COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES (CAS) RPT STANDARDS (2023)

I. CLASSIFICATIONS AND RANKS

The College of Arts and Sciences has three classifications that are involved in the Review, Promotion and Tenure process:

A. Non-Tenure Teaching classification: Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, Teaching Professor

B. Tenure Track classification: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor

II. CRITERIA

A. Definitions

   Achieving excellence in teaching and service is required of teaching-track faculty and tenure-track faculty at the associate and professor ranks in the College of Arts and Sciences. Excellence in scholarship is required of tenure-track professors in the College of Arts and Sciences. Below (II. A. 1-3), we specify how excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service within CAS is defined and should be documented.

   Additionally, individual CAS schools will develop their own teaching, scholarship and service criteria. Any revisions to school RPT criteria must be submitted to the CAS Faculty Affairs Committee by an annual deadline of October 15th. Following approval by the CAS Faculty Affairs Committee, the school criteria will be subject to a CASFA vote during the December CASFA meeting. If a school's scholarship criteria change prior to a candidate's scheduled review, the candidate will be evaluated by the scholarship criteria in effect at the time of portfolio submission, unless the candidate elects to be evaluated according to the criteria that were in place at the time of the previous review or time of hire if prior to the first review. To be reviewed according to the previous scholarship criteria, the candidate must follow this process:

- In the Annual Report preceding the RPT review, the candidate will note that he or she elects to be evaluated by the previous scholarship criteria, and will attach those criteria to the Annual Report prior to submitting to the Academic Director.
- When the Dean notifies the candidate of his or her eligibility for promotion (March 1st deadline), the candidate must note in their response that he or she elects to use previous scholarship criteria, and attach those criteria to their response to the Dean (May 1st deadline).
- At the time of submission, the candidate places the RPT criteria

in the RPT portfolio (September 1st deadline).

1. Teaching

To demonstrate excellence in teaching, the candidate must exhibit mastery of content and pedagogy, with a focus on student learning. No one metric can adequately demonstrate teaching excellence, but the sum of materials presented should indicate that the candidate meets student learning outcomes through engaged and appropriate pedagogies.

CAS recognizes that modes of documenting teaching can vary from discipline to discipline, however, all candidates must demonstrate excellence in teaching with evidence that must include:

- Course syllabi
- Peer observation written summaries
- Faculty member's annual reviews from Academic Director/Chair with Dean's signature
- Official College of Arts and Sciences student course evaluations

(While student course evaluations can be valuable in the detection of possible strengths or challenges of a candidate's teaching, decades of empirical research indicates that they are not accurate measures of effective teaching.[1] In light of this, it is recommended that student course evaluations should play a subordinate role to peer evaluations of teaching, annual reviews, and other elements of the candidate's portfolio in the RPT process. When *broad* patterns related to teaching criteria are present in an individual's student course evaluations, they should be addressed by the individual and reviewers. However, reviewers and candidates should avoid placing significance in fine-grained distinction of numerical scores or occasional negative student comments. Reviewers should also avoid drawing close comparisons of numerical scores between peers or other academic units.)

Additional materials could include:

- Samples of examinations, projects, student work, and other instructional materials that demonstrate the candidate's knowledge of pedagogy with a connection to student learning outcomes

- Reference to self-evaluations, responses to peer evaluations of teaching, reference to annual reviews, and student course evaluations, all with a focus on growth as a teacher.

---

[1] For a review of the empirical literature on student course evaluations, see Brennan and Magness' *Cracks in the Ivory Tower* (2019), Chapter 4.

- Honors or recognitions for teaching
- Evidence of serving as an advisor on a research project, senior thesis, or other student-driven independent inquiry as appropriate and defined by the department/school[1]
- Student mentoring in candidate's area of expertise
- Use of Learning Management System
- Professional development activities and identification of how these activities were implemented into teaching approaches

A. Guidelines for Peer Observations

The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) acknowledges the unique value of peer observation as a way for faculty members to (a) understand, appreciate, and learn from watching and discussing the teaching practices of our colleagues, (b) help each other develop and improve our teaching practices, and (c) provide an invaluable perspective on each other's teaching practices (in contrast to the student course evaluations) that will ensure such critical information is available to be used in annual reviews and RPT portfolios.

    i.   For assistant professors and assistant teaching professors: Each full-time CAS faculty member's teaching will be observed at least once each academic year in which they are teaching at UNE. Faculty members are encouraged to seek additional opportunities to be observed by peers, beyond the required one per year, to build their teaching portfolio Candidates should consult with their Chair/Academic Director regarding unit level expectations. In the year before their multi-level reviews, faculty members should be observed by peers promoted to at least the associate rank.

        For associate professors and associate teaching professors: The faculty member will work with their academic director/chair to ensure an appropriate number of peer observations are completed post-promotion to the associate level in alignment with their intention to seek promotion.

- Faculty members will include all peer observation written summaries in their RPT portfolios.

    ii.   Peer observers should comment on each of four aspects of teaching: *content, pedagogy, assessment,* and *development*. (Section B, below, provides several "possible indicators" of excellence in each of those categories.)

iii. Before the observation, the faculty member will share relevant course-related materials with the peer observer. Before the classroom observation the following actions should be completed:
- The syllabus for the course is shared and the main pedagogical goals are explained.
- A date for classroom observation is established.
- The main goals of the observation are established (e.g., any aspects of teaching that the faculty member being observed wants feedback on).
- Any special preparation to be done before the classroom observation (e.g., reading an assignment for that day's class) is determined.
- Any relevant materials related to assessment of student learning from the class period being observed are shared (e.g., quiz, test, written assignment)

iv. Each peer observation includes at least one classroom visit. If the course is delivered online, the observer will work with the faculty member to identify the appropriate elements of the course for evaluation.

v. Each peer observation includes a reflection meeting after the classroom observation has occurred. The observer provides feedback, which should normally include recognition of various strengths and possible areas for development or improvement of teaching. This need not be a critique. Areas for development or improvement can be things the faculty member identified as pedagogical goals. The meeting should be a constructive and collaborative conversation about the positive aspects of teaching practices and the possibility of further enhancement of these practices.

vi. Peer observers are required to submit a brief written observation summary of feedback referenced in point 5, to the faculty member observed within the academic year in which the observation occurred. This document will be included in the faculty member's RPT portfolio.

B. Possible Indicators for Each Main Category of Observation

The following indicators are provided as guidance only. They are not prescriptive, exhaustive, or intended for use as a checklist. Rather, they provide observers with a language to help them

understand, categorize, and represent the teaching practices of the faculty members they observe. It is not expected that observers will touch on every point outlined below. Many peer observation summaries are 1-2 pages in length and focus on the most salient indicators.

Content
- Content is accurate, up to date, and shows awareness of developments within the discipline and related fields
- Content is organized effectively
- Alternative viewpoints are presented; subject matter is discussed from a variety of perspectives
- Course content is linked to broader social and cultural issues, as appropriate to the learning outcomes of the course
- Disciplinary methodologies and approaches to the course content are discussed

Pedagogy

Communication
- Clearly communicates course content
- Demonstrates enthusiasm for the content
- Demonstrates effective oral and written communication - slides, writing on board, etc.
- Demonstrates good organizational abilities and planning skills
- States the goal or objective for the class clearly
- Uses a variety of effective pedagogical strategies and practices, as suits the level and nature of the course
- Encourages critical and/or creative thinking and/or making

Class Environment
- Respects students and is approachable
- Structures opportunities for students to engage with course content, develop their own understanding, and apply the concepts covered to other content or real-world experiences
- Models and supports effective communication skills peer to peer and peer to instructor
- Helps students connect learning experiences and facilitates development of self-knowledge
- Recognizes student contributions in class
- Encourages students' intellectual curiosity
- Uses inclusive pedagogical strategies to create an equitable learning environment

Assessment

- Articulates measurable learning outcomes
- Uses multiple methods of student evaluation including objective and written assignments as presented in syllabus and assignments descriptors
- Develops learning experiences aligned with stated student learning outcomes
- Differentiates teaching to meet the objectives of successful student learning
- Maintains high expectations of critical thinking and work, in a formative manner during class
- Connects course assessments to program and/or core learning outcomes

Development
- Engages in self-evaluation and self-reflection
- Open and responsive to feedback and open to setting goals based on feedback
- Consistent development and implementation/application of new methodologies
- Participates in professional development around teaching effectiveness and discipline-specific content - workshops, seminars, book studies, conferences, CETL (Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning), etc.

2. Scholarship

Excellence in scholarship requires that a candidate be a productive member of his or her community of scholars and show evidence that demonstrates a promise of continued productivity. In general, CAS accepts the definitions of scholarship as defined by Boyer (1990). Further, the Faculty Handbook states that the criterion for scholarship is "evidence of a creative program of independent inquiry constituting a credible body of work that is peer-reviewed and disseminated" (Section Three, II A 2). CAS recognizes that modes of disseminating scholarship will vary from discipline to discipline and that departments/ schools will recognize and define those appropriate modes. Normally, dissemination of research, scholarship, or creative activities, including presentations at meetings, should be distributed across the pre-tenure years rather than coming at a single point in time. Publication need not occur in every pre-tenure year, but should appear with a timeliness that assures a continuity of productivity following tenure. No single set of criteria can capture the spirit of this requirement for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure in all cases, but a holistic review of the body of work presented will indicate whether a candidate has met the expectations.

Dissemination of research, scholarship or creative activities will typically include:

- Peer-reviewed presentation at discipline specific venues such as regional, national or international conferences, exhibits or performances

---

[1] In general, CAS considers research/scholarship mentoring to be a component of teaching; however, individual department/school protocols may have candidates include these activities in the scholarship area of portfolios instead of in teaching.

- Peer-reviewed publications or creative works

Other evidence of ongoing scholarly activity could include:

- Honors or recognition for scholarly achievements
- Invited or competitive scholarly presentation
- Citation of candidate's published work
- Patents, patent applications, and/or intellectual property disclosures
- Securing competitive intramural grants to support scholarly activity
- Submission of grant proposals to extramural funding agencies
- Securing competitive extramural grant or contract awards

Criteria used to evaluate the significance of the scholarly contributions will include:

- Venue for dissemination
- Leadership by the candidate when results are multi-authored
- Amount of work presented
- Opinions of external reviewers on scholarly activity

3. Service

Excellence in service requires that a candidate has demonstrated commitment to enriching their program, school, college, university or professional communities.[2] This commitment requires participation at meetings of program, school, CASFA, college; use of advising resources; and participation in annual assessment activities at course and/or program levels, as appropriate. Candidates will demonstrate collegiality and, in consultation with their Academic Directors or Department Chairs, seek activities that 1) reflect their interests, skills and rank, 2) broaden in scope over time, and 3) create opportunities

---

[2] No amount of service outside of UNE will compensate for weak service contributions within UNE.

for candidates to make meaningful contributions towards improving or maintaining the quality of the institution.

Beyond the required activities, candidates will document excellence in service with reference to the following categories and examples:

- *Faculty-Oriented Initiatives* (e.g., mentoring colleagues, offering or organizing
   faculty development presentations, providing "technical assistance" and care of instrumentation, serving on search committees)
- *Student-Oriented initiatives* (e.g., registration advising, Faculty Advisor to Student Clubs and organizations)
- *Professionally-Oriented Activity* (e.g., organizing conferences or seminars in a field, reviewing grants and manuscripts)
- *Faculty governance and other elected positions or working groups* (e.g., ~~to~~ standing committees, or ad hoc committees; ~~curriculum~~ working group or task force)
- *Recruitment/Retention/Alumni work* (e.g., Admissions work such as Experience UNE Days and Open Houses, meeting and/or corresponding with prospective students, maintaining connections with alumni)
- *Community-Oriented Professional Activity* (performing educational outreach, such as
   presentations or volunteer work, as an application of your professional expertise)
   - *Institution-Oriented Activity* (e.g., serving as an academic unit leader, including tasks such as such as scheduling courses, budgeting, supervising faculty and professional staff, or designing or coordinating academic programs; or, in exceptional circumstances, serving in an interim or acting full-time administrative position at the college level)

As this list suggests, the CAS recognizes and values multiple dimensions of service without privileging one. It views service to the college and university as a collective effort in which responsibilities are shared and leadership takes many forms. CAS also acknowledges that specific commitments may vary from year to year. To document these contributions, candidates are encouraged to request letters as activities are completed. Any contingencies, including changes to percent effort, will be documented separately in the annual review.

B. Teaching Track: Reappointment and Promotion Policies and Procedures

Normally, Assistant Teaching Professors will stand for reappointment in the third year of service, promotion to Associate Teaching Professor will be considered following six years of service at the Assistant Teaching Professor level, and promotion to Teaching Professor will be considered after six years of service at the Associate Teaching Professor rank. Associate Teaching Professors may choose to extend the time to promotion to Teaching Professor, although the Faculty Handbook requires a four-level college review every six years. Faculty members wishing to stand for early promotion are advised to

consult with their Academic Director.

Scholarship is not required in the Teaching Track, or considered in performance reviews, unless it is a temporary workload component requested by the faculty member and mutually agreed upon by the faculty member, Academic Director and Dean–see Requestion for Scholarship Time, below—

Third-Year Review: Candidates standing for reappointment must demonstrate progress toward excellence in teaching and service commensurate with the standards defined above.

Sixth-Year Review: Assistant Teaching Professors applying for promotion must demonstrate excellence in teaching and service as defined above. Assistant Teaching Professors applying for promotion who have not demonstrated excellence in teaching or service but have demonstrated additional progress toward excellence will be considered for reappointment to Assistant Teaching Professor and must submit for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor in no more than three years (Ninth-Year Review, see below).

Assistant Teaching Professors electing to submit for reappointment (but not promotion) who have demonstrated additional progress towards excellence will be reappointed to Assistant Teaching Professor and must submit for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor in no more than three years (Ninth-Year Review, see below).

Ninth-Year Review: (Does not apply to Associate Teaching Professors). Assistant Teaching Professors must elect to submit for promotion in their seventh-year, eighth-year, or ninth-year, at their choosing, and demonstrate excellence in teaching and service as defined above. Those candidates submitting for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor in the seventh, eighth, or ninth year who do not demonstrate excellence in teaching and service will not be reappointed.

Promotion to Teaching Professor: Promotion to Teaching Professor is granted to those Associate Teaching Professors who have achieved a stature of leadership among the UNE faculty. Promotion will be granted only if there is a record of continued excellence as a teacher and evidence of evolution in teaching acumen beyond the level required for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. Teaching Professors should be considered among the most accomplished teachers in the University and promotion will be granted only to those who have attained that stature. The service contributions of the candidate should be more extensive for promotion to Teaching Professor than for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. Associate Teaching Professors should demonstrate significant leadership in the UNE community in order to be promoted to Teaching Professor.

Request for Scholarship Time: For the purpose of professional development, faculty on the Teaching Track may apply for temporary reallocation of workload to include scholarship. The request must be initiated by the faculty member according to the process

and timeline described below. If the time reallocation is awarded, the faculty member is required each semester to submit a progress report to the Academic Director and Dean, detailing the amount of time spent on the project, progress toward project goals and update on plan to completion of project.

Timeline and Procedures for Requesting Time for Scholarship (Teaching Track):

(If date falls on weekend, the next business day will apply)

September 15th	Faculty member submits proposal for reassigned time to Academic Director. Proposals must be written according to proposal guidelines, below
October 1st	Faculty member submits proposal with Academic Director's support, and the Academic Director's plan for teaching and/or service coverage, to the Dean. a. Dean forwards proposal to the CAS Research and Scholarship Committee (RSC) for review and recommendation b. b. The RSC's review of proposals is based on the quality of the proposal, the adherence to proposal guidelines (described below), and 59 whether the timeline proposed is appropriate for the scope of the project.
November 1st	The RSC submits its decision to the Dean to either recommend or not recommend each proposal. a. Dean considers the recommendation of the RSC, along with potential impact on students, impact on service, available resources and the faculty member's previous record of requests for scholarship support.
November 15th	The Dean notifies the faculty member and Academic Director of the decision in writing.

Proposal Guidelines: Proposals for requesting time for scholarship will include the following items in the order given:

1. Title Page: Containing name and contact information of faculty member requesting time for scholarship; the name of the faculty member's school; date of submission; and a descriptive title for the project.

2. Project Purpose, Objectives and Activities: A description of the purpose and nature of the project, along with specific objectives and activities to be completed during the requested time. Project descriptions should be intelligible to persons not familiar with the area of scholarship (limit three pages).

3. Scope of the project: Amount of time requested in a given semester (maximum

20% of workload) and number of semesters (maximum of three).

4. Financial support, if applicable: Explanation of internal or external grant funding obtained for the work proposed in #2.

C. Tenure Track: Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Policies and Procedures

Normally, Assistant Professors will stand for reappointment in the third year of service, promotion to Associate Professor will be considered following six years of service at the Assistant Professor rank, and promotion to Professor will be considered after six years of service at the Associate Professor rank. However, Associate Professors may choose to extend the time to promotion to Professor so as to have an appropriately strong portfolio. Faculty members wishing to stand for early promotion are advised to consult with their Academic Director and Dean.

Third-Year Review: Tenure-track candidates standing for reappointment in the third year must show progress toward excellence in teaching, scholarship and service commensurate with the standards defined above to indicate that there is a reasonable assurance that the standards for promotion will be met in the sixth-year review.

Sixth-Year Review: Assistant Professors standing for promotion must demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service as defined above.

Promotion to Professor: Promotion to Professor is granted only to those Associate Professors who have achieved a stature of leadership among the UNE faculty and in their community of scholars. Promotion will be granted only if there is a record of continued excellence as a teacher and evidence of evolution in teaching acumen beyond the level required for promotion to Associate Professor. Professors should be considered among the most accomplished teachers in the University and promotion will be granted only to those who have attained that stature. Candidates are expected to demonstrate a continued level of excellence in scholarly productivity. Service contributions of the candidate should be more extensive for promotion to Professor than for promotion to Associate Professor.

III. COLLEGE SPECIFIC CONSIDERATIONS

A. Composition of the subcollege RPTC

1. The composition of the subcollege RPTC will be determined by the appropriate Academic Director or Department Chair after consultation with the candidate. The subcollege RPTC should be composed of members from the candidate's academic discipline or, when that isn't possible, from the candidate's school or other academic programs that are close, or relevant, to the candidate's work. The subcollege RPTC will have a

minimum of three members with the total membership always being an odd number.

    a.   The subcollege RPTC for tenure track faculty must consist of tenured faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

    b.   The subcollege RPTC for teaching track faculty must consist of faculty at the Associate or Professor rank, with at least one member on the teaching track.

B. Composition of the college RPTC

1. The composition of the college RPTC will follow the guidelines of the Faculty Handbook, Section THREE, IV, B.2. Normally, members elected or appointed to the Committee will serve two-year terms. The terms of the Committee's members should be staggered, so that new members join at least two continuing members each year.

2. The college RPTC for tenure track faculty must consist of tenured faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

3. The college RPTC for teaching track faculty must consist of faculty at the Associate or Professor rank, with at least two members on the teaching track. These two members will take part only in the review of teaching track faculty.

4. The CAS RPTC will elect its own chair. The Chair will be a continuing tenured member of the Committee elected by the outgoing committee prior to the close of the academic year, in order to provide continuity and a contact person should RPT issues or questions arise during the summer prior to the seating of the incoming committee.

C. External reviews for scholarship: Timeline for solicitation.

External reviewers for RPT candidates will be selected using the process outlined in the Faculty Handbook, Section *THREE, IV, A.11*. Tenure-track candidates being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion must submit their scholarship materials to be sent out for external review to his or her Academic Director by June 8th. These materials, along with a copy of Section II.A.2 of this document, will be sent no later than June 15th with a deadline given to the external reviewers of August 15th.

IV. REFERENCES

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the*

professoriate. NY: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.