

Change #11-2

2007-08

Handbook Changes

Submitted by Office of the Provost

Pages 109-115

(p. 109)

8. Evaluation, Promotion, Tenure, and Salary of Instructional Faculty

a. Introduction

32 1) The evaluation procedures for decisions concerning retention, promotion, and tenure are predicated
33 on the propositions that peers ought to have first-hand familiarity with the accomplishments,
34 limitations, and potential of each faculty member; thus, members of the department and, to a lesser
35 extent, members of related departments are directly involved in an initial recommendation. The
36 dean reviews the recommendation and acts on it from the perspective of academic management. A
37 University committee of members of the faculty provides University-wide faculty perspective in its
38 review of all recommendations and forwards its recommendation, together with that of the dean, to
39 the Provost, who makes the final recommendations to the President. The President makes the final
40 decision and, subject to the approval of the Board of Visitors, authorizes a contract reflecting that
41 decision.

42

43 2) The University considers promotion, tenure, and (in the case of non-tenured faculty) retention to be
44 privileges to be sought by the evaluatee. In so seeking, the evaluatee asks that both certain peers and
45 certain academic administrators render informed judgments on the strength of the evaluatee's
46 candidacy. It is therefore a condition of the evaluation process that the recommendations or
47 decisions of peer groups, committees, and administrative officers be accepted by the evaluatee unless
48 the evaluatee can demonstrate that the recommendation or decision has been rendered in a fashion that
49 violates applicable policy, regulations, or law.

50

(p. 110)

1 An annual evaluation of all faculty members will be conducted by the **chairs, the** deans and the Provost. This
2 annual evaluation may lead to a full-scale peer review when the faculty member's performance is
3 considered to be unsatisfactory and in need of significant improvement in one or more area(s).

4

5 b. General Standards and Procedures for all Evaluations

6 1) University-wide Standards and Procedures

7 a) The criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure are teaching, professional development, and
8 service. At Christopher Newport University the first, teaching, is of paramount importance, and
9 poor teaching cannot be redeemed by superiority in the other two areas.

10

11 b) Decisions involving **probationary appointments**, promotions or awarding of tenure, henceforth designated
"class A

12 decisions," receive special attention, due to the long-term commitment involved. Decisions on
13 the **retention of probationary faculty**, conversion of restricted appointments to probationary
14 status, and performance reviews of tenured faculty are henceforth-designated "class B" decisions.
15 ~~When an evaluation requires more than one decision and the decisions are of a different class, the~~
16 ~~peer group for the evaluation will be that appropriate to the highest ranking class of decision~~
17 ~~involved.~~

18

19 2) Departmental Standards and Procedures

20 Consistent with the general standards described below, each department delineates the specific
21 criteria and procedures it will use in evaluating its members. The criteria are submitted to the
22 appropriate dean for approval of the initial statement or amendments thereto. The dean submits the

23 resulting criteria to the Provost for final approval. (In the absence of departmental action, the dean
24 writes the departmental criteria.) In rendering this decision, the Provost acts on the advice of the
25 Faculty Review Committee (FRC). ~~Such departmental criteria supplements but does not supercede the~~
~~evaluation criteria contained in this University Handbook.~~

26

27 3) Evaluation Scope and Schedule

28 a) By the end of January, the Provost, ~~after consultation with the FRC~~, publishes the PEER
29 REVIEW, ANNUAL EVALUATION and MERIT EVALAU UATION CALENDAR of deadlines
30 for each step of the peer review and evaluation process. The schedule is driven by the
31 deadlines for notification of appointment for probationary faculty members. (See index:
32 evaluation)

33

34 b) Probationary faculty ~~receive an initial appointment letter that provides employment through their third year~~
~~and specifies that a review for reappointment will be scheduled in the second year. In the spring of the first year,~~
~~probationary faculty meet with the department chair to receive verbal formative assessment and share any concerns.~~
~~Chairs assign probationary faculty members a faculty peer mentor during the first year. are evaluated under the peer~~
~~group format in the spring of their first year~~

35 ~~for reappointment to a second year. Possible outcomes of this peer review include:~~

36 ~~(1) Recommendation to reappoint to a second year.~~

37 ~~(2) Recommendation not to reappoint to a second year.~~

38

39 c) Probationary faculty are evaluated under the peer group format in the fall of their second year
40 for reappointment ~~to a third and fourth year.~~ to a new three-year probationary contract for years three, four, and
41 five starting in the fall of the third year (the 3rd year of the first probationary appointment is thus superseded).

Possible outcomes of this peer review include:

41 (1) Recommendation to reappoint to a third, ~~and~~ fourth, and fifth year.

42 (2) Recommendation not to reappoint to a ~~third or~~ fourth year.

43

44 ~~d) Probationary faculty are evaluated under the peer group format in the fall of their third year for~~
45 ~~reappointment to a fifth year. Possible outcomes of this peer review include:~~

46 ~~(1) Recommendation to reappoint to a fifth year.~~

47 ~~(2) Recommendation not to reappoint to a fifth year.~~

48

49 e) Probationary faculty members are evaluated under the peer group format in the fall of their
50 fourth year for reappointment to a new three-year probationary contract for years five, six~~th~~, and seven starting in
the fall of the fifth year (the 5th year of the second probationary appointment is thus superseded). Possible outcomes
of this peer review include:

(p.III)

1 (1) Recommendation to reappoint to a fifth, sixth, and seventh year.

2 (2) Recommendation not to reappoint to a sixth year.

3

4 ~~f) Probationary faculty members are evaluated under the peer group format in the fall of their fifth~~
5 ~~year for reappointment to a seventh year. Possible outcomes of this peer review include:~~

6 ~~(1) Recommendation to reappoint to a seventh year.~~

7 ~~(2) Recommendation not to reappoint to a seventh year.~~

8

9 g) Probationary faculty are evaluated under the peer group format in the fall of their sixth year for
10 promotion (if applicable) and reappointment with tenure. Possible outcomes of this peer review include:

11 (1) Recommendation to reappoint with tenure and promote (if applicable), effective the following fall term.

12 (2) Recommendation ~~not to reappoint~~ to offer a terminal contract in year seven.

13

14 h) ~~Tenured~~ All full-time faculty will be evaluated by the chairs, the deans, and the Provost ~~in consultation with~~
~~the department chair~~ as

15 outlined in Section 5) Step-by-Step Procedure for Annual Evaluation of Faculty Members.

16 Tenured faculty will undergo performance evaluation ~~in~~ the peer group format no less
17 frequently than every six years. ~~Otherwise, tenured faculty may waive evaluation under the~~
18 ~~peer group format unless it is a requirement of the Step-by-Step Procedure for Annual~~
19 ~~Evaluation of Faculty Members.~~

20

21 Evaluation under the peer group format required as a result of an unsatisfactory Annual

22 Evaluation will take place in the next (spring) evaluation cycle immediately following.

23

24 i) Distinguished Professors may elect to waive the Annual Evaluation by so indicating in writing

25 on an annual basis to their respective department chair, their dean, and the Provost.

26

27 j) Except as required elsewhere in this section, evaluation of faculty members holding restricted or

28 part-time appointments is conducted entirely within the department by a committee appointed by

29 the chair, or, if circumstances prevent this, by a committee appointed by the appropriate dean.

30 Such evaluation provides information for the chair or the dean for future decisions; it does not

31 constitute an intention to renew these restricted or part-time appointments.

32

33 4) Step-by-Step Procedure for a Peer Review

34 (All questions of interpretation or consistency that may arise concerning these procedures are

35 decided by the Provost.)

36

37 The Provost publishes the PEER REVIEW, ANNUAL EVALUATION and MERIT EVALUATION

38 CALENDAR for the next academic year by the end of January, with deadlines for each step.

39

40 Step 1

41 Each department chair submits for the review and approval of the appropriate dean a completed

42 EVAL-4 DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY

43 EVALUATIONS.

44

45 Step 2

46 The dean reviews each department's EVAL-4 statement for consistency with university-wide

47 standards and procedures, notifies the department of any required changes, and forwards an

48 approved statement for each department to the Provost.

49

50

(p.112)

1 Step 3

2 The Provost reviews each EVAL-4 statement submitted by the deans for consistency with university

3 wide standards and procedures, notifies the dean and the department of any required changes, and

4 forwards an approved statement for each department to the appropriate dean and the FRC.

5

6 Step 4

7 Each dean, using the EVAL-2 FACULTY PEER REVIEW LIST generated by the Provost: (1) notifies the
appropriate

8 department chair of required peer review of probationary faculty and any other required peer review,

9 (2) notifies the chair of faculty meeting requirements for consideration for promotion.

10

11 Step 5

12 The department chair holds a meeting of the department's faculty for the purpose of notifying faculty

13 of those meeting requirements for consideration for promotion.

14

15 Step 6

16 The department chair submits to the dean a list of faculty requesting consideration for promotion.

17

18 Step 7

19 The dean prepares and submits to the department chair, FRC, and Provost a final EVAL-2 listing of the year's
 20 peer reviews. The dean notifies tenured faculty of required peer review.
 21
 22 ~~Step 8~~
 23 ~~The dean prepares and submits to the department chair, FRC, and provost a final list of the 1st year~~
 24 ~~probationary faculty peer reviews.~~
 25
 26 ~~Step 9-8~~
 27 The department chair (or, in the event that the evaluatee is a department chair, the dean) in consultation with the
 28 Vice Provost ~~supervises~~ organizes the
 29 ~~formation of the five-member Department Review Committee (DRC) peer group (for class "B" decisions) or the~~
 30 ~~selection of the first five~~
 31 ~~members of the seven-member DRC peer group (for class "A" decisions), and.~~ The DRC should be composed of
 32 at least four and no more than seven members. The department chair submits the appropriately
 33 completed EVAL-5 CONSTITUTION OF ~~PEER-GROUP DEPARTMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE FOR~~
 34 INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY
 35 EVALUATION to the ~~appropriate dean~~ Vice Provost for review, who may consult with the dean.
 36
 37 a) General guidelines regarding DRC formation:
 38 a) The department chair ~~will be~~ is a member of the ~~peer-group~~ DRC, (except the chair's own,) and acts as
 39 chair of the ~~peer-group~~ DRC or appoints a chair. (The chair of the peer group for the department chair
 40 is appointed by the ~~dean~~ Vice Provost.)
 41 b) For tenure and promotion (~~class "A"~~) decisions and any decisions involving tenured members of the
 42 faculty, all DRC members are tenured; for promotion decisions, DRC members are also of the same or higher rank
 43 as that sought by the evaluatee. For reappointment decisions, ideally all DRC members are members of the tenured
 44 faculty.
 45 c) When the number of tenured faculty in a department is four or fewer, it is expected that all such
 46 members will serve on the DRC. When the number is greater than four, the Chair will work with the Vice Provost
 47 to determine the DRC membership. When the number is fewer than three, additional peer group members will be
 48 selected according to the procedure outlined in paragraph d), below.
 49 d) The DRC will include one member from outside the department, selected as follows: The evaluatee
 50 generates a list of at least four tenured faculty members who are in the evaluatee's division but not in the evaluatee's
 51 department. ~~The evaluatee may not approach colleagues to serve on his/her DRC.~~ The department chair consults with
 52 the Vice Provost to prioritize this list of nominees; consensus is to be sought but the Vice Provost's decision carries
 53 forward. The Vice Provost contacts the nominees in the order of approved preference. While non-departmental
 54 DRC members ideally are chosen from within the department's academic division, the Vice Provost can approve a
 55 faculty member outside the division when circumstances warrant and with the permission of the evaluatee. In the
 56 event that no members of the evaluatee's generated list are able or willing to serve, the evaluatee will be asked to
 57 generate more nominees until a DRC member is appointed (thus identification of outside members must always
 58 begin with the evaluatee's nomination).
 59 e) Departments may approach the review process in a number of ways. For example, they can create a
 60 review committee that is expected to follow the candidate through the tenure/promotion reviews, or they can create a
 61 standing DRC for all reviews that year in the department.
 62 f) No member of the FRC who serves on a ~~peer-group~~ DRC shall also
 63 participate in the FRC review of the recommendation of that ~~peer-group~~ DRC (see index: Faculty
 64 Review Committee).
 65 g) Each member of the ~~peer-group~~ DRC must be a full-time member of the
 66 Instructional faculty serving in an instructional capacity at the time of the formation of, and
 67 throughout the life of, the ~~DRC peer-group~~.
 68 h) (When ~~either of~~ the
 69 requirements of this paragraph conflicts with the requirement that the department chair serve as
 70 a member of the ~~DRC peer-group~~, the requirement for the chair membership takes precedence.)
 71
 72 b) The department chair is responsible for the formation of the peer group for each other member
 73 of the department. For peer review of the chair, the academic dean is responsible for the
 74 formation of the peer group.

~~49 c) For class B decisions, the peer group consists of five members selected in the following
50 sequence: First, one faculty member (other than the chair of the department), selected by the~~

~~(p. 113)~~

~~1 evaluatee; second, the chair of the department (except for the chair's own peer group, in which
2 case the second member is selected by the other members of the department); and third, one
3 faculty member selected by the dean. If both of the first two members are members of the
4 evaluatee's department, then the member selected by the dean must be chosen from another
5 department in a related field.~~

~~6~~

~~7 Two additional members are selected by the department chair (except for the chair's own peer
8 group,) in which case these two are selected by the other members of the department.~~

~~9~~

~~10 d) For class A decisions, the peer group consists of seven members, five selected as set forth above
11 in c), and then two selected by the Provost.~~

~~12~~

~~13 Step 10~~

~~14 The dean reviews the EVAL-5 for consistency with all applicable departmental, college/school, and
15 university requirements, effects any necessary changes, and submits the EVAL-5 to the provost for
16 final review and certification.~~

~~17~~

~~18 Step 11 9~~

~~19 The Provost reviews the EVAL-5 for consistency with university-wide requirements, effects any
20 necessary changes (including appointing the non-departmental member as described in d) above provost
21 appointments for class "A" decisions), certifies the
22 membership, and forwards copies of the completed EVAL-5 to the evaluatee, the dean, the FRC chair,
23 and all DRC peer-group members.~~

~~24~~

~~25 The final membership of each DRC peer-group must be certified by the Provost before any subsequent
26 steps occur.~~

~~27~~

~~28 Step 12 10~~

~~29 The DRC peer-group holds its first (organizational) meeting and establishes timetables and procedures for
30 the conduct of its business.~~

~~31~~

~~32 Step 13 11~~

~~33 The evaluatee submits his or her required EVAL-6 PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES REPORT and
34 updated dossier to the DRC peer-group chair.~~

~~35~~

~~36 a) Consistent with University and departmental standards and procedures, the DRC peer-group solicits
37 and accepts for consideration written, signed, dated information from the academic dean and
38 other sources, including DRC peer-group members' firsthand knowledge about the evaluatee. Such
39 information may be added to the dossier as long as the faculty member has, at the same time,
40 the opportunity to include a written response to the new information prior to the next step in the
41 review process period. Examples of information to be considered are classroom visitation
42 reports, discussions with students and colleagues, and information from chairs of committees on
43 which the evaluatee has served. In the special case of information from a source requesting
44 anonymity, the evaluatee may request verification of the source, without revealing the identity, by
45 a third party mutually acceptable to the evaluatee and the DRC peer-group. If agreement cannot be
46 reached, the third party is selected by the FRC. The DRC peer-group may recommend to the evaluatee
47 the inclusion of additional information or clarification concerning any submissions.~~

~~48~~

~~49 b) In its deliberations the DRC peer-group may call upon other members of the academic community to
50 contribute written statements concerning the evaluatee and/or to participate in part or all of the
51 deliberations. However, the decisions are those of the DRC peer-group.~~

(p. 114)

1

c) The ~~DRC peer-group~~ meets to combine the individual findings of each member. 2 On a form furnished
3 by the Provost, the ~~DRC peer-group~~ reports its recommendation, along with an accompanying
4 statement justifying that decision.

5

6 Each member signs the report form indicating agreement or disagreement, and either signs the
7 statement or prepares a separate statement indicating the area or areas of disagreement with the
8 recommendation and/or accompanying statement.

9

10 Step ~~14-12~~

11 The ~~DRC peer-group~~ submits its signed EVAL-7 PEER GROUP RECOMMENDATION AND
12 SUMMARY STATEMENT to the evaluatee for review and acknowledgment.

13

14 a) The signed recommendations are presented to the evaluatee for signature. This signature confirms
15 that the evaluatee has read them.

16

17 b) If in disagreement with the recommendation or with any minority statement, the evaluatee may
18 forward a signed statement concerning the areas of disagreement.

19

20 Step ~~15-13~~

21 The ~~DRC peer-group~~ submits its signed EVAL-7 bearing the evaluatee's acknowledgment, the EVAL-6, and
22 the dossier to the dean.

23

24 Step ~~16-14~~

25 The dean reviews the dossier and associated documents to add a college ~~/school~~-wide perspective to
26 the evaluation. In the case of questions, the dean may consult with the department chair, the ~~DRC peer~~
27 ~~group~~ and/or the FRC. The dean completes the appropriate section of the EVAL-8 SUMMARY OF
28 ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS ON INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY EVALUATION and forwards
29 it, the EVAL-6, the EVAL-7, and the dossier to the Provost. A copy of the resulting EVAL-8 is
30 sent to the evaluatee. The evaluatee may give to the Provost written comments on the dean's
31 recommendations. A copy of the evaluatee's comments should be sent to the dean by the evaluatee.

32

33 Step ~~17-15~~

34 The Provost refers the materials in step ~~16 14~~ to the Faculty Review Committee (FRC). The FRC
35 reviews the materials to provide University-wide perspective to the evaluation process and assigns
36 relevant University-wide priorities.

37

38 Step ~~18-16~~

39 The FRC completes the appropriate section of the EVAL-8 and forwards it, together with the other
40 materials in step ~~16-14~~, to the Provost.

41

42 Step ~~19-17~~

43 The Provost reviews the dossier and associated documents, forms a final recommendation, completes
44 the appropriate section of the EVAL-8 and forwards it, together with the other materials in step ~~16-14~~,
45 to the president. Should there be any failure to act in Steps 1 ~~18-16~~ in any required peer review, the
46 dean, upon the request of the faculty member(s) to be reviewed, proceeds to develop a file and a
47 recommendation for timely presentation to the Provost.

48

49

50

(p.115)

1 Step ~~20-18~~

2 The president completes the appropriate section of the EVAL-8. The completed EVAL-6, EVAL-7

3 and EVAL-8 are placed in the evaluatee's official file. Copies of the EVAL-8 are sent to the evaluatee,
4 the department chair, the dean, and the FRC. The EVAL-6s, EVAL-7s, EVAL-8s, and dossiers
5 are returned to the custody of the department chair.

6

7 Step ~~21-19~~

8 For those positive presidential decisions requiring action by the Board of Visitors, a resolution is
9 prepared for approval of the president and action by the Board.

10

11 Step ~~22-20~~

12 The Board of Visitors acts on the resolution in step ~~24-19~~.

(p. 123)

d. Tenure

13 1) Introduction

14 a) Christopher Newport University accepts the principle of tenure as stated in the Policies of the
15 Board of Visitors. No reference to other documents is intended or implied. An appointment
16 with tenure may be terminated by the University as provided by Board policy and university
17 regulations.

18 b) An appointment with tenure is granted to a faculty member only after the grantee has
19 demonstrated excellence of professional performance during a probationary period and only
20 upon clear and compelling demonstration of a continuing need by the University for the faculty
21 member's services. **For assistant professors, the tenure and promotion review will occur at the same time and as
part of a single process.**

22

23 2) Standards for Awarding Tenure

24 a) Minimum Qualifications

25 (1) Type of Service

26 Tenure is granted only to full-time faculty who hold rank in an academic department.

27 Part-time positions and T&R administrative positions do not, in themselves, qualify the
28 holder for tenure. However, a faculty member who earns tenure in an academic department
29 does not relinquish tenure because of the acceptance of an administrative position on a part

30

or full-time basis. **Faculty on restricted, term, visiting, or research contracts are not eligible for tenure consideration.**

31

32 (2) Years of Service

33 (a) The normal probationary period at CNU is six years, and can be extended for an
34 additional year for exceptional circumstances only by the Board of Visitors. Faculty
35 members with prior service may, on joining the faculty at CNU, be given credit for all
36 or part of that prior service, even if the total number of years of employment without
37 tenure is thereby extended beyond seven years (including one year under a terminal
38 contract if tenure is not awarded).

39

40 Service at one or more other academic institutions will ordinarily be counted as
41 satisfying no more than two years of the CNU probationary period. **If such credit is granted to assistant
professors, the tenure and promotion reviews will occur simultaneously, as provided in Section XII 8.d.1b), above.
Faculty hired on a probationary basis at the rank of associate or full professor are normally reviewed for tenure in
their third year of a four-year contract. Exceptions to this schedule can be approved only by the Provost. Tenure of
an associate professor does not assume promotion in rank.**

42

43 (b) Leaves of absence are not counted as part of the probationary period except in those

(p. 167)

h. The Faculty Review Committee (FRC) shall consist of ~~four~~ eight elected tenured
1 faculty members: ~~(one two from each division and one at-large member appointed by the Provost.~~
2 ~~Liberal Arts, one from Science and Technology, one from Social Science and Professional Studies~~
3 ~~and one from the School of Business)~~ elected by the faculty of each area; ~~and four tenured faculty~~
4 ~~members (one from each area) appointed by the Provost.~~ The committee:
5 1) consults with the Provost on faculty personnel issues; and
6 2) reviews recommendations from the academic departments and the academic deans on
7 standards for evaluation and on the matters of retention, promotion, ~~and~~ tenure, ~~and merit~~
8 ~~increases~~ and makes its recommendations to the Provost.
9
10 NOTE: Members of the FRC shall not participate in any review of a member of their own
11 academic departments or of any faculty members on whose ~~DRC~~ peer evaluation group they have
12 served during that academic year. ~~The at-large member shall vote only in the case of such recusals. FRC~~
~~members are obliged not to participate in any review in which they have a conflict of interest.~~