
- Extent to which a faculty member's current work is adequately distinguished from his/her doctoral research relative to their career stage.

In recognition of the importance of grant-seeking to our School, pending and unfunded grant proposals receive credit as scholarly products in the context of annual reviews, but only funded grants are considered in the context of promotion and tenure reviews (see Section 4). Unfunded grant proposals provide important indicators of progress and are weighed commensurate with the funding agency's assessment.

### **3.2.2 Grants and Contracts**

Another key measure of success in scholarly activities is securing external grants or contracts for work that is appropriate to each faculty member's discipline and research program. Generally, grants awarded by national funding agencies to faculty members in principal investigator or equivalent roles are the most desired type of funding, but funding from foundations and regional, state, and local organizations is also valued. Collaborative inter- and cross-disciplinary proposals and grants that provide support for students are particularly desirable and contributions to these proposals are weighed more positively than proposals that lack these elements. Faculty that serve as principal investigator for awarded grants receive the full weight of the grant's funding amount, while grants where the faculty member is a co-investigator are given weight commensurate to his/her contribution to the overall effort as a percentage of the total effort of all investigators. Internal grants will be considered as part of the annual review as evidence of scholarly activity, but will have a significantly diminished role in promotion and tenure reviews.

A number of cross-cutting factors may impact the weight given to grants and grant proposals during annual reviews, including but not limited to a consideration of the pattern of prior success in grant-seeking activities; and the extent to which a faculty member demonstrates leadership in grant-seeking efforts (e.g. by assuming principal investigator roles or organizing multi-investigator teams).

### 3.2.3 Annual Review Criteria for Scholarly Activities

For faculty members of all ranks and position type with a scholarly workload allocation, the overall merit rating in this category is based on evidence demonstrating achievement and contribution in the areas and activities outlined in the preceding section. The responsibility for presenting clear and convincing evidence that establishes the grounds for each merit rating lies solely with the faculty being evaluated and the material provided in their Annual Faculty Performance Report. These will be assessed in the context of scholarly product and grant/contract expectations relative to workload allocation as shown in Table 1, where an item is defined as one of a scholarly product, grant proposal, or \$75K of active annual funding, or equivalent combination. While the following scale will be used as a guide, review committees may adjust ratings (upward or downward) based on various relevant factors:

- *Unsatisfactory*  
Does not fulfill minimum criteria for scholarly activities.
- *Satisfactory*  
Fulfills minimum criteria for scholarly activities.
- *Meritorious*  
Exceeds criteria for satisfactory scholarly activities.
- *Highly Meritorious*  
Substantially exceeds criteria for satisfactory scholarly activities.

*Table 1: SICCS guidelines for minimum scholarly activity relative to scholarly workload allocation.*

Scholarly Allocation	Minimum Criteria for Scholarly Activities
<= 15%	One item, proportional to the scholarly workload allocation
16%-40%	Criteria for 15% allocation, plus one item proportional to the difference between the scholarly workload allocation and 15%, at the rate of 10% for each item
>= 41%	Criteria for 40% allocation, plus one item proportional to the difference between the scholarly workload allocation and 40%, at the rate of 8% for each item

As an example, consider a faculty member with a 35% scholarly workload allocation. He/she would be expected to produce a total of one item for the first 15% and two items for the second 20% of his/her 35% workload allocation. In total, this could consist of, e.g., a total of three scholarly products or three grant proposals or approximately \$225K of active annual funding, or an equivalent combination of products, e.g., one scholarly product, one grant proposal, and approximately \$75K of active annual funding.

As another example, a faculty member with a 60% scholarly workload allocation would be expected to produce a total of one item for the first 15%, 2.5 items for the second 25%, and 2.5 items for the final 20% of his/her 60% workload allocation. In total, this could be six scholarly products or six grant proposals or approximately \$450K of active annual funding, or an equivalent combination of items.

### 3.3 Service Activities

The School is committed to supporting our instructional, mentorship, and scholarly activities through substantive engagement with the University, professional, and local and regional communities. The service activities indicated as specific criteria to be used in faculty evaluations, as applicable to specific responsibilities, define the priorities we set in demonstrating this commitment.

Faculty with service assignments are expected to fulfill all minimum service responsibilities, including:

- Attending and constructively contributing to School faculty meetings;
- Serving on high-impact School, College, or University committee or other University bodies;

- Attending and contributing to major School, College, and University events, such as Advisory Council, Technical Advisory Board, and Undergraduate Research and Design Symposium;
- Contributing to assigned program improvement and reporting activities for University assessment and external program accreditation, with contributions to relevant outputs and reports;
- Participating in daily campus visits or other student recruitment events, as appropriate; and
- Attending University graduation ceremonies dressed in academic regalia.

Beyond these minimum service responsibilities, faculty are also expected to engage in one or more additional areas of highly-desirable activity, particularly in leadership roles as appropriate, including but not limited to:

- Contributing to the profession by serving on editorial boards, conference organization or program committees, conducting manuscript reviews for reputable journals or conferences, reviewing proposals for national funding agencies, or conducting external promotion and tenure reviews;
- Formally mentoring junior faculty, including post-doctoral scholars, on professional issues;
- Contributing to public media and debate or formal community education, outreach, or service as a university expert;
- Serving on local, state, regional, national, or international panels, boards, and commissions; and
- Actively advising student organizations and contributing to relevant activities.

### **3.3.1 Annual Review Criteria for Service Activities**

For faculty members of all ranks and position type with a service workload allocation, the overall merit rating in this category is based on evidence demonstrating substantive involvement, effectiveness, achievement, and contribution in the areas and activities outlined in the preceding section. The responsibility for presenting clear and convincing evidence that establishes the grounds for each merit rating lies solely with the faculty being evaluated and the material provided in their Annual Faculty Performance Report. While the following scale will be used as a guide, review committees may adjust ratings (upward or downward) based on various relevant factors, such as lack of convincing evidence of substantive involvement, effectiveness, achievement, and contribution; and the relative workload distribution in this area:

- *Unsatisfactory*  
Does not fulfill minimum service responsibilities.
- *Satisfactory*  
Fulfills minimum service responsibilities.
- *Meritorious*  
Fulfills criteria for satisfactory service responsibilities and exhibits substantial evidence of effectiveness in one or more highly-desirable service activities.
- *Highly Meritorious*  
Fulfills criteria for satisfactory service responsibilities and exhibits substantial evidence of effectiveness in multiple highly-desirable service activities.

## **4 Criteria for Retention, Tenure, Renewal, and Promotion**

The unit-level criteria included in this section for faculty of all ranks provide the foundation for assessing retention, tenure, and promotion decisions, based on faculty performance in student-related, scholarly, and service activities and the definitions for each rank listed in the NAU COFS (Section 1.2).

### **4.1 Criteria for Tenure-eligible and Tenured Faculty**

The following criteria address retention for the Assistant Professor, tenure and promotion for the Associate Professor, and promotion for Professor ranks. Tenure-eligible faculty support student-related and scholarly activities in the School to extents varying based on their workload.

#### **4.1.1 Retention**

To retain the rank of an Assistant Professor, the faculty member must at minimum meet the standards of satisfactory overall performance and demonstrate growth in accomplishing substantial evidence of

effectiveness in student-related activities, a sustained pattern of scholarly success, and sustained service to the profession and University community.

#### **4.1.2 Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

To be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, faculty must demonstrate effectiveness in all areas appropriate to the faculty member's workload allocation. In student-related activities, faculty must demonstrate substantial and consistent evidence of effectiveness in teaching, student mentorship, program assessment, and other student-related activities. Faculty are expected to have served or be serving as a research advisor for graduate students, as appropriate to their scholarly workload. In scholarly activities, faculty must demonstrate a sustained pattern of achievement in scholarly dissemination and external grants, an upward trajectory of success and leadership in these efforts, and national visibility as a scholar in the field, as appropriate to workload allocation. A strong pattern of accomplishments for faculty applying for promotion and tenure consists of both scholarly products and funding support that, over a five year average and not including unawarded grant proposals and internal grants, achieves the criteria described in Table 1. In service activities, faculty must demonstrate a sustained pattern of service to the profession and University community as well as the potential to assume a leadership role in such activities.

#### **4.1.3 Promotion to Professor**

To be promoted to the rank of Professor, faculty must demonstrate a sustained pattern of substantial and consistent effectiveness in all areas appropriate to the faculty member's workload allocation as well as outstanding accomplishments in either student-related or scholarly activities. In student-related activities, faculty must demonstrate substantial and consistent evidence of effectiveness in teaching, student mentorship, program assessment, and other student-related activities, with outstanding accomplishments consisting of noteworthy contributions and leadership in the area. Faculty are expected to have served as a research advisor for graduate students who have successfully completed their degree, to an extent appropriate to their discipline and scholarly workload. In scholarly activities, faculty must demonstrate a sustained pattern of achievement in scholarly dissemination with significant impact and external grants and international visibility as a scholar in the field, as appropriate to their workload allocation. In service activities, faculty must demonstrate a sustained pattern of service to the profession and University community, the ability to assume leadership roles in service activities, and effective mentorship of junior faculty.

### **4.2 Criteria for Lecturers**

The following criteria address renewal and promotion criteria for the Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer ranks, which are non-tenure eligible and may be appointed for one to three years. Lecturers primarily support student-related activities in the School. Criteria described in Table 1 establish expectations for scholarly achievements and products appropriate to a faculty member's scholarly workload allocation.

#### **4.2.1 Renewal**

To be renewed in the rank of a Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, or Principal Lecturer, the faculty member must at minimum meet the standards of satisfactory overall performance and demonstrate growth in accomplishing substantial and continued effectiveness in student-related activities and a record of service and professional development related to teaching.

#### **4.2.2 Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

To be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, faculty must demonstrate substantial and consistent evidence of effectiveness in teaching, program assessment, and other student-related activities. In service activities, faculty must demonstrate a sustained pattern of professional development and service to the profession and University community in teaching.

#### **4.2.3 Promotion to Principal Lecturer**

To be promoted to the rank of Principal Lecturer, faculty must demonstrate a pattern of sustained excellence in teaching, program assessment, and other student-related activities. In service activities, faculty must demonstrate a pattern of sustained excellence in professional development and service to the profession and University in teaching.

#### **4.3 Criteria for Professors of Practice**

The following criteria address renewal and promotion criteria for the Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, and Professor of Practice ranks, which are non-tenure eligible and may be appointed for one to three years. Professor of Practice ranks support either student-related or scholarly activities in the School, as agreed upon in the faculty member's signed offer letter. Criteria described in Table 1 establish expectations for scholarly achievements and products appropriate to a faculty member's scholarly workload allocation.

##### **4.3.1 Renewal**

To be renewed in the rank of an Assistant, Associate, or Professor of Practice, the faculty member must at minimum meet the standards of satisfactory overall performance and demonstrate growth in accomplishing substantial evidence of effectiveness in student-related activities. Faculty with a scholarly assignment must additionally demonstrate growth in accomplishing a sustained pattern of scholarly activity appropriate to their workload allocation.

##### **4.3.2 Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice**

To be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor of Practice, faculty must demonstrate substantial evidence of effectiveness in student-related activities and substantial evidence of effectiveness in scholarly dissemination and external grants, appropriate to their relative workload allocation.

##### **4.3.3 Promotion to Professor of Practice**

To be promoted to the rank of Professor of Practice, faculty must demonstrate a sustained pattern of substantial and consistent effectiveness in student-related activities as well as outstanding accomplishments in scholarly dissemination and external grants, appropriate to their relative workload allocation.

#### **4.4 Criteria for Research Faculty**

The following criteria address renewal and promotion criteria for the Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Research Professor ranks, which are non-tenure eligible and may be appointed for one to three years. Research Professor ranks primarily support and provide leadership for research and scholarly activities in the School. Criteria described in Table 1 establish expectations for scholarly achievements and products appropriate to a faculty member's scholarly workload allocation.

##### **4.4.1 Retention**

To be renewed in the rank of an Assistant, Associate, or Research Professor, the faculty member must at minimum meet the standards of satisfactory overall performance and demonstrate growth in accomplishing substantial evidence of effectiveness in scholarly activity.

##### **4.4.2 Promotion to Associate Research Professor**

To be promoted to the rank of Associate Research Professor, faculty demonstrate a sustained pattern of substantial achievement in scholarly dissemination and external grants.

##### **4.4.3 Promotion to Research Professor**

To be promoted to the rank of Research Professor, faculty must demonstrate a sustained pattern of outstanding accomplishments in scholarly dissemination with significant impact and external grants as well as national or international visibility and leadership as a scholar.





## Appendix A: Statement of Expectations Guidelines

Each faculty member's SOE captures the set of anticipated activities during the time under NAU contract, indicating the overall percentage of effort devoted to each category of faculty activity (student-related, scholarly, service, or other assignments) and the set of anticipated major activities for each of these categories. When preparing the SOE document, please consult with the most current SOE template. All full-time faculty must have an individualized SOE for each academic year, completed as both a stand-alone document with the same information mirrored in NAU's FAAR system by April 1 of the previous academic year. These SOEs are used to provide context for each faculty member's performance reviews and as input in workload planning and allocation processes at the unit, College, and University levels. Since the SOE is a part of the faculty evaluation process, please refer to activities listed in the COFS to ensure that your plans for each academic year consider the relative desirability of particular activities.

Workload variability within the School mirrors the diversity of expectations for our faculty and how their expertise best supports the mission and needs of the unit. While initial workload allocations are established in each faculty member's hire offer letter, these allocations may change over time based on various factors such as special assignments, changing faculty interests and career goals, and continued success in scholarly productivity. Baselines are defined in CEIAS's Work Load Definitions and Assignments guidelines with a summary of workload expectations defined by CEIAS for each type of faculty rank appearing in Table 2. These baselines are just a starting point and each faculty member's specific allocation is determined in consultation with and must be approved by the Director to ensure that each faculty member's effort supports current unit-level priorities and needs and enables success in the context of the evaluative criteria used by review committees to assess faculty performance.

It is important to note that the sum of your workload allocation in each activity area must add up to 100%. If your expected teaching assignments (not including other teaching related activities like office hours or mentoring independent studies) would put you above your student related activity expectation by more than 5%, please speak with the SICCS Director or one of the Associate Directors to address the issue.

*Table 2: Baseline CEIAS workload allocations as a function of the category of faculty position.*

Category	Student-related	Scholarly	Service	Administrative
Tenured and tenure-eligible	60%	30%	10%	0%
Lecturer	90%	0%	10%	0%
Research faculty	0%	100%	0%	0%
Professor of Practice	90%	0%	10%	0%

Given that the SOE forecasts anticipated activities, it is common that faculty revise their plans in response to unforeseen contingencies or opportunities. Any inter-category workload change (i.e. effort reallocation from scholarly to student-related activity) greater than 10% must be accompanied by a formal SOE revision and reapproval by the Director. Intra-category changes (i.e. effort reallocation from one scholarly project to another) do not require a formal revision.

### 1 Student-related Activities Guidelines

Before specifying anticipated student-related activities, faculty must consult on unit-level plans for course offerings. Depending on each faculty member's area of primary responsibility between the School's undergraduate and graduate degree programs, consult with the Associate Director for Undergraduate Programs or Research and Graduate Programs respectively. For each anticipated course assignment, faculty members should list the course section, credit hours associated with the section, expected student enrollment, and expected actual instructor load. Faculty should also indicate whether this course is a new preparation for them or whether there are plans for making significant improvements to the course.

Consult the CEIAS Work Load policy and, as needed, with one of the Associate Directors on the appropriate workload allocation for each course assignment. In general, a 3-credit course equates to 10% effort—workload credit for co-taught courses is divided equally among participating instructors for tag-team courses and instructors of team-taught courses may claim up to three-quarters of the workload credit. Large enrollment courses receive additional workload credit of 1.25 times base workload for the

course for more than 65 students and 1.5 times base workload for more than 120 students. Additional credit is also available for a grading intensive class where TA support cannot be used (this is not very common). You should briefly address how you would like to improve these classes or your teaching and should especially consider addressing points raised in your last evaluation.

## **2 Scholarly Activities Guidelines**

Planned scholarly activities should be organized by research project, with each project separately titled along with: (a) brief (two to three sentences) description of key insights and goals, (b) listing of personnel involved in the project, including students, (c) a forecast of effort invested (as a percentage of total workload) in the project during the period under review, (d) major milestones and products, such as planned manuscripts and grant proposals. For planned journal and conference manuscripts, it suffices to provide the journal or conference being considered for submission, while for planned grant proposals, provide a working title, an estimate of the anticipated level of requested funding, anticipated project duration, and the funding agency considered.

## **3 Service Activities Guidelines**

Faculty should supply a listing of planned service activities grouped by service to the University (including School or College activities), community, and profession. For committee-based service activities, planned participation should be quantified by the approximate number of hours invested in the activity (either as an overall or average weekly investment). Professional service should list the expected venue of contribution (i.e. specific journals, conferences, or professional organizations), the type of service the faculty member expects to invest, and an approximation of effort. As a rule of thumb, a 10% service commitment translates to one university level committee, accreditation tasks (e.g., ABET), and several department level committees or activities. Service loads over 10% are highly unusual, so consult with the Director or one of the Associate Directors for more guidance if you feel such an allocation is appropriate.

## **4 Other Activities Guidelines**

This type of workload allocation should only be used by faculty with a formal administrative assignment. As appropriate, faculty should consult with the Director on how to effectively forecast and document such activities.

## **5 Using FAAR/Faculty180**

In addition to preparing your SOE in document form, you will also see FAAR prompts when SOE reporting is due. After logging in to FAAR, follow these steps:

1. You will see a screen with 2 tabs: Home and My Data
2. You will see a message on the Home tab: "Statement of Expectations Fall XXXX-Spring YYYY"
3. Please click the message and the "Set Faculty Classifications – Statement of Expectations" screen will open.

There are four sections and each section has a text box and a small field for a numeric percentage value. The four sections read:

- Expectations: Student-related activities
- B. Expectations: Scholarship/research/creative activities
- C. Expectations: Service activities
- D. Expectations: Other (e.g., administrative assignments)

Copy and paste text and workload percentage values from your SOE document in each appropriate text box. When you complete all sections, click "Submit Classification" button and the data will be sent to the Chair. Important Note: If you only complete part of the SOE and hit "Return", all data will be erased.

## Appendix B: Annual Faculty Performance Report Guidelines

Review processes largely rely on information provided by the faculty member under review in the form of the Annual Faculty Performance Report (AFPR), which captures accomplishments for the previous review period for student-related, scholarly, and service activities, and is used for annual, retention, and renewal reviews. When preparing the AFPR document, please consult with the most current AFPR template for the organization of needed information. All AFPRs and associated reviews become elements of the Professional Review File (PRF), which (when augmented with additional elements depending on the specific review process) forms the basis for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews. Each faculty member is responsible for submitting all AFPRs and PRFs by the deadlines specified in each academic year's PAC. Detailed specifications for format and content of PRFs for promotion and tenure are provided in the CEIAS Promotion and/or Tenure Application guidelines.

Each faculty member's AFPR must minimally consist of a self-evaluation report, the SOE for the academic year being reviewed, and a current curriculum vita (CV)—all made available to review committees through FAAR. The CV should be included as a standalone document in a format consistent with School guidelines and also as appropriate entries for accomplishments in the CV section of FAAR (entities, such as the NAU Provost's Office, almost exclusively consider FAAR entries in assessing unit-wide productivity and performance). Similarly, the SOE must consist of entries made through FAAR, which is then included in the AFPR record that is available to review committees through FAAR, but faculty should also additionally submit an SOE document as part of the AFPR.

The self-evaluation report enables faculty to provide details of and evidence for their annual accomplishments, providing a clear argument and evidence of effectiveness, achievement, and impact in all relevant areas of work. For each activity or product, faculty should make every effort to convey the extent of their time commitment, disambiguate their role in collaborative efforts, and document the effectiveness and impact of their efforts. Additionally, faculty should discuss how their activities map to the expectations in their SOE and the extent to which these SOE expectations were fulfilled as well as discussing any intra-category SOE changes. The sections below provide more information on required sections for the AFPR.

### 1 Overview Guidelines

In this section, faculty should ensure that committees have easy access to information important in appropriately contextualizing their accomplishments: Faculty should explicitly provide the academic term when they joined NAU and how many years they have been in their current position. Tenure-track faculty should also provide their critical year, which is the year they will be applying for promotion and tenure. Faculty should finally summarize their workload allocations in each activity category and provide an explanation if their actual workload allocation does not match the allocation presented in their SOE.

### 2 Student-related Activities Guidelines

Faculty must provide information to appropriately contextualize their student-related accomplishments (or professional development activities in the student-related category), in addition to the information that FAAR automatically presents for review committees (FAAR automatically provides listing of course sections taught and the content of student evaluations for each course). For each course assigned to them, faculty should make sure to add a syllabus in FAAR to complete the course record.

Faculty should provide a summary table of their course-related activities for the period under review, which should list each course section taught, student enrollment for each section, credit hours associated with the section, instructor load, student evaluation response rate, average student evaluation rating, and instructional support received (for example, how many graduate assistants or graders contributed to supporting the course).

For each course taught, faculty must provide an overview of their associated efforts, making sure to clarify whether this course was a new preparation for them and describing any course or learning material revisions or other improvements that were particularly effort-intensive. For courses that are associated with accreditation or assessment processes, faculty should also summarize relevant data collection,

assessment reporting, or other continuous improvement actions taken. Faculty should also provide an analysis of each course's student evaluations, reflecting over student feedback, identifying evidence and indicators of strongly positive results, and describing any resulting changes or improvements to the course content, design, or delivery that address student feedback. If applicable, faculty should include course expert- or peer-observation reports or other evidence that may be used to establish quality of instruction.

Faculty should make sure to summarize any **mentorship** activity for the period under review, including the number of students and their degree programs, the mentorship context and faculty role for each student, an approximation of invested effort, and any products, such as dissertations, theses, scholarly manuscripts, grant proposals, or technical reports, resulting from the faculty-student collaboration.

For contributions to **program assessment activities**, faculty should provide an overview of their activities and demonstrate effectiveness by documenting activities such as contributions and leadership in creating assessment reports, improving assessment processes and instruments, or engaging in assessment-related professional development.

Finally, faculty should explicitly describe their participation and role in **student-related or instructional professional development activities**.

### 3 Scholarly Activities Guidelines

Faculty must provide a listing of **scholarly accomplishments** (or **professional development activities** in the scholarly category), including specific information on products, including published or submitted manuscripts, funded or submitted grant proposals, published data sets, released software products, or other products appropriate to the discipline. It is useful to review committees to begin this section with a summary of scholarly accomplishments.

Funded grants and grant proposals should clearly describe: (a) Proposal title, (b) brief (two to three sentences) description of specific aims, (c) reporting faculty member's specific role in the grant and all collaborators, (d) funding agency and specific program submitted to, (e) grant activity period, (f) funded or requested grant or subcontract amount (or both for grants funded at levels other than requested), and (g) proposal status (funded, pending, or declined). In the context of collaborative projects, it is particularly important that faculty **disambiguate their own contributions to the grant proposal by specifying their contribution to the overall effort as a percentage of the total effort of all investigators**. Declined grants should include a summary of the funding agency's review comments for consideration by review committees.

Published or submitted scholarly manuscripts should provide **full citation information**, including title, authors, title of journal or conference proceedings, page length, manuscript status (published or to appear, accepted pending major or minor review, under review, or declined), and a **brief abstract** (two to three sentences). Faculty should disambiguate disciplinary conventions of authorship order by identifying the **lead author** (primarily responsible for scientific or development effort and authorship), **corresponding author** (responsible for project direction or intellectual leadership), or other discipline-appropriate authorship roles—percentages should be used to best capture the reporting faculty member's contributions and provide additional context for review committee consideration. For published manuscripts, faculty should additionally include a short (two to three sentences) discussion contextualizing the importance of the manuscript's scientific contributions, the degree of departure from doctoral work (if the work is related to the faculty member's time as a graduate student), and the importance of the specific journal or conference in its disciplinary context, including, if appropriate, such metrics as **impact factor or acceptance rates**.

**Conference presentations resulting from only abstract submission** should include a title and brief (one to two sentences) summary, abstract authors, presenters, and conference title. Presentations that are not associated with a conference paper or abstract, such as **keynote or other invited addresses**, should include the presentation and conference title and explanatory comments on the importance of the presentation in its disciplinary context.

Published software products and data sets should include a title, brief (two to three sentences) summary of functionality or content and its importance in the research discipline, a description of the intended audience and breadth of current use and adoption, and a description of the faculty member's role in and degree of contribution to the product. Additionally, faculty should provide information on elements establishing the quality of the product, such as associated peer-review processes for data sets or indicators of software maturity as established by accompanying software documentation, extensive test-suites, or formal quality certifications.

Faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor or Professor should include appropriate indicators of their progress toward establishing national and international visibility as a scholar. Relevant indicators include widely-cited scholarly dissemination in venues with broad reach, participation and leadership in the organization of reputable national and international conferences, participation in editorial boards for journals and other professional publications, participation in national funding agency review panels, national or international collaborations, adoption of software products and data sets by a broad community, or positive media coverage of scholarly work.

Finally, faculty should explicitly describe scholarly professional development activities, such as conference attendance or participation in grant-development workshops.

## **4 Service Activities Guidelines**

Faculty must supply a listing of service activities (or professional development activities in the service category) grouped by service to the University (including School or College activities), community, or profession. For committee-based service activities, participation must be quantified by the approximate hours invested in the activity (either as an overall or average weekly investment). Additionally, faculty should provide a listing of special roles, such as committee or sub-committee leadership, and any specific contributions beyond participation. Awards or letters of appreciation in this area should be mentioned and included as a way to demonstrate effectiveness. For service as a manuscript reviewer, specify the conference or journal and indicate the number and approximate page counts of manuscripts reviewed. For service in conferences, or as a journal editor or member of an editorial board, provide indicators of the relevance and importance of the conference or journal to the professional community.

## **5 Other Activities Guidelines**

For other types of workload assignments, such as administrative service, faculty should consult with the Director on elements necessary for effective documentation of activities.

## **Appendix C: Review Committee Composition and Guidelines**

Faculty reviews will be conducted by a joint Faculty Status and Annual Review Committee (FSC/ARC) constituted at the beginning of each academic year's Fall semester (as delineated in sections B.1 and B.3 of NAU's COFS). The FSC/ARC will make recommendations concerning merit ratings, retention, renewal, promotion, tenure, post-tenure, sabbatical requests, Regent's Professor status, and any other personnel status-change matters determined appropriate by the Director.

### **1 FSC/ARC Composition**

Voting members of this committee will consist of a minimum of three full-time, tenured faculty members, elected by simple majority by full-time School faculty (this vote may be held through electronic means, at the Director's discretion). As faculty participation in this body entails substantial workload, FSC/ARC committee members, chair, or co-chairs may be nominated for election by the School's Director based on faculty work allocations. Committee members must not be present or involved in their own review or in the reviews of other faculty with whom a conflict of interest is identified. Other faculty may participate in this committee's activities as non-voting observers with a majority approval of committee members; for example, additional specialized knowledge might be needed for the committee to provide a meaningful review for faculty in specialized areas, or so that FSC/ARC committee organizational knowledge be propagated and faculty prepared for future service on the committee.

### **2 Committee Guidelines**

The FSC/ARC is responsible for considering the guidelines and criteria presented in this document, other requirements specified in the NAU and CEIAS COFS, and adhering to all deadlines established in NAU's PAC (presently found in the Reviews and Tenure section of the Provost's website).

For each type of review (outlined in Section 2), the FSC/ARC will review each faculty member's APRF or PRF and decide on the substance of the committee's recommendation, as appropriate to the type of review conducted. For tenured faculty undergoing an expedited review, the FSC/ARC may either affirm the previous year's rating or elect to conduct a comprehensive annual review in cases where the review committee deems a change from the previous overall rating is warranted. In the committee's decision-making process, lack of appropriate documentation of activities or accomplishments in a particular area of work may be assumed as evidence of no activity. Faculty may inform the FSC/ARC chair or co-chairs of recent significant accomplishments not already included in their FAAR materials that they would like to be considered. The committee chair or a designee will then compose a memorandum providing constructive feedback and justifying the rating or recommendation—templates for review memoranda will be made available to the FSC/ARC. This memorandum will be reviewed by the committee for consistency and accuracy with the committee's deliberations and revised if necessary. Finally, the committee chair will submit a digital version of this memorandum to NAU's FAAR system for subsequent review by the Director.

It is important to note that faculty being evaluated are responsible for presenting evidence that establish the grounds for individual category merit ratings. Committee members should carefully weigh such evidence in convincingly establishing that merit ratings above Satisfactory are warranted. For Annual Reviews that assign a merit rating, the overall rating is determined by weighing each individual category's rating according to the relative workload allocation. Each of the standard merit rankings of highly meritorious, meritorious, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory are assigned a numeric value of 3, 2, 1, and 0 respectively. The overall rating is the sum of the product of each workload category percentage and numeric rating, rounded to the first decimal place (rounding the first decimal place digit up if the second decimal place digit is 5, 6, 7, 8, or 9). The overall rating is determined based on this sum as follows: 3.0 to 2.5, highly meritorious; 2.4 to 1.5, meritorious; 1.4 to 0.5, satisfactory; 0.4 to 0.0, unsatisfactory. For example, a faculty with a workload allocation of 50% and a rating of meritorious for student-related activities, 40% and a rating of meritorious for scholarly activities, and 10% and a rating of highly meritorious for service would have an overall numeric rating of 2.1 and a ranking of meritorious. However, the overall merit ranking can be no higher than meritorious if any individual category merit ranking is unsatisfactory.

Faculty with other formal workload commitments such as an administrative assignment, receive an additional merit rating for this category of workload by the Director or other supervisor for these commitments. The FSC/ARC should make a recommendation of an overall rating based on the committee's individual ratings for teaching, research, and service. The Director may adjust this overall rating according to the faculty member's performance in his or her other workload commitments.



## Appendix D: References and Resources

Arizona Board of Regents Policy 6-201, Conditions of Faculty Service

[https://public.azregents.edu/Policy Manual/6-201-Conditions of Faculty Service.pdf](https://public.azregents.edu/Policy%20Manual/6-201-Conditions%20of%20Faculty%20Service.pdf)

Northern Arizona University Conditions of Faculty Service

[https://nau.edu/Human-Resources/ General-Forms/Conditions-of-Faculty-Service-Appendix-C/](https://nau.edu/Human-Resources/General-Forms/Conditions-of-Faculty-Service-Appendix-C/)

College of Engineering, Forestry, and Natural Sciences Conditions of Faculty Service

<https://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic/CEFNS/CEFNS%20approved%20guidelines%20for%20annual%20evaluations,%20promotion%20and%20tenure%2012-18-15.pdf>

College of Engineering, Forestry, and Natural Sciences Promotion and/or Tenure Application Guidelines

<https://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic/CEFNS/CEFNS%20Promotion%20and%20or%20Tenure%20Application%20Guidelines%203-17-15.pdf>

College of Engineering, Forestry, and Natural Sciences Work Load Definitions and Assignments

<https://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic/CEFNS/Forms/2011%202012%20workload.pdf>

Northern Arizona University Personnel Action Calendar

<http://nau.edu/provost/reviews-tenure/>

College of Engineering, Forestry, and Natural Sciences FAAR User Manual

[https://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic/CEFNS/ Media/CEFNS%20FAAR%20Manual%20updated%204-16-15.pdf](https://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic/CEFNS/Media/CEFNS%20FAAR%20Manual%20updated%204-16-15.pdf)

College of Engineering, Forestry, and Natural Sciences FAAR SOE Instructions

[https://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic/CEFNS/ Media/SOE%20FAAR%20instructions.pdf](https://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic/CEFNS/Media/SOE%20FAAR%20instructions.pdf)

College of Engineering, Forestry, and Natural Sciences Quick Reference Guide

<https://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic/CEFNS/Faculty%20180%20Quick%20Reference%20Guide.pdf>

College of Engineering, Forestry, and Natural Sciences Quick Reference Guide for Evaluators

<https://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic/CEFNS/Faculty%20180%20Quick%20Reference%20Guide%20for%20Evaluators.pdf>