

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Task Force

Issues and Opportunities

The Charge to the Task Force

The Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) Task Force was constituted on October 2, 2007. Following the *2006 Winds of Change Faculty Retreat* and the *2006 Report on Tenure-Related Processes at the University of Colorado* campus leadership felt the time was right to take a close look at how UCCS defines, evaluates and rewards faculty work through its tenure and promotion process. With an expected completion date of Task Force recommendations in early 2008, both Chancellor Shockley-Zalabak and Interim Provost Bacon gave the Task Force its charge.

The charge was:

- *To examine the promotion and tenure processes and procedures at UCCS and recommend changes*
- *To create a new framework for primary units to develop their own criteria to satisfy the requirements defined by the Regents as set out in the system-wide tenure study*
- *To develop new ways to define and evaluate scholarship (research)*
- *To develop new ways to define and evaluate teaching*
- *To develop new ways to define and evaluate service*
- *To ultimately improve the work and lives of faculty at UCCS.*

This charge was intentionally broad. To allow the Task Force to take these broadly-based directions and use them to re-evaluate and possibly redesign the way we think about, define, manage, and implement the entire reappointment, tenure, and promotion system at UCCS to address the many issues that are outlined below.

Issues and Challenges

The Task Force addressed issues and challenges from many sources. Some came from the Regents' expectation that we more clearly define how departments, primary committees, and others along the stream of evaluators review faculty in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions. Some came from long-lingering problems that the current system has not as yet addressed. Some come from a hesitancy to relinquish tradition and its historical view of the tenure process. Some came from opportunities that may be

embraced by new ways of looking at the RTP processes. Wherever the issues arose, they include:

- *Faculty has work that does not easily fall into the traditional categories for evaluation. How can the faculty be evaluated/rewarded for this work?*
- *The term “research” as currently defined/understood is often too narrow.*
- *The traditional 40-40-20 breakdown in teaching-research-service does not fit all faculty responsibilities and, in fact, is not required by the university.*
- *Certain colleges and departments require large time commitments to activities that cannot fit into the 40-40-20 model. For example clinical practice by Beth-El faculty, librarianship for our tenure track librarians, or K-12 teacher/student teacher mentoring by Education faculty.*
- *We must figure out a way to reconcile the wording of the campus vision/mission statements and the work faculty do to keep the campus functioning with our evaluation and rewards for this work.*
- *Whatever we devise must be relatively easily implemented and should not create a significant reporting burden for the faculty*
- *Whatever we do must be communicated clearly and unequivocally to the reviewers at all levels of the RPT process.*
- *Whatever we do should not inherently put some faculty at an advantage or disadvantage with respect to other faculty.*
- *Any substantive changes in how we evaluate faculty must carry along with them the training and support necessary for unit chairs and others in the process.*
- *Faculty need to embrace whatever recommendations are adopted from this work.*

Opportunities

Faculty at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs by bent and definition are scholars. Most entered the profession because being a scholar is a high calling and one worthy of professional energy. The word scholarship can be a loaded one and can conjure up many definitions. But most of faculty would agree that scholarship in its basic form means the work done by faculty contributes to the growth of knowledge. A more complex, more inclusive definition of scholarship might be the creative, systematic, rational inquiry into a topic and the honest, forthright application and exposition of conclusions drawn from that inquiry. Scholarship draws on existing knowledge as a

foundation and uses critical analysis and judgment to improve understanding. When looked at in this context, scholarship definitely includes what we have known as “research” and “creative works.” But it also has broader implications and is more inclusive of many of the other things done as faculty/scholars.

Ernest Boyer published *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* in 1990 for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In this text he outlined a set of ways to better define and articulate the various types of scholarship. Boyer broke scholarship into four areas:

1. Scholarship of Discovery – this is what most now view as basic research.
2. Scholarship of Integration – this is where meaning is given to facts across disciplines in the larger context. It may mean working with non-specialists in collaboration or consultation.
3. Scholarship of Application – this is where we use our expertise in our special fields of knowledge and apply that expertise to real-world problems.
4. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) – this is the serious, rigorous study of teaching and learning that evolves into the sharing of pedagogical research.

In addition to these categories, the Task Force proposes an additional category

5. Scholarship of Creative Works – this is the artistry that creates new insights and interpretations.

This Task Force’s contention is that with some modification and slight redefinition, this could become a new paradigm for evaluating more broadly and fairly, what faculty do in what has been called by its narrower name, research. This is not meant in any way to diminish the rigor or standards of work as faculty. It will, however, start to value some of the very serious work that many faculty on campus must do for their positions, but do not get evaluated or compensated for. Often faculty are hired and expected to do many things for the unit or campus, but the old norm of the 40-40-20 may not accommodate the work that is required of a faculty member. Not only is this patently unfair to the individual, it is certainly not a way to get the best results from faculty work. Whatever areas of scholarship that an individual and unit determine to be a part of a faculty member’s work, all scholarship has some things in common. First and foremost, the work must be original and of the highest quality and rigor. Second, it must be communicated and disseminated. Third, it must be evaluated by peers to assure quality and appropriateness. Finally, the work must be sophisticated, at an intellectual level that cannot be duplicated by others with far less education or experience.

One way for faculty to develop an identity as a scholar in the newer and broadest sense of the definition is to start thinking of teaching as a professional activity. This is not the same as the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning from above----but to begin thinking of

work in the classroom as professional teaching. This means many things, but essentially requires faculty to take the teaching mission seriously, maintain currency in the discipline, and have a high degree of disciplinary expertise in the classroom and other teaching venues.

The proposal outlined in the next few pages is our vision of how these ideas may be implemented at the university and college level while still allowing departments/units to devise their own specific criteria to fit their discipline or sub-discipline.

This document specifically addresses the processes for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Although the Task Force has not explicitly considered using this model for annual reviews, we believe that it would be a good model to emulate in future discussions of annual review process and procedures.

Proposal for Standards for Promotion and Tenure

Introduction

Evaluation of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure is based primarily on evidence of scholarship in the faculty member's teaching, research/creative activities, and/or professional practice. In all areas of professional activity, a faculty member is expected to uphold the highest standards of the discipline, the university, and the profession.

There are a number of ideas and issues that should be used in designing an evaluation process. These include

- *Faculty has work that does not easily fall into the traditional categories for evaluation. How can the faculty be evaluated/rewarded for this work?*
- *The term "research" as traditionally defined/understood is often too narrow.*
- *The traditional 40-40-20 breakdown in teaching-research-service does not fit all faculty responsibilities and, in fact, is not required by the university.*
- *Certain colleges and departments require large time commitments to activities that cannot fit into the 40-40-20 model. For example clinical practice by Beth-El faculty, librarianship for our tenure track librarians, or K-12 teacher/student teacher mentoring by Education faculty.*
- *The campus vision/mission statements and the work faculty do to keep the campus functioning should be consistent with our evaluation and rewards for this work.*
- *Whatever we devise must be relatively easily implemented and should not create a significant reporting burden for the faculty*
- *Whatever we do must be communicated clearly and unequivocally to the reviewers at all levels of the RPT process.*
- *Whatever we do should not inherently put some faculty at an advantage or disadvantage with respect to other faculty.*
- *Any substantive changes in how we evaluate faculty must carry along with them the training and support necessary for unit chairs and others in the process.*
- *Faculty need to embrace whatever recommendations are adopted from this work.*

Evaluation criteria are developed by each primary unit for promotion to associate and full ranks, and for post-tenure review. An important consideration is that Regental

requirements of "meritorious" and "excellent" will still be applied and must be defined by the primary unit. The role of the second level review (the Provost's committee) remain the same – to assure compliance with proper procedures by lower level committees and to assure that the department criteria were followed during the faculty member's evaluation.

The purpose of this proposal is two-fold:

- 1) To broaden the "research" category to include different types of scholarships and to introduce a "professional practice" category where appropriate
- 2) To introduce the faculty responsibility statement (FRS) as a mechanism which will allow increased flexibility in the distribution of a faculty member's workload and which gives the faculty member and the primary unit some guidelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion evaluations.

The fundamental tool in the promotion and tenure review process is the primary unit criteria. The faculty responsibility statement describes the agreed upon responsibilities and activities of the individual faculty member within the primary unit criteria. The FRS identifies the proportion of effort by the faculty member in 1) professional teaching; 2) scholarship; 3) professional practice, and 4) service. This statement is agreed to by the individual and the department/unit chair and approved by the dean of the individual's college/school.

The FRS provides for flexibility in faculty staffing to meet the unique missions of individual colleges and departments. It will also provide specific guidance to individual faculty members in identifying significance of different areas of work and how effort might be most appropriately allocated. Not all faculty will have identical FRSs; and the individuals FRS will provide guidance for comprehensive review, and the tenure review process.

The following sections define more precisely the areas of scholarship, professional teaching, professional practice, and service.

Scholarship

Meaning of Scholarship

All tenured/tenure-track faculty members are expected to engage in scholarship, professional teaching, and service. Some disciplines as self-defined will also promote activity in the area of professional practice. Scholarship is creative, systematic, rational inquiry into a topic and honest, forthright application or exposition of conclusions drawn from that inquiry. Scholarship may be defined differently for each faculty member and explicated in her/his FRS.

Whatever areas of scholarship that an individual and unit determine to be a part of a faculty member's work, all scholarship has some things in common. First and foremost,

the work must be original and of the highest quality and rigor. Second, it must be communicated and disseminated. Third, it must be evaluated by peers to assure quality and appropriateness. Finally, the work must be sophisticated, at an intellectual level that cannot be duplicated by others with far less education or experience.

All five forms of scholarship carry equal weight if done with equal rigor, communication, and peer review. The scholarship category will be a minimum of 40% before tenure. Under special circumstances or where a faculty member's required "professional practice" effort is large, a lower level of scholarship is understood. The exact amounts will be negotiated with the unit chair and the dean of the appropriate college. Similarly there will be a minimum of 20% after tenure. For the same reasons, the "Professional Teaching" category ought to be a minimum of 30% before tenure. And there ought to be a minimum of 20% after tenure. The numbers above refer to averages over time. In an individual year the faculty member could be below these minimum requirements.

Scholarship results in products that are shared with others and are subject to criticism by individuals qualified to judge the product. These products may take but are not limited to, the form of books, refereed journal articles, critical reviews, annotated bibliographies, lectures, reviews of research on a topic, or speeches synthesizing the thinking on a topic. Also falling under the umbrella of scholarship are original materials designed for use with computers; inventions on which patents are obtained; art exhibits by faculty-artists; musical concerts/compositions; novels; essays; short stories; or poems. In short scholarship includes materials that may generally be called "intellectual property."

Scholarship implies that one has a solid foundation in the professional field addressed and is current with developments in that field. However, it must be noted that significant advances sometimes accrue when a scholar extends her or his scope of topics beyond those traditional to a particular discipline. All of these areas of scholarship fit into five scholarships (modified from the Boyer model)

1. Scholarship of Discovery – this is what most now view as basic research.
2. Scholarship of Integration – this is where meaning is given to facts across disciplines in the larger context. It may mean working with non-specialists in collaboration or consultation.
3. Scholarship of Application – this is where we use our expertise in our special fields of knowledge and apply that expertise to real-world problems.
4. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) – this is the serious, rigorous study of teaching and learning that evolves into the sharing of pedagogical research.
5. Scholarship of Creative Works – this is the artistry that creates new insights and interpretations.

Scholarship often requires teamwork or other collaborative relationships, particularly because of the growth of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary programs and research agendas. When work that is a result of joint effort is presented as evidence of scholarship, clarification of the faculty member's role in the joint effort should be provided.

In the promotion and tenure review process, the emphasis is on the critical evaluation of the scholarly nature of the candidates achievements by professional peers, including peers external to the university. Evidence should be presented as to the impact of the scholarship in terms of its depth, duration, and/or persistence of influence or use, as well as its public and critical appreciation. Table 1 provides the framework for the evaluation.

The farther that scholarship moves from traditional peer-reviewed research, the more important it becomes for the faculty member and the chair of the primary unit to have a clear understanding of who will constitute the cohort of reviewers and how the reviews will be done. This understanding should be made explicit in the FRS

Table 1. – Parameters for Judging Scholarship

Character of Scholarship

- Does it develop and communicate new understanding and insights?
- Does it generate, synthesize, interpret, critically analyze, and communicate new knowledge, methods, understandings, technologies, materials, uses, insights, beauty, etc.?
- Is the work sophisticated, at an intellectual level that cannot be duplicated by others with far less education or experience?

Audiences for Scholarship

- Do the audiences include peers, undergraduates, graduate students, post-doctoral associates, users, patrons, and the public?

Means of Communicating Scholarship

- Do the means include teaching materials, curricula, publications, presentation, exhibitions, performances, patents, copyrights, and other distribution of materials/programs?

Criteria for Validating Scholarship

- Is the work original, significant, accurate, replicable, applicable, broad, or have depth?
- Does it have a significant duration of influence, persistence of influence or use, adoption by peers, or impacts on the public?

Means of Documenting Scholarship

- Is there evidence that it has been validated by peers?
- Has it been communicated to peers or broader audiences?
- Is it recognized, accepted, cited, and adopted by others?

- Did it make a difference?
-

A dossier format is used to document faculty scholarship beyond what is contained in the vita. The faculty dossier includes materials such as summaries of completed, current, and future research projects; descriptions of the applied use of the research; summaries of grants/grant applications, patents, and inventions; exhibition catalogs, and other juried work. The effectiveness of the candidate's scholarship is determined by evaluating the character of the work using the general criteria described in Table 1 in the context of the unit criteria established by the department/unit and approved by the relevant dean and provost.

Professional Teaching

Most faculty have significant teaching responsibilities, and the quality of teaching is a major factor in evaluating accomplishments. Teaching is a scholarly and dynamic endeavor and covers a broad range of activities. These activities could include the following:

- Presenting resident credit courses, international courses, non-credit seminars and workshops, and distance learning programs
- Directing undergraduate and graduate projects, internships, theses, and dissertations
- Serving on masters and dissertation committees
- Advising and mentoring undergraduates, graduate students, and post-doctoral associates
- Directing undergraduate research programs.

Particular evidence of effective teaching varies widely and can be difficult to judge. In addition to the Faculty Course Questionnaire, other evidence may demonstrate pedagogical abilities in organized lectures or laboratory sessions; others may promote collaborative learning or may improvise in the classroom in response to the dynamics of the student group, while still others may be adept in facilitating appropriate group discussion. All of these methods are valid but must be documented to allow appropriate evaluation.

Professional Practice

The UCCS vision and mission statements highlight the commitment of the campus to the community. One critical component of this is the professional practice for certain

colleges and disciplines. It is common for some faculty to work with community organizations/agencies in addition to the practice relevant on the campus. Examples might be clinical work done by Beth-El College of Nursing and Health Sciences faculty, site observation for teacher development by College of Education faculty, or work done in our library by tenured/tenure-track librarians. Professional practice means the engagement of faculty using their professional skills to provide direct service in the discipline, solve problems, disseminate information, or improve the campus or community. This work should be specified in the FRS for those faculty that have professional practice responsibilities.

Since professional practice activities vary greatly among departments, it is the responsibility of each department to identify the activities acceptable to the unit under this category and ways to evaluate the contribution within department/unit promotion and tenure criteria.

Service

Faculty members are expected to play a vital role in the functioning of the university at all levels by participating in faculty governance; in the formulation of department, college, campus, or university policies; in serving on campus/university committees; or, carrying out various administrative functions. Therefore, to be promoted and/or tenured, faculty members are expected to have been involved in institutional service.

Other types of service for the community or discipline, for example, are acceptable as part of the service component. Such service could include referee work, serving as an NSF panel member for judging proposals, being part of an organizing committee for a conference, etc. In all cases such service outside of the university needs to be directly linked to the professional abilities of the faculty member.

It is intended that the flexibility introduced through the FRS will allow faculty who are significantly engaged in service to be appropriately rewarded for their efforts by an appropriate weighting of the service component of the FRS.

Faculty Responsibility Statement

Faculty Responsibility Statements are generally short documents - usually a single page – that specify the breakdown of what the faculty member is responsible for within the needs of the department/unit within the context of the University’s mission, goals, and strategic plan. The proportion of an evaluation may be specified as percentages but other methods may be preferred by the department/unit. It must be remembered that all tenured/tenure-track faculty have a scholarship commitment. Only under special circumstances will a faculty member not have scholarly teaching responsibilities. Service is also an area that is nearly always some part of the evaluation. Professional practice may or may not be a part of the evaluation dependent upon the discipline and character of the faculty position. Some example parsing of responsibilities in the FRS are given in **Appendix A**.

The FRS is put into place when the faculty member is hired and may be changed with the agreement of all parties. The FRS will be developed for already employed faculty on a schedule to be worked out. The FRS will be signed by all agreeing parties. The FRS will be used by all evaluators to interpret the quality, extent, balance, and scope of the faculty member's achievements. Departments must consider primary unit criteria when developing the FRS and the evaluation standards.

It will be incumbent upon the faculty member and the primary unit chair to articulate as needed the specific ways that non-traditional scholarship will be reviewed and evaluated. If it is decided that more comprehensive explanation of the scholarship and its evaluation is needed, an addendum may be attached to the FRS outlining the specifics of the faculty member's scholarly contributions. However this is articulated, it will be the responsibility of the faculty member to discuss in the promotion and/or tenure dossier, how the scholarship was evaluated, who the peer reviewers were, and how this fits into the FRS and the addendum if any. See examples in **Appendix B**.

It is emphasized that the primary units decide which of the scholarships are appropriate for their individual disciplines. The primary units also decide on evaluation measures and, for example, what level of performance is required for an evaluation of "meritorious" or "excellent." The FRS is not expected to replace the criteria developed by the primary units, but is intended to give some insight on how the primary unit criteria apply to a particular faculty member.

APPENDIX A

Sample Faculty Responsibility Statements

Example 1

UCCS Computer Science Department Faculty Responsibility Statement

Professor X

Professor X has responsibilities in the activities of professional teaching, scholarship, and service. All tenured and probationary faculty members are expected to engage in scholarship.

Appointment

60% Professional Teaching
20% Scholarship
20% Service

Professional Teaching (60%)

Teaches 21 Credit Hours of course work. Faculty mentor for student projects in INOV 201/202/301/302/401/402. Serves on project and thesis committees for MS, ME, and Ph.D. students. May also advise MESE and Ph.D. students.

Scholarship (20%)

Engages in Scholarship of Application and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) activities. UCCS Faculty Fellow for Educational Excellence.

Service (20%)

Engages in institutional and professional service activities. Serves as the Program Director, Bachelor of Innovation™ in Game Design and Development. Annually performs the duties of an Engineering and Applied Science Ambassador. Serves on campus-, college-, and department-level committees as appropriate. Paper reviewer for various computer science education conferences.

FRS is agreed to by:

Signatures

Faculty Member	_____	Date	_____
Unit Chair	_____	Date	_____
Dean of EAS	_____	Date	_____

Example 2

UCCS Kraemer Family Library Faculty Responsibility Statement

Professor Y Cataloging/Archives Librarian

Professor Y has responsibilities in the activities of professional practice, research, and institutional service. All tenure-track and tenured library faculty members must engage in scholarship in their professional practice, research and service.

Professor Y must demonstrate personal initiative, leadership, and collegiality; creativity in practical application of knowledge; knowledge of current research and new developments; demonstrated communication and analytical skills; and achievements in working in a team-based environment.

This position reports to the Head of Technical Services.

Appointment

75% Professional Practice
15% Scholarship
10% Professional Service

Professional Practice (75%)

Oversees the operations of the Cataloging department and the UCCS Archives:
Plans, organizes, schedules, analyzes, and evaluates Cataloging department and Archives department activities, goals, and policies to ensure that they operate in an efficient and productive manner.

Selects, trains, directs, and evaluates the Cataloging Technician and the Archives Technician and assists in supervision of student employees and volunteer workers in the Cataloging and Archives departments.

Manages the operation of the OCLC Cataloging System and implements software upgrades as they become available.

Maintains the Library's bibliographic database—Innovative Interfaces, Inc. (III).

In accordance with established national standards and practices, catalogs materials in all formats and creates original catalog records when needed for inclusion in WorldCat and in the Library's local catalog.

Provides reference assistance at the Library's reference desk for up to four hours a week.

Develops the Library's collections in the areas of Nursing and Health Sciences and Computer Science.

Provides general library instruction sessions or workshops.

Assists students and faculty, particularly those in the Beth-El College of Nursing and Health Sciences and in the Computer Science Department, in the use of library resources.

Participates in development of library-wide policies, procedures, and goals.

Serves as acting Head of Technical Services when necessary.

Research and Scholarship (15%)

Develops professionally as a member of the library academic community by participating in continuing education opportunities related to cataloging and archives work.

Establishes a record of scholarship by engaging in research projects, presentations at library conferences, procuring grants, and/or publishing articles in professional journals or edited works.

Professional/Institutional Service (10%)

Engages in professional service activities at the local (city/state) and/or national level.

Serves on departmental, campus, and/or university committees as authorized by the Head of Technical Services or the Library Dean.

This FRS is agreed to by:

Signatures

Faculty Member _____ **Date** _____

Unit Chair _____ **Date** _____

Dean of the Library _____ **Date** _____

Example 3

Beth-El College of Nursing & Health Sciences Faculty Responsibility Statement

Professor A

Appointment

40% Teaching
20% Professional Practice
20% Research/Scholarly Activity
20% Service

Professional Teaching (40%)

Dr. A will contribute to the teaching mission of the Nursing Department by teaching six credits in one semester and nine credits in another. Teaching assignments will be primarily in the graduate program although cross programmatic assignments should be anticipated. Curricular standards will be measured using NONPF's *Nurse Practitioner Primary Care Competencies in Specialty Areas: Adult, Family, Gerontological, Pediatric, and Women's Health* and the AACN's *Essentials of Master's Education for Advanced Nursing Practice*. FCQs are required to be maintained at means of 4.0 or higher. Performance in teaching will be evaluated based upon the criteria found in the Beth-El College of Nursing & Health Sciences TPR Document.

Professional Practice (20%)

Dr. A will practice as a family nurse practitioner in the faculty practice clinic for El Paso County one day per week. She will provide primary health care services to the patients in the clinic. She may precept advanced practice students during this scheduled time. She is required to maintain an unencumbered current license as a registered nurse in Colorado with authorities as a FNP and prescriptive authority. She is also required to maintain current national board certification as a FNP.

Scholarship (20%)

Dr. A will fulfill her contribution to this mission of the College through research and scholarly productivity. Performance in this area will be evaluated based upon the criteria found in the Beth-El College of Nursing & Health Sciences TPR Document. At least one national, invited peer-reviewed presentation will be submitted and at least one data-based, peer-reviewed journal article will be submitted annually.

Service (20%)

Dr. A will serve on College and University committees as designated. She will also serve on the CQI Committee for the El Paso County faculty practice clinic. Criteria for

evaluation of service are also found in the Beth-El College of Nursing & Health Sciences TPR Document.

This FRS is agreed to by:

Faculty Member _____ **Date** _____

Unit Chair _____ **Date** _____

Dean of Beth-El _____ **Date** _____

Example 4

UCCS Department of Physics and Energy Science Faculty Responsibility Statement

Professor B

Professor B's efforts will be approximately distributed in the following way: 10% scholarship, 40% professional teaching and advising, and 50% service to the institution or broader community.

Appointment

30% Professional Teaching
20% Scholarship
50% Service

Professional Teaching (30%)

Dr. B will be expected to teach the equivalent of three (3-credit) lecture classes per academic year, two in the fall semester and one in the spring semester.

He is also expected to provide an effective learning experience for students. This will be demonstrated by FCQ scores, student comments on FCQs, and continuing his work with the Presidential Teaching Scholars "President's Learning Collaborative" program.

Specifically, he will maintain a score of 5.7 (or higher) out of 6 on question 13 (compare this course with other courses you have taken) and question 14 (compare this instructor with other instructors). Any adverse comments by the students on the FCQs for his classes will be addressed as soon as possible. He will continue to mentor at least one faculty member per year in the "President's Learning Collaborative" program.

Scholarship (20%)

Dr. B will continue to edit the annual proceedings of the American Association of Radon Scientists. He will publish at least one paper in a refereed journal each year and deliver at least one talk at a national or international conference in his field. He will continue to do original research in radon related topics and be active in looking for external funding to conduct that research.

Service (50%)

Dr. B will continue to be the chair of the Department of Physics and Energy Sciences and, as such, will perform all activities expected of that office. These include, but are not limited to: supervision of the two classified employees in the department, supervision of the department budget, chairing of search committees and other departmental

committees, evaluation of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, hiring and firing of non-tenure track faculty and honoraria, advising of undergraduate physics majors, handling all student complaints and resolving conflicts between students and physics teachers, scheduling of courses, editing of bulletin copy, attending chairs' meetings, conducting post-tenure reviews, writing the 5-year departmental reviews and providing alcohol, purchased with non-state funds, for departmental meetings.

He will be expected to conduct his "Magic in Science" program for local school children at least one a month.

Dr. B will continue as Director of the Western Regional Radon Training Center and is expected to offer five radon courses a year, to be taught at UCCS. In addition, he is expected to generate \$250,000 annually in external funding, most of which will be monies generated in contracts with state and federal organizations seeking radon training.

This FRS is agreed to by:

Signatures

Faculty Member	_____	Date	_____
Unit Chair	_____	Date	_____
Dean of CLAS	_____	Date	_____

Example 5

**UCCS Department of History
Faculty Responsibility Statement**

Professor Z

Appointment

40% Professional Teaching
40% Scholarship
20% Service

Professional Teaching (40%)

Dr. Z will contribute to the teaching mission of the department by teaching 5-3 credit hour courses per academic year. Included in these courses will be a section every two years of the senior seminar that is required for all students. FCQ scores will at least be within one standard deviation of the department's average

Scholarship (40%)

Dr. Z will fulfill her contribution to this mission of the College through the completion of her research project on the history of the university as a part of the social fabric of the state of Colorado. It is expected that a contract for the book coming out of this research will be in hand with the first year of this FRS being signed, and significant progress will be made with the manuscript over the subsequent two years.

Service (20%)

Dr. Z will serve on the following College committees for this AY: Curriculum, Graduate Faculty, Graduate Admissions (Chair). Additionally, she will serve on college committees that meet regularly. Dr. Z has just been elected to national office in the National Historical Society. The work done in this capacity will also be considered a part of her service.

This FRS is agreed to by:

Signatures

Faculty Member _____ **Date** _____

Unit Chair _____ **Date** _____

Dean of Beth El _____ **Date** _____

Example 6

**UCCS Department of Visual and Performing Arts
Faculty Responsibility Statement**

Professor G

Appointment

40% Professional Teaching
40% Scholarship
20% Service

Professional Teaching (40%)

Dr. G will contribute to the teaching mission of the department by teaching 5-3 credit hour courses per academic year. Included in these courses will be a section every two years of Hum 399 that is required for all students. FCQ scores will at least be within one standard deviation of the department's average

Scholarship (40%)

Dr. G's scholarship activity will all be within the scholarship of creative work category. She will develop at least one major show every two years which will be professionally juried.

Service (20%)

Dr. G will serve on the following College committees for this AY: Curriculum, Graduate Faculty, Graduate Admissions (Chair). Additionally, she will serve on college committees that meet regularly. She has just been appointed to be a reviewer for NIA proposals. The work done in this capacity will also be considered a part of her service.

This FRS is agreed to by:

Signatures

Faculty Member _____ **Date** _____

Unit Chair _____ **Date** _____

Dean of LAS _____ **Date** _____

Appendix B

Non-Traditional Scholarship Peer Review Examples

Discussion

Evaluation of Scholarship

When scholarship is defined as traditional research and creative work (scholarship of discovery), the review process for that research is well-defined. The researcher's peers, generally also in academia, evaluate the work as part of the standard paper or grant proposal review process. This peer review process is widely accepted for research, but other forms of scholarship challenge the usefulness of this process, and even challenge the ways in which we define who should perform the review. The guiding principle in the discussion below is that reviewers of the validity of original scholarship are "those individuals qualified to judge the product" of the scholarship, whether they are academics, practitioners, or members of the general public.

Scholarship must be something which is written, performed, delivered, etc. at a level which is considered appropriately sophisticated for a university-level author or presenter. In plain words, even if the work contains original material, it must be at an intellectual level that cannot be duplicated by others with far less education or experience. Quite possibly, a lack of sophistication will be caught by the competent reviewers, but not always. A letter to the editor of a newspaper which encourages everyone to get a radon test, for example, would not be original, would not be reviewed, nor would it be sophisticated.

Scholarship of Discovery

This is the traditional research and creative works area, where the researcher's peers, generally also in academia, evaluate the work as part of the standard paper or grant proposal review process.

Scholarship of Integration

The review process in this area would follow the traditional scholarship of discovery process for the traditional publication and grant proposal products. Other products of Scholarship of Integration activities are best evaluated by the people who understand the significance of the cross-disciplinary insights gained from the product.

Scholarship of Application

When we apply our knowledge to practical problems in the real world, we generally serve two different constituencies: customers and users. Customers are those who benefit in some way from the product, whether or not they use the

product directly. Users are those who actually have direct interactions with the product.

For example, if a faculty member helps with development of educational games for 7th graders, the 7th graders are the users of the product. A 7th grade teacher, however, would be the customer, because she conceivably helps decide the requirements for the game based on what she needs her students to learn from the game and she (as well as the students) benefits from the learning the students acquire from the game.

In this scenario, it would obviously be unreasonable to have the users (the 7th graders) evaluate the validity of the scholarship, but the teacher (the customer) is uniquely qualified to judge the validity of the scholarship through direct observation of its effects on her students. In other cases, both the customers and the users of the product might be appropriate evaluators of the scholarship.

In general, the products generated through Scholarship of Application activities are best evaluated by the people (customers and/or users) who actually benefit from or use that product. Independent reviewers (e.g., those not directly involved in the project developing the product) who have similar qualifications to the customers and/or users directly involved in the project should also be used to evaluate the product.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

Traditional views of research generally require that the research be conducted in the researcher's field of specialty; rigorous inquiry into how to effectively teach the topics in that field are often characterized as "just teaching, not real research." Many times SoTL work is reviewed in the traditional way – a journal article is written and reviewed by peers before being published.

But other non-traditional review can take place. For example, publishing a textbook clearly falls in this category because the publication process includes critical review by numerous individuals qualified to judge the product (publishers tend to select reviewers familiar with the topic of the textbook). As another example, conducting a workshop to share insights into teaching and learning for a group of faculty colleagues would also qualify as SoTL if the workshop material meets the standards of scholarship and the attendees judge the workshop to be useful.

In general, the products generated through Scholarship of Teaching and Learning activities are best evaluated by the people involved as reviewers during the generation of the product (book reviewer) or the people (customers and/or users) who actually benefit from or use that product. Independent reviewers (e.g., those not directly involved in the project developing the product) who have similar

qualifications to the customers and/or users directly involved in the project should also be used to evaluate the product.

Scholarship of Creative Works

The scholarship of creative works has always been evaluated differently than traditional peer reviewed research. Generally, work is judged by artistic peers in formal settings where a faculty member demonstrates his or her professional competence in a gallery, theater production, or concert. These methods of faculty evaluation will remain unaltered with this proposal.

Examples of Peer Review of Non-Traditional Scholarship

Scholarship of Application

Example 1

Description

Works with K-12 teachers through the PIPES grant and other mechanisms to help BI™ students develop and evaluate the effectiveness of educational games. Both the games and the evaluation results are documented for the reviewers.

Non-traditional Peer Review

The teachers involved in the activity evaluate the validity of the scholarship through a questionnaire including both Likert scale questions and open-ended questions. Reviewers not directly involved in the project also evaluate the product.

Traditional Peer Review

The effectiveness of the games in enhancing learning is evaluated by comparison to a control group and the material is sent to an education journal and published.

Example 2

Description

Professor H has produced a technical report as a consultant for the Canyonview school district. This analysis projects population trends and the impacts on schools within the district using an original research methodology and incorporating quantitative and qualitative data. The analysis presents alternative scenarios to be used in district planning based on an understanding of local political culture and dynamics.

Non-traditional Peer Review

Description of the project and the products of work reviewed by researchers who conduct similar studies for school districts, school superintendents, school officials, and professional planners. Commentary provided on originality and significance of work.

Traditional Peer Review

The technical report is rewritten and is accepted by a University Press for publication in a book series on school politics.

Example 3

Description

A faculty member measures the properties of stainless steel that is used in carrying gasses in the local semiconductor industry and writes a report to that company.

Non-traditional Peer Review

The faculty member working with the industry develops a process to eliminate contaminants and this is patented.

Traditional Peer Review

The faculty then generalizes the results and writes a paper that appears in a peer-reviewed technical journal.

Example 4

Description

A faculty member works with the local utilities to go to local schools and give talks on the benefits of compact fluorescent light bulbs. The faculty member studies the impact of these talks and how the work with the school district engineer to implement a new light bulb program that makes an impact. The faculty member along with the school engineer, studies the costs versus the savings, and writes a report which is sent to other school districts.

Non-traditional Peer Review

This report is evaluated by other schools who also adopt this new lighting system.

Traditional Peer Review for this same work – the results of the work are published in a peer reviewed journal.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Example 1

Description

Publishes a textbook (note the textbook would need to be published, not just written).

Non-traditional Peer Review

Critical review occurs during the publication process. Actual publication implies positive results from that critical review.

Example 2

Description

Synthesizes insights into teaching and learning and conducts a workshop to share those insights with faculty colleagues.

Non-traditional Peer Review

Workshop attendees evaluate the validity of the scholarship through a questionnaire including both Likert scale questions and open-ended questions.

Traditional Peer Review

The professor writes up the insights, demonstrates how these insights change learning outcomes and publishes the results in a peer-reviewed journal.

Example 3

Description

Professor M and her research team have designed a curriculum for building inclusiveness in the workplace and in the classroom. This curriculum builds a theoretical foundation for understanding inclusiveness and leads participants through experiential exercises leading to participatory problem-solving. This project also includes the design and implementation of strategies to embed this educational program in institutional practices throughout the institution.

Non-traditional Peer Review

Description of the project and assessment measures reviewed by diversity administrators, faculty, and staff from other universities. Commentary provided on originality and significance of work.

Traditional Peer Review

The work is rewritten in journal format and is peer reviewed by a national journal and published.

Scholarship of Integration

Example 1

Description

Professor J has redesigned an engineering course to underscore the cultural context of engineering practice and the relationship of distinct social groups to engineered public spaces. This work incorporates interdisciplinary and cross-cultural course materials to challenge students to design alternative solutions and evaluate whether technologies are culturally and socially appropriate.

Non-traditional Peer Review

Description of course design, teaching methodology and learning outcomes reviewed by teachers in multiple disciplines. Commentary provided by colleagues on originality and significance of work.

Example 2

Description

A faculty member gives a general talk on Pluto to the Society of Physics Students. He subsequently works with PBS and makes a half-hour documentary on Pluto which is eventually shown on TV.

Non-traditional Peer Review

Professionals, not necessarily other academics, review this documentary and publish reviews about it in appropriate venues. The fact that it appears on television also indicates that it has passed a number of internal reviews.

Example 3

Description

A Geography faculty collects data and does the needed GIS work to establish a natural hazard website for the county. This website is used by other earth scientists, county and city planners, and the real estate industry.

Non-traditional Peer Review

The county planners and the Home Builders Association provide comments and criticisms for the usefulness of the website.

Traditional Peer Review

The process of creating the website and the impacts of the site are studied. A journal article evolves out of this work that is peer reviewed and published in an international journal.

Scholarship of Creative Works

Example 1

Description

Professor K develops a series of sculptures which are part of the theme being shown at a regional art gallery. He is chosen by a jury of art peers to participate in this show.

*Non-traditional Peer Review**

The fact that he was chosen for the show and the reviews that come from this showing are both considered peer review of scholarship.

**Traditional Peer Review*

The above review is the normal way creative works are reviewed.

Counter-Examples of Non-Traditional Scholarship – Things which are not scholarship

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

- *Description:* Generates class notes for a class instead of using a textbook. There's no critical review of the validity of the scholarship by individuals qualified to judge the product.
- *Description:* Diversity presentations that do not represent original contributions to understanding or innovations in teaching methodology.
- *Description:* A faculty member gives a general talk on Pluto to the Society of Physics Students. This is not scholarship because it is not original, nor is it sophisticated.

Scholarship of Application

- *Description:* Activities that involve the routine application of research methodologies in empirical settings may fall under professional practice rather than scholarship, for example, producing opinion survey and reporting results without original analysis or methodological innovation.
- *Description:* A faculty member measures the properties of stainless steel that is used in carrying gasses in the local semiconductor industry and write a report to that company. No review takes place as the report is just accepted by the company.
- *Description:* A faculty member works with the local utilities to go to local schools and give talks on the benefits of compact fluorescent light bulbs.

Scholarship of Integration

- *Description:* Participation in interdisciplinary conference that does not result in original integrative contribution.

Finally, we note that just because some work is considered as scholarship, it does not necessarily mean that it has the same weight as other work in evaluations. For example, a single presentation on the theory of learning may be scholarship, but it might not be regarded as an equal to a published book on the theory of learning.