

# PORTFOLIO HANDBOOK

*FOR*

*REAPPOINTMENT*

*TENURE*

*PROMOTION*



Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts  
2/4/15

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>A Message to the MCLA Faculty</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Portfolio Security</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Evidence/Criteria</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Portfolio Evidence/Criteria for Librarians</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Portfolio Documents</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Reduced Submissions for Third and Fifth Year Reappointments</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Evaluations during Third, Fourth and Fifth Year Reappointments</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Organization Guidelines</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Recommendation to include a Narrative</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Some Options for Organizing the Portfolio</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Considerations of Fairness</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Additional Considerations</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Some Cautionary Notes about SIR II's</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Evaluation Timelines</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Candidate's Right to Respond</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>PEC's and Other Issues: Memo</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>PEC Checklist for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>The Importance of Tenure</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>a. Review Period</b>	
<b>b. Eligibility for Tenure</b>	
<b>Eligibility for Promotion</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>The Exceptional Clause</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Memo: Promotion Language: The Exceptional Clause</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Special Thanks</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	

## **A Message to MCLA Faculty**

This is the **third edition** of the Portfolio Handbook. This edition reflects changes in the 2014-2017 Contract. A concerted effort was made to develop a comprehensive guide but some sections may need to be improved in future editions. We hope you will find this handbook helpful.

The Portfolio handbook is both a guide and a summary of the applicable provisions found in the collective bargaining agreement. The agreement is posted on the MSCA website at [www.mscaunion.org](http://www.mscaunion.org). This document was prepared by Michele Ethier, with Dana Rapp and Deb Foss providing editorial assistance. While we believe that the statements contained in this handbook are accurate, we welcome questions, comments, and clarification for future editions.

Relevant documents can be found in the appendices of this handbook.

**Reappointments, tenure and promotion are earned. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate that s/he has fulfilled the criteria that pertain to the personnel action for which s/he is a candidate.**

The following handbooks may be useful to candidates seeking reappointment, tenure, promotion or Post-Tenure Review.

**The Peer Evaluation Committee Handbook  
The Committee on Tenure Handbook  
The Committee on Promotion Handbook  
The PTR Handbook**

All sections contained in this handbook refer to the current 2014-2017 agreement.

## **Portfolio Security**

Portfolios are secured in or near the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) Office. Documents within the portfolio may not be removed or photocopied. Portfolio materials are confidential documents.

Deliberations regarding portfolios are confidential proceedings.

## **Evidence/Criteria**

A candidate's portfolio should show evidence of the following:

- Teaching effectiveness (for faculty).
- Academic advising (for faculty). If a faculty member has more than 30 advisees, she/he can elect to have those considered under category II of Continuing Scholarship.
- Effectiveness in performing assigned responsibilities (for librarians).
- Effectiveness in rendering assistance to students, faculty, and the academic community (for librarians).
- Continuing scholarship.
- Professional activities.
- Alternative assignments (if any).

The evaluation is conducted according to the criteria selected by the candidate on Appendix A-1 or A-2. These are as follows:

### *Continuing Scholarship*

*Candidates are required to select one criterion for continuing scholarship but may choose to select more.*

- Contribution to the content of the discipline (for faculty); contribution to the content and pedagogy of the discipline through the development of library programs or library services (for librarians).
- Participation in or contribution to professional organizations and societies.
- Research as demonstrated by published or unpublished work.
- Artistic or other creative activities.
- Work toward the terminal degree or relevant post graduate study.
- Other, as explained by the candidate.

### Professional Activities

*Candidates are required to select one criterion for professional activities but may choose to select more.*

- Public Service.
- Contributions to the professional growth and development of the College Community.(May include academic advising of students in excess of 30 as assigned at the beginning of the semester).
- Other, as explained by the candidate.

### Alternative Assignments

*This is only considered if the candidate has an alternative assignment and, if so, the individual must be evaluated in the role of:*

- Chair.
- Alternative Professional Responsibilities.
- Professional development program.
- Other, as explained by the candidate.

**Alternative assignment applies to anyone who receives a course reduction for any reason.**

### Evaluation Standards

**The basis of the evaluation is “professional quality demonstrated with reference to each of the applicable criteria.”**

**For promotion, the current Agreement states, “it being the understanding of the parties that for promotion to each higher rank a higher order of quality may be properly demanded” (Article VIII).**

When recommending in favor of reappointment, promotion, or tenure, evaluators have an obligation to provide **clear and convincing** arguments in favor of the action. When recommending against reappointment, promotion or tenure, evaluators have an obligation to provide **full and complete** reasons for its recommendation.

Completed evaluations are transmitted to

- The Department Chair for reappointment and promotion
- The Committee on Tenure through the VPAA for tenure

Please note: Portfolios must be submitted in hard copy. This is required. An identical electronic copy is optional.

## **Portfolio Evidence/Criteria for Librarians**

- Effectiveness in performing assigned responsibilities in the Library.
- Effectiveness in rendering assistance to students, faculty and the academic community.
- Direct observation of Librarians Performance: Form needs to be developed. Librarians are responsible for developing the form.

See Appendix A-2 – (the checklist)

- I. Continuing Scholarship: (Candidates are required to select one criterion for continuing scholarship but may choose to select more.)
  - a. Contributions to the content and pedagogy of the discipline through the development of library programs or library services.
  - b. Participation in or contribution to professional organizations and societies.
  - c. Research as demonstrated by published or unpublished work.
  - d. Work toward the terminal degree or relevant post graduate study.
- II. Professional Activities:
  - Public Service
  - Contributions to the professional growth and development of the University. This service may include work on inter-institutional and system wide committees and service as a program area chair (without release time).
- III. Alternative Assignments (if applicable) – any assignment in lieu of the normal librarian workload in library services, may include a program of professional development or service as Library Program Area Chair.

**Please note**: Whenever a librarian teaches a credit-bearing course, his/her teaching will be evaluated under the provisions of Article VIII, the same as a faculty member's teaching.

### Evaluation Standards

The basis of the evaluation is “professional quality demonstrated with reference to each of the applicable criteria.”

For promotion, the current Agreement states, “it being the understanding of the parties that for promotion to each higher rank a higher order of quality may be demanded.”

Materials to be used in the Evaluation of Librarians

- a. Direct Observation and written evaluation of the Librarian’s Performance: by Library Director or Library Program Area Chair. Librarian evaluation: Library Peer Evaluation Committee evaluates Librarians every 3<sup>rd</sup> year of service beginning in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year unless otherwise directed by the VP.
- b. (Appendix A-2 checklist)
- c. Appendix B and resume
- d. Additional Evaluation Reports (if librarian received a reduction in his/her workload) – does not include acting as an officer in the Faculty Association
- e. Relevant materials submitted by the librarian being evaluated, including any written self-evaluation the librarian chooses to submit.

**PORTFOLIO DOCUMENTS**

	<b><u>Mandatory</u></b> Professional Activities “Checklist” Appendix A-1 or A-2), most recent resume and Appendix B-1.	<b><u>Optional</u></b>	<b><u>Omit</u></b>
<b><u>Teaching Effectiveness</u></b>	<p><b><u>single syllabus</u></b>/outline for each course taught during review period. e.g. If you taught multiple sections of a course or the same course multiple semesters, submit a single syllabus.</p> <p><b><u>Student Evaluations</u></b> (SIR-II results for each course)            A. 1 section of each type of course for tenured faculty            B. All sections for each type of course for non-tenured faculty</p> <p><b><u>Classroom Visits:</u></b>            Appendix: D-1(a)            Dept. Chair:            A. 1 section of each course in Fall &amp; Spring for 1<sup>st</sup> year faculty.            B. For all other personnel actions (1 section of each type of course taught per semester (limit of 2 per semester.)            PEC Appendix D-2(b)            A. one course per year, not</p>	<p>Sample of course materials you developed: exams, paper topics, assignments, outlines, powerpoint presentations, bibliography</p> <p>own formative or summative data (follow data collection guidelines) Signed letters from students to document teaching effectiveness.</p>	<p>Multiple syllabi for a single course unless substantial changes were made.</p> <p>Anonymous, unsigned letters from students</p> <p>Articles written by other people about teaching effectiveness or pedagogical techniques, copies of student work, routine email correspondence about scheduling, etc.</p> <p>DGCE Evaluations</p> <p>Multiple copies of “Interpreting SIRII Results”)</p>

<b>Teaching (other)</b>	necessarily the same course B. 2 <sup>nd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> yr., for reappointment C. Promotion D. Tenure	Narrative description, (optional but highly recommended) of teaching philosophy & pedagogical methods, documentation of activities to improve teaching, address criticisms.	
<b>Advising</b>		Narrative description and data about advising load	Schedule from office door, weekly office hours, or schedules for advising appointments
	<b>Mandatory</b>	<b>Optional</b>	<b>Omit</b>
<b>Continuing Scholarship</b>	<p><b>Category I on Appendix A-1 (must check 1)</b> and provide <u>appropriate documentation</u></p> <p><b>Options:</b> Unpublished papers, publications, presentations, artistic creations, nontraditional/unconventional “products”</p> <p><b>For work in progress:</b> recent draft or proposal, current status of the project and timeline for completion.</p> <p><b>For conference attended:</b> documentation of sessions attended, continuing ed. credits, certificate of attendance, single registration document for conference.</p> <p><b>For faculty working on terminal degree:</b> include most recent transcript, description of completed courses, remaining coursework, timeline for completion of dissertation/thesis &amp; projected graduation date.</p>	May check more than one but will be evaluated on all that are checked	<p>Routine correspondence about activity</p> <p>Drafts of work already completed</p> <p>Conference registration info</p> <p>Resumes or publications by collaborators</p> <p>Inclusion of entire conference booklet (copy only the cover &amp; page that includes your name (highlighted))</p> <p>Copies of student research you sponsored.</p>



Classroom Observation Clarification: Post observation visit (where PEC/Chair visit with the candidate) to discuss the class is done **prior** to completing D-1a or D-1b (classroom observation or distance observation form.)

## **AMENDMENTS**

### **Reduced Submission Requirements**

**Amendments to the 2012-2014 Contract that impact Portfolios:**  
**Reduced Submission requirements apply during the third and fifth year reappointments.**

- The materials required to be submitted in reappointment evaluations in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> years are a narrative, SIR II student evaluations and classroom direct observations by the department chair or library director as appropriate.
- PEC's are not required
- Documents to support the claims made in the narrative (other than those mentioned above) are not required.
- No other evidence for teaching effectiveness such as syllabi or course documents are necessary.
- No evidence of effectiveness (for librarians) in performing assigned responsibilities.
- No evidence in rendering assistance to students, faculty and the academic community (for librarians).
- No evidence for continuing scholarship, professional activities, or alternative assignments (for faculty).

**PLEASE NOTE:** The review period for reappointment in the 4<sup>th</sup> year must include the faculty/librarian's 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> years.

**These Amendments remain in effect in the  
2014-2017 agreement.**

## Evaluations of Tenure-Track Unit Members during Their Third, Fourth and Fifth Years

- I. Evaluation of a unit member during his/her third and fifth years\*
  - A. Unit member submits ONLY a narrative that addresses accomplishments during the one-year review period ending with the submission of the narrative.
  - B. There is no Peer Evaluation Committee.
  - C. The Department Chair conducts classroom observations and completes an evaluation of teaching effectiveness, academic advising, scholarship, service (and any Alternative Professional Responsibilities), based on the unit member's narrative and the relevant student evaluation reports.

The unit member will be responsible for documenting in the following year's portfolio the statements made in the third and fifth year narratives.

- II. Evaluation of a unit member during his/her fourth, year
  - A. The unit member submits a comprehensive portfolio for a **two-year review period**.
  - B. The Peer Evaluation Committee conducts classroom observations and completes an evaluation as is done during a unit member's second year, except that the evaluation will address a **two-year review period**.
  - C. The Department Chair conducts classroom observations and completes an evaluation addressing a **two-year review period**.

\*This summary pertains to unit members hired on tenure track on or after January 1, 2006.

## Organization Guidelines

In fairness to evaluators, it is important to spend some time organizing your portfolio so that it is easy to read and locate documents. Consider using a table of contents, tabs or dividers and numbering pages. Be sure to include all mandatory materials and be selective about optional materials. The quality of your work, and not the quantity of documents, is what counts in the evaluation process. If you include a narrative (and it is highly recommended that you do), then have one narrative for all evaluative criteria at the beginning of the portfolio or a separate narrative for each criterion before the specific section. Your narrative could be broken into subsections following the criteria found on Appendix A-1 for faculty and A-2 for librarians. Your portfolio could also be broken into subdivisions using tabs or dividers and following the mandatory evaluation criteria found on Appendix A-1/A-2, (see Article VIII of the Agreement). In other words, include a discussion in your narrative and a subsection within your portfolio on: teaching effectiveness, academic advising, continuing scholarship, professional activities, and alternative assignments (if applicable). For additional suggestions on portfolio organization, see "A Guide to the Selection and Organization of Evaluation Materials" by Patricia Markunas in the MSCA Perspective, Summer 2010.

**It is recommended that all candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion attend a portfolio workshop sponsored by the Faculty Association and the VPAA.** This workshop is offered annually.

Why does the MCLA Faculty Association recommend that you include a narrative in your portfolio?

The narrative is an optional document. The Agreement does not require it. The MCLA Faculty Association recommends that you include a narrative for a number of reasons. First, the narrative helps to focus evaluators on your unique and significant contributions, as well as provide you with an opportunity to highlight the substantial evidence provided in your portfolio. The documents help verify and demonstrate that you've fulfilled the criteria that pertain to the personnel action for which you are a candidate, and the narrative helps you explain your professional self to evaluators who may be unfamiliar with your work. The narrative allows you to frame the portfolio in light of your individual strengths and allows you to address any weaknesses in terms of how you will make changes to improve them. It states clearly why you have earned reappointment, tenure or promotion.

## **Some Options for Organizing the Portfolio For Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and PTR**

The following options are suggestions **only**. **The Contract/Agreement does not address organization of the Portfolio for Personnel Actions**. There are many ways to organize the portfolio. There is no one right way. These are just suggestions.

### **Option 1:**

Introduction – an overall statement of the personnel action you seek and that you have earned it. For example: I am seeking \_\_\_\_\_ . I am providing a substantial portfolio in support of this personnel action. **OR** I am \_\_\_\_\_ and this is my work. You will find that I have earned \_\_\_\_\_. My portfolio substantiates this claim. **OR** The evidence within this portfolio will confirm that I deserve to be \_\_\_\_\_. **OR** your own unique way of introducing yourself and your work

Table of Contents

Appendix A-1 (faculty) or A-2 (librarians)

Appendix B and CV

## Narrative Self Evaluation on all contractual criteria:

### Faculty

Teaching Effectiveness

Academic Advising

Continuing Scholarship

Professional Activities

Alternative Assignments

### Librarians

Library Effectiveness

Effectiveness with Students, faculty, others

Continuing Scholarship

Professional Activities

Alternative Assignments

### Appendices:

Course Documents: syllabi, Sir II's, classroom visitations, and other optional documents such as selected assignments, exams, paper topics, etc.

Advising: no documents are mandated by the contract.

Optional documents or narrative might include flow sheets you created, analysis of advising on Sir II's, your advising philosophy, your mentorship of students, other, etc. Although no documents are required in this category you are evaluated on advising and therefore the candidate must provide something for evaluators to evaluate. It is a classic Catch-22 for the candidate or double-bind for the evaluator.

Continuing Scholarship (Category 1): documents to support contributions to your discipline, participation in professional organizations, research both published and unpublished, artistic creations and activities, other such as unconventional

products. What you include here depends on what you checked off on A-1 or A-2 but you can include other documents that address the categories you have not checked.

Professional Activities (Category II): documents to support public service, departmental service, college service, 30+ advisees, other. What you include here depends on what you checked off on A-1 or A-2 but you can include other documents.

Alternative Assignments: documents to support your alternative service as chair, work in counseling center, alternative assignment (anything you received a course reduction for,) professional development program, other.

**With Option 1 the evaluator reads the narrative and then locates the documents that support the claims made in the narrative. The evaluator will need to flip back and forth between the narrative and the appropriate appendix. Candidates should make it logical and sequential. Consider using page numbers, tabs and dividers.**

## **Option 2**

Introduction (same as above)

Appendix A-1 or A-2

Appendix B and CV

Table of Contents

Narrative Self Evaluation for Each contractual criterion with documents following each criterion.

A. Narrative Self Evaluation on Teaching

Teaching Documents

B. Narrative Self Evaluation on Advising

Advising Documents (optional)

C. Narrative Self Evaluation on Continuing Scholarship

Scholarship Documents

D. Narrative Self Evaluation on Professional Activities

Professional Activities Documents

E. Narrative Self Evaluation on Alternative Assignments (if any)

Alternative Service Documents

**Option 2 reads like a book.**

**Option 3**

Narrative Self Evaluation on Teaching

Teaching Documents

Appendix A-1 or A-2

Appendix B and CV

Table of Contents

Narrative on all other criteria

Documents on all other criteria broken up by dividers or tabs.

**Option 3 rationale: Candidate feels strongly that because state universities are primarily teaching institutions, other documents are of secondary importance.**

**Option 4 (not recommended)**

No narrative. A narrative is not required by the contract but it is **highly recommended** by the MSCA and the MCLA Faculty Association.

Documents only, separated by contractual criteria.

**Option 5 (not recommended)**

All mandatory documents and optional documents included in file without a narrative or any organization by criteria.

**Where does sabbatical work belong in the portfolio?**

**Sabbaticals are for study and research (broadly defined). In part it depends on what you did during your sabbatical. It could be included as a separate category or under continuing scholarship or professional activities. I suppose an argument could be made to include it under alternative service since you receive multiple course reductions during a sabbatical. Use your best judgment. I would hope that evaluators would not**

**penalize you if they disagree with your interpretation of where to put sabbatical work. The Contract does not seem to address it.**

**The opinions expressed here are mine and mine alone. The options included here (except Options 4 and 5 which I have never seen) are those that I have read most often when serving as Chair, on PEC's, the COT and COP. There are certainly other possibilities and ways to combine the options to fit your own unique presentation of self. There is no one right way.**

### **Three General Rules to Consider:**

- 1. Follow Contractual Criteria**
- 2. Mandatory documents before optional documents**
- 3. Reverse chronological order (most recent first)**

#### **Considerations of Fairness**

Both candidates and evaluators have a responsibility to be fair to each other. It is important that both share an understanding of the Agreement, the criteria of evaluation, and the evaluation process. A culture of shared expectations at MCLA will enhance the probability that personnel actions will be productive, respectful, and collegial.

##### **A. Scholarship**

Evaluation by the PEC, COT, or COP requires the exercise of academic judgment. Scholarship or pedagogy can vary across departments or even within a single department, so effort is needed to understand disciplines that are different from one's own. In Article VIII the Agreement states that

"In evaluating each member of the faculty, it shall be the responsibility of those charged with doing so to assess the quality, significance and relevance of that faculty member's continuing scholarship."

Please note that quantity is not an evaluative measure. What constitutes scholarship is open to interpretation and may involve both traditional, nontraditional and unconventional “products.”

B. Contractual Criteria Only

Be objective and open-minded. Although it may seem obvious, remember to address only the contractual criteria and not extraneous matters such as personal interactions or department issues. Use only documentation provided in the portfolio. Evidence obtained or provided from other sources **cannot** be used in the evaluation. Evaluations should not include incidental observations.

C. Organization

**A candidate’s file should be clearly organized** and include one or more of the following: a table of contents, tabs, sections, dividers, numbered pages. The Agreement does not address how to organize a portfolio. There is no one right way. See: Options for organizing the portfolio included in this handbook.

D. Missing Documents

**A candidate should provide a full and complete portfolio.** It is understood that evaluators may request missing documents (via appropriate channels or personnel) in order to make a clear and convincing, or full and complete, recommendation. Evaluators may not arbitrarily decide to request one or two missing documents from one candidate but not from another candidate. There is no limit on the number of appropriate documents that can be requested.

E. Categories

It shall be the responsibility of any member of the bargaining unit who is a candidate for reappointment, tenure, or promotion to verify and demonstrate that he/she has fulfilled the criteria that pertain to the personnel action for which she/he is a candidate. In applying these criteria, it should be understood that Massachusetts State Universities are primarily teaching institutions.

F. Definitions and Standards

In Article VIII, A4 of the Agreement, it states, “it being the understanding of the parties that for promotion to each higher rank, a higher order of quality may properly be demanded.”

What is the higher standard? What is the standard? What is the lower standard? These are questions that the contract does not answer.

G. Professional Quality (Article VIII, A4): Professional quality is **not defined** in the contract.

H. Meritorious Performance (Article VIII, Article xx): is **not defined** in the contract.

### **Additional Considerations:**

1. The narrative is an optional document (but highly recommended).
2. Candidates cannot be compared.
3. Quotas are not allowed. Quotas by rank are not allowed.
4. No Faculty member should serve on an evaluation committee or participate in the conduct of an evaluation if to do so would constitute a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest.
5. All evaluators are bound to **keep confidential** all aspects of an evaluation.
6. The absence of student evaluations from the record of the following semesters shall not be considered either positively or negatively when evaluating a faculty member's teaching effectiveness: Fall 1999, Spring 2000, Fall 2000, Fall 2003, Spring 2004, Fall 2004, Spring 2005, Fall 2005.
7. For Positive Recommendation – Clear and convincing reasons (Article VIII)
8. For Negative Recommendation – Full and complete reasons (Article VIII)
9. Paid Work: Service cannot be discounted or ignored on the basis that candidate was compensated for the work. This applies to both faculty and librarians.
10. Evaluators must vote: Members of PEC, COP and COT must vote. **Members cannot abstain.**
11. Role of COP and VP: COP does not consult with VP. COP makes a single recommendation to VP and process moves forward.
12. **Who in the administration will evaluate the candidate?** VP can delegate to Academic Dean. Levels of evaluation cannot be split.
13. **Who cannot evaluate the candidate:** Dean of Graduate Education or Graduate Studies, Dean of Continuing Education, Dean of Graduate and Continuing Ed, Dean of Students, Dean of Enrollment Management, Dean of Admissions, Dean of Multicultural Affairs, and Dean of Faculty Development cannot evaluate candidates for reappointment, tenure, promotion, tenure with promotion, or post-tenure review.
14. **Notification Date of Administrator who will conduct evaluation:** 2015/2016 and thereafter by April 8<sup>th</sup>.

### Some Cautionary Notes About SIR II's

(See MSCA Perspective)

- ETS will no longer process SIR II forms where 6 or fewer students are enrolled. The scores are not valid with an N of 6 or less. The Administration will not distribute evaluations to courses with 6 or fewer students. Evaluators must hold harmless if this applies to the candidate.
- Evaluators should be cautious when drawing conclusions about SIR II Evaluation data.
- The MSCA is pursuing 3 consolidated grievances alleging procedural violations in the misuse and inconsistent use of SIR II student evaluation forms.
- SIR II's cannot be used as the sole or only determinant of teaching effectiveness. Course materials, classroom observations by the chair and peers and the self evaluation are **equally important** components.
- The SIR II student evaluations are **NOT** more important than other types of evaluation.

### Comparison Group of 4 Year Institutions

- Compared to 19 other institutions not identified
- There are 2,474 four year institutions of higher education in the United States. The sample size of 19 is only .77%
- The MSCA maintains that the SIR II comparison group should not be described as “peers”, “national peers”, “peer institutions”, “comparable institutions”, “similar institutions”, etc.
- The 19 institutions (unnamed and unidentified) may be substantially different from the state universities in Massachusetts.
- Comparative does not mean comparable!
- **SIR II's do not indicate teaching effectiveness as excellent, very good, good, average, moderate, or low. These terms were rejected by the designers of SIR II and should not be used in your evaluative statements regarding SIR II's.**

**\*Beware the Micrometer Fallacy:** Don't make decisions or draw conclusions based on small differences.

**This data was fully discussed in the MSCA Perspective's special issue for State University Faculty and Librarians undergoing Personnel Action.** (Quoted here with permission of the MSCA.)

## Timelines

If a deadline falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, the action is due on the next business day. Actions should be taken no later than the dates indicated.

Action	Reappointment				
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth
Materials submitted	N/A	SEE CPC	SEE CPC	SEE CPC	SEE CPC
PEC members selected	N/A	9/30	N/A	9/30	N/A
Classroom Observations by Chair/Library Director	SEE CPC	Previous Semester or SEE CPC	Previous Semester or SEE CPC	Previous Semester or SEE CPC	Previous Semester or SEE CPC
PEC conducts classroom visits	N/A	SEE CPC	N/A	SEE CPC	N/A
PEC submits evaluation to candidate (5)	N/A	SEE CPC	N/A	SEE CPC	N/A
PEC submits evaluation to Chair/Library Director	N/A	SEE CPC	N/A	SEE CPC	N/A
Evaluation by Chair/Library Director (5)	N/A	SEE CPC	SEE CPC	SEE CPC	SEE CPC
Submission sent to VPAA (6)	N/A	SEE CPC	SEE CPC	SEE CPC	SEE CPC
Evaluation by VPAA	N/A	SEE CPC	SEE CPC	SEE CPC	SEE CPC
Submission sent to President	SEE CPC	SEE CPC	SEE CPC	SEE CPC	SEE CPC
Non-renewal Notification N/A = Not Applicable	03/15	01/15	9/1 of final year	9/1/ of final year	9/1 of final year

**cpc=current personnel calendar**

**Definition of Day: Deadlines following a Saturday, Sunday or holiday are moved to the next day. This applies to evaluation deadlines and the candidate's right to respond.**

## Timelines

If a deadline falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, the action is due on the next business day. Actions should be taken no later than the dates indicated.

<b>TENURE</b>		<b>PROMOTION</b>		<b>CHAIR EVALUATION</b>	
Materials Submitted	CPC	Materials Submitted	CPC	Selection of PEC (7)	9/30
Chair Conducts Classroom Visit	Previous semester or by CPC	PEC Members Selected	9/30	Solicits Comments from department	CPC
Evaluation by Chair/Library Director	CPC (5)	Classroom Visit by Chair/Library Directory	Previous Semester or by CPC	PEC submits rec. to Chair	CPC (5)
Chair/Library Director transmits to next step	CPC	PEC conducts classroom visits	CPC	PEC submits to VP	CPC
PEC conducts classroom visit	CPC	PEC submits evaluation to candidate	CPC (5)		
PEC evaluation conducted	CPC	PEC submits to Chair/Library Director	CPC		
PEC submits to COT via VPAA	CPC				
Recommendation by COT to candidate	CPC (6)	Evaluation by Chair/Library Director	CPC (5)		
COT Submits to VP	CPC	Chair Submits to COP via VP	CPC		
Recommendation of VP to candidate	CPC (6)	COP submits to VP	CPC		
VP recommends to President	CPC	Recommendation By VP	CPC (6)		
Pres. Rec. to Trust.	CPC	VPAA sub. To Pres.	CPC		
		Pres. Recommends	CPC		

**cpc=current personnel calendar**

For candidates applying for BOTH promotion and tenure: see supplement to Appendix M-1 for current AY (attached to the current personnel calendar.)

## **Notes**

1. Peer Evaluation Committees must be formed no later than 09/30. Candidates select the third member of the committee. Given the early deadlines for classroom observations for reappointments, it is recommended that PEC's be formed as early as possible.
2. For Librarians, the Library Director conducts direct observation.
3. The Committee on Promotions must be formed no later than 09/30.
4. The Committee on Tenure must be formed no later than 10/30.
5. Candidate has **10** calendar days from receipt to respond.
6. Candidate has **7** calendar days from receipt to respond.
7. Chairs are evaluated by Departmental PEC's during the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> years of first term and during the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of any subsequent consecutive terms.

## **Candidate's Right to Respond**

The faculty member has the right to respond to **any** written evaluation conducted by **any** evaluative body.

- The PEC's evaluation: 10 calendar days to respond
- Chair's evaluation: 10 calendar days to respond
- Vice President's evaluation: 7 calendar days to respond

For promotion and tenure, COP and COT evaluations are transmitted to the faculty member through the Vice President: 7 calendar days to respond.

"Days" begin with the date the candidate receives the evaluation (the candidate signs it, indicating it has been received and read.)

The Faculty Association recommends that the candidate respond to a negative evaluation.

## **PEC'S AND Other Issues**

Dear Faculty,

I have received numerous questions about PEC's and related issues. Let's see if I can clarify some, most, or all of them: PEC's are required for reappointment, promotion, tenure and tenure with promotion (but PEC is for tenure) PEC's are not required for reduced submissions, 1<sup>st</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> year.

- Only tenured MCSC members are eligible to serve on PEC's (tenure at any rank) A person can serve on more than one PEC.
- Unit members on sabbatical or other leave only during the spring may serve on PEC's since the business of these committees will conclude during the fall semester. Unit members on sabbatical for a full year or just the Fall semester may not serve on PEC's
- Unit members who serve on the PEC of a faculty member may not also serve of the tenure committee of that individual.
- Department Chairs may not serve on a PEC within their own Department.

### **DEPARTMENT CHAIRS CANNOT SERVE ON ANY PEC'S.**

- A candidate for promotion may not serve on a PEC.
- Members of the Committee on Promotions may not serve on the PEC of any candidate for promotion. They are not prohibited from serving on the PEC of candidates seeking reappointment or tenure.
- A candidate for PTR can serve as the third member of a PEC if s/he is not evaluating the Department Chair. A person undergoing post-tenure review may not serve on the PEC for the evaluation of a chair who is observing him/her.

### **EVALUATION OF CHAIR AS CHAIR**

- First term as chair – during the second and third years
- Each subsequent consecutive term – during the third year

### **PEER EVALUATION COMMITTEE FOR CHAIR**

- The committee solicits comments from all members of the department.
- The committee records its evaluation on Appendix D-4

### **CHAIR AS PTR CANDIDATE**

When a chair is a PTR candidate, the chair may not conduct classroom observations of any other PTR candidate. In the circumstance above, the tenured members of the department would elect a chair from among themselves to serve as chair for all candidates in the department up for PTR.

### **A NON-TENURED CHAIR**

A non-tenured chair may not evaluate a candidate for tenure or serve as a consultant to the COT. If that circumstance exists, then the tenured members of the department must elect one from among themselves to serve as chair for all tenure evaluations in the department.

### **EVALUATION OF CHAIR FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION OR TENURE**

The evaluation procedure follows those for faculty being evaluated for the same personnel action except that there is no evaluation by a chair. The first evaluation in the evaluation process is therefore conducted by the PEC. Evaluations of the chair as chair (see above) are a part of the record used in any evaluation of the chair for reappointment, promotion or tenure.

**Please note: The Contract is not an easy document to decipher. I've tried to clarify rather than obscure. I hope this helps. Take care.**

## **PEC CHECKLIST**

### Checklist for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

- Department elects two tenured members to the PEC by September 30, (only tenured and tenure-track faculty can vote)
- Candidate selects third member (must be tenured.)
- PEC meets to elect the PEC chair.
- Candidate submits materials to Department Chair/Director of Library Services including Appendix A-1 or A-2, B-2 (the Comprehensive Resume), and supporting materials.
- PEC obtains candidate's materials from Chair/Director of Library Services.
- For faculty, each PEC member visits one class for the purposes of evaluating teaching effectiveness, and completes Appendix D-1 (a), the Classroom Visitation Form.
- PEC meets to discuss candidate's portfolio and contractual criteria and takes an official vote recommending for or against personnel action. Please note that evaluators must vote. Members cannot abstain.
- PEC can invite candidate to meet with them prior to writing the report.
- PEC writes and signs the report using Appendix D-2(b) for faculty, or Appendix E-1 (b) for librarians.
- PEC shares report with candidate, who has 10 days to respond (reappointment or promotion), or 7 days to respond (tenure).

After 7 or 10 days, the PEC submits its reappointment or promotion evaluation to the Department Chair, or its tenure evaluation (if applicable) to the Committee on Tenure through the VPAA, along with documentation and the candidate's response, if any.

### **The Importance of Tenure**

“The granting of tenure is the single most important type of decision made in an educational institution. Barring unforeseen circumstances, tenure obligates the institution to employ the recipient of tenure for the balance of his/her professional life. It not only makes a major financial commitment to the individual until retirement but even beyond. Tenure has its place in the academic community as the principal means through which academic freedom is preserved.

It must be accomplished with the utmost care, concern and searching evaluation by the faculty and the administration of the institution.

The serious decision of granting tenure demands that the President, before making recommendations to the Board, have substantial evidence, determined through professional evaluation, that the candidate will be a constructive and significant contributor to the continuous development of high quality education in the institution. It is the responsibility of the candidate for tenure to produce such substantial evidence based on his/her prior academic and professional work.” (see Article IX)

### **Review Period**

The entire period of the faculty member’s service at the college while on tenure track.

### **Eligibility for Tenure**

- Must be Assistant Professor or higher rank to be considered for tenure
- Must be Assistant Librarian or higher rank to be considered for tenure
- No person holding a part-time appointment can be considered for tenure
- Any faculty whose tenure track appointment began before December 31, 2005 and who has 4 years of consecutive service at the college, and is reappointed for a 5<sup>th</sup> year, can be evaluated for tenure during their 5<sup>th</sup> year. This does not apply if not reappointed to a 5<sup>th</sup> year.
- Any faculty member whose tenure track appointment had effect on or after January 1, 2006 and who has 5 years of consecutive service at the college, and is reappointed for a 6<sup>th</sup> year, can be evaluated for tenure during their 6<sup>th</sup> year. This does not apply if not reappointed to a 6<sup>th</sup> year.
- Any candidate who was initially appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor and reappointed for a third consecutive year, can be evaluated for

tenure during their third year. This does not apply if candidate was not reappointed to a third year.

- No member of the faculty can be a candidate for tenure more than once.
- Candidates can be evaluated for tenure prior to their 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> consecutive years of service.

## **Eligibility for Promotion and Review Period**

### **Faculty**

- a. If there has been no prior promotion, the review period includes the time since the faculty member's initial appointment to a tenure track position.
  - b. If there has been a prior promotion, the review period includes the entire time since the last promotion, including the year prior to when the promotion became effective.
  - c. Change beginning with 2015/2016 Academic Year: Assistant Professor, Assistant Librarians, Associate Librarians who are candidates for tenure and have satisfied time in rank, will be considered for tenure with promotion. Candidates must satisfy requirements for Article IX (tenure) and demonstrate meritorious performance Article XX (promotion). If an Assistant Professor/Assistant Librarian/Associate Librarian meet the minimum requirements (time in rank, years of service, etc.) when they apply for tenure he/she **will need to have a PEC** (which will do a tenure evaluation.) Candidate selects 3<sup>rd</sup> member of PEC. **If granted tenure they will receive a promotion as well.** If candidate does not meet minimum requirements for a higher rank – must apply for promotion separately or under the exceptional clause. Three years in rank at Assistant Professor and 6 years of teaching are required.
  - d. Article XX Promotion Count: Unpaid leave less than a semester is not deducted from count.
- Faculty members who, when hired, possess a terminal degree effective on or before the date of appointment, must be appointed above the rank of Instructor.
  - Associate Professor – 6 years of full-time experience in teaching, at least 3 years of full time employment at the rank of Assistant Professor at an accredited four year college or university and meritorious performance as demonstrated by the candidate's evaluations (see Article VIII of the Agreement).
  - Professor – 8 years of full time experience in teaching (5 of which must have been at an accredited two year or four year college or university), at least 4 years of full time employment at the rank of Associate Professor at an accredited four year college or university, and meritorious performance as demonstrated by the candidate's evaluations (see Article VIII of the Agreement).
  - Promotion of Certain Instructors – Faculty who hold an appointment at the rank of Instructor and who earn a terminal degree notify the College and are

automatically promoted to Assistant Professor without required evaluation, effective September 1 after notification.

### **Librarians**

- Librarians may initially be appointed at any rank except Library Assistant and as of July 1, 2014 no librarian is hired at the rank of Library Associate.
- All Librarians must meet the following:
  - Fulfillment of the minimum requirements set forth by rank.
  - Meritorious performance as demonstrated by the candidates evaluations (see Article VIII of the Agreement).
- Appointment and Promotion for Librarians: Time requirements have decreased in the 2014-2017 agreement.

Assistant Librarian – M.L.S. or M.L.S.I.S., 3 years of full time experience in an academic or research library.

Associate Librarian – M.L.S. or M.L.S.I.S., 4 years experience as a librarian, 2 years at an academic or research library, for promotion 2 years at the rank of Assistant Librarian

Librarian – (6 years fulltime, 3 years research library, 3 years in rank) M.L.S. or M.L.S.I.S. and a second subject Master's Degree.

Senior Librarian – D.L.S. or D.L.S.I.S. or appropriate doctorate and the M.L.S. or M.L.S.I.S., or M.L.S. or M.L.S.I.S. and a second subject Master's degree, 8 years of full-time experience as a librarian (at least 5 at an academic or research library), 5 years at the rank of Librarian.

M.L.S. = Master of Library Science

M.L.S.I.S. = Master of Library Science and Information Science

D.L.S. = Doctorate of Library Science

D.L.S.I.S. = Doctorate of Library Science and Information Science

In all cases degrees must be granted from institutions accredited by the American Library Association.

Definition of Terminal Degree for Librarians: MLS and MLSIS with a total of 60 graduate credits is a terminal degree.

**Exceptional Clause:**  
**Faculty**

If the candidate does not meet the stated criteria for promotion (degree, experience, years in rank), the Board of Trustees (BOT) or the President may promote an individual of "exceptional talent or accomplishment" who demonstrates:

- a. Evidence to render a unique academic contribution to the College.
- b. Evidence of extraordinary competence in the area of his/her discipline or specialty **or**
- c. Evidence that the discipline or specialty does not customarily demand fulfillment of those academic degree requirements set forth by the Board as minimum criteria for appointment or promotion to each rank. (see Article XX of the Agreement).

**Librarians**

"For sound academic reasons" exceptions to the requirements for promotions may be made "in certain specialized areas and under rare and extraordinary circumstances by the Board of Trustees" (see Article XX of the Agreement).

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty and Librarians

FR: Michele Ethier

RE: Promotion Language: The Exceptional Clause

DA: April 19, 2013

Please consider the following in future recommendations for promotion if the faculty member is a candidate under the Exceptional Clause.

If you are a Chair or member of a PEC and you are recommending that a candidate be promoted, it is **advised and wise** to use the contractual language found on page 241 of the 2012-2014 Contract if the candidate does not meet all stated criteria set forth in the Agreement. This language recognizes that faculty of exceptional talent or accomplishment can be promoted even if they do not meet all criteria. If they do not meet all criteria then due regard must be given to the following:

- a. Evidence to render a unique academic contribution to the university.
- b. Evidence of extraordinary competence in the area of his/her discipline or specialty.
- c. Evidence that the discipline or specialty does not customarily demand fulfillment of those academic degree requirements set forth by the Board as minimum criteria for promotion to each rank.

The stated criteria and requirements for Promotion to each higher rank can be found in the contract on pages 241-243. A non-legalese version (stated in plain English) can be found in the committee on Promotions Handbook on pages 5 & 6.

**What the COP, the President, and the Board of Trustees need is language in recommendations that supports the Exceptional Clause.** Therefore, clearly state: Dr. Einstein's unique academic contribution is \_\_\_\_\_. Edgar Allen Poe has provided evidence of extraordinary competence in \_\_\_\_\_. Although Professor Louisa May Alcott does not have a Ph.D. in \_\_\_\_, her degree is considered the terminal degree in her profession and she has provided proof of this claim.

The use of this language helps the reader/evaluator see that the candidate meets the criteria demanded by the Exceptional Clause.

For Librarians: "For sound academic reasons" exceptions to the requirements for promotion may be made "in certain specialized areas and under rare and extraordinary circumstances by the Board of Trustees" (see page 247 of the agreement.) The stated criteria and requirements for Promotion to each higher rank can be found in Article VIII of the Agreement. A non-legalese version (stated in plain English) can be found in the Committee on Promotions Handbook on pages 5 and 6. Both the candidate and the evaluators should make claims in support of "sound academic reasons", "specialized areas" and "rare and extraordinary circumstances". None of these terms are defined in the contract.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter. Take care.

This document was prepared by Michele Ethier, Professor of Social Work, Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work at the Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts.

### **Special Thanks**

Thanks to Bridgewater State University for the use of their model, to Dana Rapp and Deb Foss for editorial assistance, to Pat Markunas and the Employee Relations Committee (ERC) for printed guides sponsored by MSCA, to Dale Fink, Matt Silliman, and Greg Scheckler for suggestions for improvement which have been incorporated, and to Sumi Colligan, Jen Zoltanski, Ingrid Castro, Susan Birns, Rosanne Denhard, Mark Miller, Joe Ebiware, Sharon Claffey, Dan Shustack, Ely Janis, David Eve, Anthony Daley, Nick Stroud, Emily Maher, Grazianna Ramsden, Liz Hartung, Karen Cardozo, Melanie Mowinski, Monica Joslin and Cindy Brown for kind words of support but especially to Maria LaValley for typing and retyping this document.