

STOCKTON

THE RICHARD STOCKTON COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY

PROCEDURES

Procedure #	TBD
Supersedes:	6136
Title:	PROCEDURE FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY AND LIBRARY FACULTY
Adopted Date:	May 31, 2007, as approved by Herman J. Saatkamp, President, and SFT President Michael Frank
Effective Date:	Academic year 2007-2008
References:	Related Faculty Evaluation Policy and MOA on transition to the new procedures

1.0 PREAMBLE & DEFINITIONS

1.1 The College conducts regular evaluations of all faculty, including adjuncts, for purposes related to their current employment status at the College. The evaluation procedure will vary depending on the purpose of the evaluation and the faculty member's employment status.

1.2 The procedures outlined below will govern the evaluation of faculty, half time faculty and library faculty, with the exception of adjunct faculty.

1.3. DEFINITIONS applicable to the document on POLICY and PROCEDURES

1.3.1 FACULTY: The term "faculty" shall mean tenured and tenure-track teaching faculty, including half-time faculty and 13-D, 13-O, and 13-M faculty, but not adjunct, emeriti/ae or affiliated faculty.

1.3.2 LIBRARY FACULTY: In these procedures the term "Library Faculty" shall be used to refer to Librarians covered under Article XVII of the Master Agreement.

1.3.3 DIVISIONS: A Division is a unit of the College headed by an Academic Dean or other academic officer with line responsibility over faculty. For purposes of this definition, Teacher Education and the Library shall be considered Divisions. Graduate Studies is considered a division for administrative purposes only. Any new Division created by the College that meets this definition shall automatically be covered.

1.3.4. PROGRAMS: A Program is an academic unit of the College with its own academic degree (major) at the graduate or undergraduate level. Those academic units with only minors or certificates are not considered

programs for personnel evaluation purposes, with the exception of those minors to which full time or part time faculty lines have been assigned. For the purpose of this Procedure, the definition of Program shall include Basic Studies.

1.3.5 ALL APPLICABLE STANDARDS: All Applicable Standards shall mean College, Divisional and Program Standards that apply to the candidate.

2.0 DIVISIONAL AND PROGRAM STANDARDS

2.1 The College Standards set forth in Policy _____ are applicable to all faculty. To facilitate their use in evaluations of faculty, each Division and Program will develop standards for the evaluation of faculty in teaching, scholarship/creative activity and service within the context of its own disciplinary tradition(s). Each Divisional standard will also be consistent with College standards. All Program standards shall be consistent with College and Divisional standards. These Divisional and Program standards will be developed and approved through the processes described below.

2.2 APPROVAL OF DIVISIONAL AND PROGRAM STANDARDS

2.2.1. Approval of Divisional Standards

2.2.1.1 Each Program will elect one representative of the program to serve on the ad hoc committee to develop Divisional standards that reflect the role of the Division within the College and the community at large.

2.2.1.2 Once the proposed Divisional standard is prepared, it will be reviewed by Divisional faculty who will vote to approve or amend the proposed standard. Full time faculty and those part time faculty with at least half-time appointments will be eligible to vote but adjunct and visiting faculty will not. Approval will require a simple majority of the eligible members of the division and the vote will be in person at a divisional meeting and by secret ballot.

2.2.1.3 The proposed standard will be reviewed by the Divisional Dean. If the Dean has concerns about the proposed standard, the Dean will outline the objections and discuss these with the Divisional faculty. If no agreement between the faculty and the Dean is reached, the Dean and the committee will convey their respective concerns to the Provost for further disposition. Once approved at the Divisional level, proposed standards will be forwarded to the Provost.

2.2.1.4 The Provost either approves the proposed standards as being consistent with College standards and commensurate across Divisions and forwards them to the President for approval or sends them back to the Division along with a statement reflecting her/his concerns, for further consideration.

2.2.1.5 The President either approves the proposed standards or sends them back to the Provost along with a statement reflecting his/her concerns, for further consideration.

2.2.2 Approval of Program Standards

2.2.2.1 Each Program, acting through an elected sub-committee or a committee of the whole, will develop its standards for the evaluation of faculty in teaching, research, and service to reflect the role of the Program within the Division, College, and the community at large. These standards will be approved by a simple majority vote of the eligible members of a program in an election by secret ballot, administered by the Divisional Dean among the faculty in the program which include 13-D, 13-M and 13-O faculty.

2.2.2.2 Generally a faculty member is a member of only one program and those serving as Associated Faculty do not participate in the program's voting process. The exception is for programs without at least three full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members. In those cases Associated Faculty may vote with equal status as program faculty. Although this will not be the norm, this may result in some faculty voting in more than one program area.

2.2.2.3 If a program has fewer than three members eligible to vote, the Dean, in consultation with the faculty, will appoint sufficient ad hoc faculty for the development of, and voting on, standards.

2.2.2.4 Once approved by the Program, the proposed standards will be reviewed by the Dean. In the review, the Dean is charged with ensuring commensurability among the standards articulated by the various programs within the Division and consistency with College and Divisional Standards. The Dean will either recommend approval of the proposed Program Standard or communicate concerns to the Program faculty and ask the faculty to reconsider the proposed standards. If no agreement is reached, the Dean and the program coordinator will convey their respective concerns to the Provost for further disposition.

2.2.2.5 Once approved by the Divisional Dean, the proposed standards will be transmitted to the Provost for approval. If the Provost has concerns and cannot approve the proposed standards, the Provost shall communicate these concerns to the Dean and the Program faculty with a request for reconsideration and consultation. Once approved, the Provost will forward the proposed standard to the President for approval.

2.2.2.6 The President either approves the proposed standards or sends them back to the Provost along with a statement reflecting his/her concerns, for further consideration.

2.2.3 Notification of Faculty, Programs, and Divisions

2.2.3.1 Once Divisional and program standards are approved, they will be

distributed to all faculty and, thereafter, to all faculty upon appointment. Divisional and Program standards will also be published on the College's web site.

2.3 Review of Standards

2.3.1 Divisional and Program standards will be reviewed every five years, the program standards concurrent with the regular 5-year program review process. (For accredited programs, those reviews take place concurrently with accreditation reviews, and may occur less frequently than every 5-years, based on the accrediting body's review schedule). Any changes will require approval through the processes outlined above for the creation of these standards.

3.0 Participants in the Review of Faculty

3.1 As set forth in this Procedure, the following persons at the college are responsible for review of faculty:

- Tenured members of the Program Faculty Committee
- Divisional Dean, or in the case of Librarians, the Director of the Library and Associate Director of the Library.
- The Faculty Personnel Committee, or in the case of the Librarians, the Library Personnel Committee
- Provost
- President
- Board of Trustees

3.2 As set forth in this Procedure, the following additional persons at the college are responsible for providing letters of evaluation to be considered by the Reviewers listed in Section 2.1

- If requested by the faculty member, the Dean of General Studies with respect to the faculty member's contributions to General Studies
- In the case of faculty members whose primary responsibility is for graduate teaching or administration in a graduate program, the Dean of Graduate Studies, with respect to faculty contributions to the mission of the Program.

3.3 As set forth in this Procedure, External Reviewers of faculty scholarship/creative activity for those seeking tenure and/or promotion to senior rank.

4.0 Selection of Faculty Review Bodies

4.1 Program Review Committees

4.1.1 Consideration at the program level is made by the Program Review Committees. Except as set forth in this section, the Program Review Committee consists of all tenured members of the faculty member's program.

4.1.2 In programs with 10 or more tenured faculty members, the Program Review Committee will consist of no fewer than 7 tenured faculty elected for a term of three years by secret ballot and a simple majority. Additional fair and appropriate procedures as deemed necessary will be approved by a 2/3 majority of the program and the Divisional Dean.

4.1.3 Should it happen that a program has fewer than (3) tenured faculty members, the Dean shall select up to three (3) tenured members of the faculty from related disciplines, agreed to by the program, for a total of three (3) tenured faculty members, who will serve as a program-level review committee for non-tenured faculty members in the program for a term of three years. Upon mutual agreement, they may continue to serve as long as they are needed to make the requisite number of tenured program faculty. In the event that one or more “related faculty” end their service before a Program has at least three (3) tenured faculty members, the Dean shall select faculty members to replace them.

4.2 Library Review Committee (LRC)

4.2.1 The Library Review Committee is selected in accordance with Article XVII of the Master Agreement.

4.2.2 If there are untenured members of the library faculty, the library Review Committee is selected by secret ballot conducted each April at the same time as the elections for the Faculty Review Committee. If there are no untenured library faculty, elections will be held when structural or growth promotions are announced by the President. In both cases, all full time librarians included in the negotiations unit are eligible voters and candidates for the LRC unless they are candidates being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. All elections will be by secret ballot and will be conducted at a meeting of all eligible library faculty that is chaired by the Director of the Library.

4.2.3 Those candidates receiving a majority of the votes of the library faculty shall be considered elected for the one year term. A minimum of three members of the library faculty are required to serve on the LRC. If there are fewer than three eligible, the Director of the Library shall, following consultation with the Library faculty, select a sufficient number from among faculty serving on the Library Committee of the Faculty Assembly to constitute a LRC of three members.

4.2.4 The election and operation of the LRC will be consistent with the College Personnel Calendar and any contractually mandated timelines

4.3 Faculty Review Committee (FRC)

4.3.1 **ELIGIBILITY:** Tenured faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or higher are eligible to serve on the Faculty Review Committee

4.3.2 MEMBERSHIP: The FRC consists of nine faculty members including at least one DIVISIONAL REPRESENTATIVE from each Academic Division. Following the election of divisional members and alternates, any remaining seats will be elected from the faculty at-large during a second election. However, at no time will there be more than two persons from any one Academic Division serving on the FRC at the same time. Members shall serve for two years.

4.3.2.1 FRC Representatives will serve staggered two-year terms, such that approximately half of the FRC is elected each year for a two year term.

4.3.3 NOMINATIONS: Nominations shall be opened and closed in the spring of each year as determined by the college's personnel calendar. There will be two separate voting cycles in the election and separate slates will be prepared for each cycle:

4.3.3.1 Each Academic Division nominates at least one person to serve as its MEMBER and at least one person to serve as its ALTERNATE to the

4.3.3.2.FRC according to the election-rotation cycle above. Eligible Faculty may also self-nominate to be a MEMBER or ALTERNATE to the FRC representing his/her Division

4.3.3.3 Faculty may self-nominate or nominate any eligible person from any division who agrees to serve as an At-Large Member.

4.3.3.4.Individuals may be a part of both slates; however, their names will be withdrawn from the at-large slate if they are elected as a divisional member (or an alternate) in the initial voting cycle.

4.3.4 ELECTIONS: In order to fill vacant seats the Provost's Office shall conduct an online elections, with secret ballots, in which all faculty except 13-D, 13-O, 13-M, emeritus/ae and affiliated faculty are eligible to vote for all open positions (i.e. for representatives from all Divisions). The quorum for a valid election shall consist of a majority of the faculty.

4.3.4.1 Members will be elected in two sequential ballots, the first of which shall elect Members and Alternates and the second of which shall elect At-Large representatives.

4.3.4.2 The Ballot will include at least one eligible nominee for each MEMBER vacancy, and (separately listed) at least one eligible nominee for ALTERNATE vacancy. Two eligible nominees will be required if one of the candidates for ALTERNATE is also running as an AT-LARGE candidate.

4.3.4.3 Members will be selected on the following basis: The Candidate for MEMBER and for ALTERNATE from each Academic Division who receive

the highest number of votes for the position of Divisional Representative/Alternate will be designated the Representatives of their Academic Divisions. At-large MEMBERS will be chosen from those candidates with the highest numbers of votes unless that would result in there being more than one at-large representative from a single academic division. In such cases, the selection will skip to the next-highest vote getter.

4.3.5 SERVICE: Members of the Faculty Review Committee, including alternates serve two year terms. Faculty who are elected to the FRC are expected to serve for the full term. If for extraordinary reasons, such as health or serious illness of a family member, a faculty member is unable to serve during one or more personnel cycles, s/he should make a written request to the Provost, explaining the reasons why s/he needs to be replaced for that cycle. Potential candidates should take into account their desire to seek promotion, range adjustment or other personnel action reviewed by the FRC since those would not be considered valid reasons for requesting to be excused from the committee except under extraordinary circumstances.

4.3.6 ALTERNATES: If required to serve, Alternates will only serve during those personnel cycles for which they are needed. In the event that the Member who is unable to serve is an At-Large Member, or where neither a Member nor the Alternate from his/her Division is able to serve, a duly elected Alternate from any Academic Division shall be randomly chosen to serve.

5.0 Responsibilities in the Annual Faculty Review Process

Phase of Evaluation	Responsible Party
I. Send Notification of Evaluation consistent with the established personnel calendar	Divisional Dean
[II through V—apply to tenure and/or promotion reviews only, consistent with section 6.2] II. Compile list of potential evaluators	Candidate
III. Select outside evaluators	Candidate, Tenured Faculty, Dean (In case of Promotion to full: Candidate and Dean)
IV. Submit scholarly/creative material to be considered by External Evaluator to Dean	Candidate
V. Send materials to External Evaluators	Dean
VI Prepare Evaluation File According to Established Format	Faculty Member under review

VIII Review Evaluation File and Sign cover sheet Attesting to the File's Completeness and Accuracy	Faculty Member under review
IX. Ensure a Properly Established Program Review Committee	Divisional Dean and Program Coordinator
X. Thorough and Timely Reading of Evaluation Files and Supporting Materials in Light of Program, Divisional, and College Standards and approved Faculty Plan.	Members of Program Review Committee
XI. Meet together to discuss, deliberate and vote on the merits of each faculty member's case for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. Write a letter that reflects the vote and explains academic judgment as to each candidate's strengths and weaknesses, meeting of criteria reflected in Program, Divisional, and College standards, and quality of performance in meeting goals outlined in the Faculty Plan. PRC transmits letter signed by all members to the file, the Divisional Dean and affected faculty member in a timely fashion.	Members of Program Review Committee
XII. Prepare of a letter of dissent by a member(s) who disagrees with the majority vote of the Program Review. Transmits signed letter to file, Divisional Dean and affected faculty member(s) in a timely fashion.	Dissenting Faculty Member/s
XIII. Thorough and Timely Reading of Evaluation Files and Supporting Materials in Light of all applicable standards and approved Faculty Plan.	Divisional Dean
XIV. Using his/her best academic judgment, assess each candidate's strengths and weaknesses, meeting of criteria reflected in all applicable standards, and quality of performance in meeting goals outlined in the Faculty Plan. Prepare a letter summarizing this assessment. Transmit signed letter to file, affected faculty member and FRC and/or Provost in a timely fashion.	Divisional Dean

<p>XV. Meet together to discuss, deliberate and vote on the merits of each faculty member's case for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. Write a letter that reflects the vote and explains academic judgment as to each candidate's progress in the meeting of criteria reflected in all applicable standards, and quality of performance in meeting goals outlined in the Faculty Plan. FRC transmit signed letter to file, Provost and affected faculty member in a timely fashion.</p>	<p>Faculty Review Committee</p>
<p>XVI. Thorough and Timely Reading of Evaluation Files and Supporting Materials in Light of all applicable standards and approved Faculty Plan.</p>	<p>Provost</p>
<p>XVII. Using his/her best academic judgment, assess each candidate's strengths and weaknesses, progress in the meeting of criteria reflected in all applicable standards, and quality of performance in meeting goals outlined in the Faculty Plan. Prepare a letter summarizing this assessment. Transmit signed letter to file, President and affected faculty member in a timely fashion.</p>	<p>Provost</p>
<p>XVIII. The President will review all personnel recommendations. Normally, the President will undertake an independent assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative to all applicable standards only in those cases where a negative recommendation has been made at any stage of the review process, where the review involves questions of tenure or promotion to the rank of Professor or Distinguished Professor. However, he/she retains the right to review any decision.</p>	<p>President</p>
<p>XIX. The President notifies the affected faculty members of the nature of his/her recommendation in a timely fashion.</p>	<p>President</p>
<p>XX. Recommendation to the Board of Trustees</p>	<p>President</p>
<p>XXI. Action by the Board of Trustees on Affirmative Recommendations</p>	<p>Board of Trustees</p>

6. RESPONSIBILITIES IN REVIEW PROCESS

6.1 Faculty Member Under Review

It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review for reappointment and/or promotion to demonstrate in an accurate and timely manner the extent and quality of his/her performance in relative to all applicable standards.

6.1.1 Performance is demonstrated through the preparation of a file of materials for consideration by the evaluating individuals and groups.

6.1.2 The file should include materials related to the faculty members work from the time of one's previous evaluation at the College.

6.2. EXTERNAL REVIEWERS AND SELECTION PROCESS, WITH RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES OF CANDIDATE, PROGRAM, DIVISIONAL DEAN, AND PROVOST

6.2.0 The following procedure (6.2.1 through 6.2.9) is recommended for those seeking tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, but not required. The procedure (6.2.10 and 6.2.11, respectively) is required, however, for promotion to full Professor or Distinguished Professor, as described below.

6.2.1 In the case of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, no later than three months prior to the due date for the candidate's file, consultation will take place among the candidate, the appropriate Dean, and a mutually agreed upon tenured faculty member of the college to select at least two external reviewers. Normally, the faculty member's dissertation advisor will not be one of the selected reviewers. No reviewer will be selected over the objection of the faculty candidate.

6.2.2 Within two working days after said selection, the Dean's office shall contact the persons selected to ascertain their willingness to serve as external reviewers. Should the number of external reviewers who agree to serve be fewer than two, the faculty candidate, Dean and tenured Faculty member will meet again to select additional reviewers.

6.2.3 Should the above three persons be unable to reach consensus in a timely manner, the matter of selection of the external reviewers will be referred to the Provost, who will meet with them and render a decision. If requested by the candidate, a union observer may be present at this meeting. No reviewer will be selected over the objection of the faculty candidate.

6.2.4 No later than two and one half months prior to the due date for the candidate's file, the candidate shall provide the Dean's office with copies of his/her scholarly or creative work to be reviewed and commented on by the external evaluator. The candidate may also include other material bearing on the judgment of their scholarly/creative activity. All material sent to the external reviewers will become part of the candidate's file.

6.2.5. As soon as possible after receiving the work to be reviewed, the Dean's office shall send a letter to the external reviewers, along with copies of the scholarly/creative work or other professional materials be reviewed, the candidate's curriculum vitae, the candidate's Plan(s) for Promotion and Tenure, and all applicable standards for tenure and promotion.

6.2.6 The Dean's letter shall indicate that the reviewer is to make a written judgment regarding whether the candidate's materials evidence that the candidate has met all applicable standards for tenure and/or promotion in the area of scholarly/creative activity, including those matters that may bear on the judgment of the candidate's record in these areas. The letter shall request that letters containing the reviewer's written judgment should be returned three weeks prior to the due date of the candidate's file. The faculty member will receive a copy of the Dean's letter accompanying the materials to be evaluated.

6.2.7 The reviewer's comments shall be returned to the Dean, who will provide the candidate with copies of the comments within three days of receiving them.

6.2.8 The candidate may include a response to the reviewer's comments in her or his file, and the response will be placed in the section of the file adjacent to the reviewers' comments.

6.2.9 No letter from an external reviewer will be considered over the objection of the candidate if it arrives after the closing of the candidate's file. In the event that an external reviewer fails to submit a timely letter, a letter will be added to the file [by the Dean] that explains that the external reviewer's letter is missing due to circumstances beyond the control of the candidate, and that no negative inference shall be drawn from its absence. If the letter arrives late but prior to the file's closing, the candidate shall have a minimum of 2 weeks to prepare a written response to the reviewer's comments, which will be added to the file as noted above in 6.2.9.

6.2.9.1 In the event that the candidate's response to a late-arriving external review is received into the file after any level of review has rendered a judgment, all those levels which have rendered such a judgment will be given a copy of the external reviewer's comments along with any written response prepared by the candidate. Those bodies in the levels of review so affected will be given three business days to reconsider their recommendations and revise them if necessary.

6.2.9.2 Any revised recommendation above shall carry with it the same option for candidate response as the original recommendation by the review body.

6.2.10 In the case of promotion to the rank of Professor, no later than three months prior to the due date for the candidate's file the Dean and the candidate will confer to select at least three external reviewers. At least one of the reviewers recommended by the Dean will be selected. Once informed of the Dean's choice, the candidate may register an objection, along with providing a rationale for the objection. The objection will not be unreasonably ignored in making the final selection of external evaluators.

6.2.10.1 The procedures outlined in sections 6.2.2 through 6.2.9 above will be followed for those being considered for promotion to Professor.

6.2.11 In the case of promotion to the rank of Distinguished Professor, no later than three months prior to the due date for the candidate's file the Dean and the candidate will confer to select at least five external reviewers, At least two of the reviewers recommended by the Dean will be selected. Once informed of the Dean's choice, the candidate may register an objection along with providing a rationale for the objection. The objection will not be unreasonably ignored in making the final selection of external evaluators.

6.2.11.1 The procedures outlined in sections 6.2.2 through 6.2.9 above will be followed for those being considered for promotion to Distinguished Professor.

6.3 Program Faculty

6.3.1 The evaluation of colleagues is one of the most important aspects of faculty responsibility, in part because scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues. Implicit in that is the responsibility for both adverse and favorable judgments. For this reason, all tenured faculty are expected to participate in the thorough reading of materials, to attend and actively participate in deliberative meetings to discuss applicants and/or to vote on all recommendations. Faculty shall not abstain from voting. In the case of a conflict of interest, the faculty member should recuse himself/herself from the deliberations and vote regarding that applicant.

Program Faculty are also expected to be available to colleagues for consultation and advice regarding Faculty Plans, and to participate in deliberations and approvals of those plans.

6.3.2 The Program Review Committee shall review the evaluation file and, following a face to face meeting to discuss their evaluation, vote, and report the vote, recommendations and evaluation in a letter appropriate for the type of review as set forth in Sections 9.0 through 9.7. This letter becomes part of the evaluation file and the applicant's official personnel file. Any member(s) of the program who disagree(s) with the majority vote may provide a letter of explanation for such disagreement. Both the program letter and any dissenting letter(s) will be provided to the candidate and will become a part of the candidate's evaluation file as it advances through the Review Process.

Except under unusual circumstances where a faculty member has had a unique interaction that requires explanation (e.g. co- authorship with a candidate), members of the Program Review Committee shall not write individual peer or advocacy letters on behalf of any program candidate.

6.3.3 The candidate may provide a letter of rebuttal to the program or any dissenting letters within three (3) business days after the Program Review Committee's recommendation due date. The candidate's response letter also becomes part of the evaluation file.

6.4 Divisional Dean

6.4.1 The Dean shall provide an independent evaluation of the faculty member, taking into consideration the recommendations of the Program Review Committee, and transmit her/his letter to the candidate. The Dean's letter becomes part of the evaluation file. The evaluation file is then transmitted to either the Provost or to the Faculty Personnel Committee, as appropriate depending on the year of review or the nature of the personnel action, as set forth earlier in this document.

6.4.2 The candidate may provide a letter of rebuttal to the Dean's letter

within three (3) days after the recommendations' due date. The candidate's response letter also becomes part of the advancing portfolio.

6.5 Faculty Review Committee

6.5.1 Organization: The committee shall be convened by the Provost and charged with responsibility to elect a chair of the committee for one-academic year. Election of the chair shall be by majority vote of the whole committee, conducted by secret ballot. The chair is responsible for handling administrative chores, running meetings, and facilitating various communications. In the case that a procedural conflict cannot be resolved informally by the chair, it will be resolved by simple majority vote of the committee.

6.5.2 Confidentiality: Members shall hold confidential all matters pertaining to the FRC, including the names of the presenters, the materials contained in the files, the nature of the discussion and the numbers of the positive and/or negative votes.

6.5.3 Access to Files/IDEA: The office of the Provost shall make all Evaluation Files available to be read by FRC members in the Provost's Conference Room or another room designated by the Provost after Program letters have been placed in the files. Each member of the FRC shall read all of the files, including teaching portfolios, IDEA results and comments. Divisional offices shall make IDEA forms available to the committee in the Divisional offices prior to the submission of the program letters. After the Dean's letters, IDEA forms are transferred to the Provost's conference room.

6.5.4 Presentation of Files: Files are assigned to a member of the committee to be presented when the committee convenes to discuss and vote. Presenters will lead the discussion about each of their assigned files. Presenters are not expected to advocate for or against a file. In all cases the presenter is "at some distance" from the applicant, i.e., not in the same program and not a close friend. Most often, the presenter is not a member of the division of the applicant. Any personal connections between any applicant and any committee members are acknowledged before discussion of the applicant's file takes place. A member who has a conflict of interest that makes it impossible for him/her to judge an applicant fairly should recuse himself/herself from all discussion and vote on that applicant.

6.5.5 Discussion of candidates: Members are expected to participate in discussion of each candidate. It is the responsibility of the chair to ensure that discussions are based on material in the applicant's file and all applicable standards.

6.5.6 Vote: After full review and consideration of a file takes place and there is a readiness to vote, a vote by secret ballot is taken and the results announced and recorded. Ballots are shredded at the end of the cycle. Any 2 members of the committee are allowed to call for one revote for any individual candidate. Revotes are preceded by a brief discussion of the file and are again voted upon by secret ballot. In the case of a revote, only the results of the final revote are recorded, no record is kept of the previous vote(s), and neither is a record kept or reported as to whether or not re-votes took place.

6.5.7 **Letters of Recommendation:** The committee shall use a uniform format for letters including a “Template” opening sentence/paragraph for each category. After consideration and vote, the presenter shall write the first draft of the letter to the applicant based on verbal recommendations from the committee on the contents of the letter. All draft letters are reviewed and edited by all members of the committee. Any disagreements about the language of the letters are resolved by the chair. After the editing process is completed each committee member initials the letter. Each member also signs the signature page that accompanies the letter to the applicant. The chair reviews all letters for any minor editorial corrections before the letters are delivered to mailboxes by the Provost. Letters will be delivered in a timely fashion.

6.5.8 **Workshop:** The FRC shall conduct at least one workshop annually to which all members of the faculty are invited to provide general advice on such matters as “common mistakes in file construction.” Members of the FRC shall make every attempt to assist at the workshop.

6.5.9 **Limitations on Members:** Members of the committee shall refrain from writing individual letters of recommendation for any candidate, except under extraordinary circumstances requiring input from the member (e.g. co-author, team-teacher.)

6.5.10 The candidate may provide a letter of rebuttal to the evaluation of the FRC, or to any dissenting letters, within three (3) days after the recommendation’s due date. The candidate response letter also becomes part of the advancing evaluation file.

6.5.11 In the event that a faculty member believes there was a procedural violation by one or more members of the FRC, the procedures for addressing the concerns that were agreed to in the Memorandum of Agreement between the College and the SFT (December 2004) shall be followed.

6.6 Provost

6.6.1 In situations where a Dean’s positive recommendation constitutes the last step of review, the evaluation file will be forwarded to the President via the Provost.

6.6.2 In situations where the Provost is to make a formal recommendation to the President, the Provost reviews the file, as appropriate, and prepares a letter that summarizes the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses on the evaluation criteria and makes a recommendation “yes” or “no” appropriate to the personnel action under consideration.

6.6.3 The letter of the Provost will be provided to the candidate and will become a part of the candidate’s file as it advances through the review process.

6.6.4 The candidate may provide a letter of rebuttal to the Provost within three (3) days after the due date of the Provost’s letter. The candidate response letter also becomes part of the file.

6.7. President

6.7.1 All recommendations to the Board of Trustees are made by the President.

6.7.2 In situations in which the President is to make an evaluation before a recommendation to the Board of Trustees, the President reviews the file as appropriate.

6.7.3 The President makes a recommendation for renewal, tenure and/or promotion to the Board of Trustees, and notifies the candidate in writing of the recommendation. Where, in the President's best academic judgment, such a recommendation is not warranted, the President also notifies the faculty member in writing.

6.7.4 A candidate who disagrees with the recommendation of the President may meet with the President within three days after the due date of the President's recommendation.

6.7.5 The President may, within twenty-four hours of any meeting as described above, make a revised recommendation and notify the candidate. The President then makes this recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

6.8 Board of Trustees

6.8.1 The Board of Trustees will review and act upon affirmative recommendations of the President in accordance with its procedures. Written notification will be sent to the candidate within one day of the Board's decision. The decision of the Board is final and may not be reconsidered, except as provided within the Master Agreement or law.

7.0 The Evaluation File

7.1 Contents

The evaluation file must be structured by the candidate in the manner outlined below. The focus should be on clarity and brevity; evidence to support the candidate's own testimony; and accurate representations of one's achievements. Evidence to support one's achievements is a core part of the file, although candidates may choose to organize their files by packaging such evidence in one or more appendices.

FILE, PART I

7.1.1 The appropriate file cover page (see attached forms) as required by the College.

7.1.2. Required Background Information for Faculty

7.1.2.1 Official description of position responsibilities, including any unique contractual responsibilities.

7.1.2.2 Current curriculum vitae or professional resume.

7.1.2.3 Copies of all program, FRC, Divisional Dean, and Provost letters of evaluation, including rebuttal letters, since the faculty member's employment at the College, arranged chronologically with the most recent on top. Tenured faculty members seeking promotion should provide these documents from their most recent review.

7.1.2.4 A copy of the approved Faculty Plan along with College, Divisional, and Program standards as applicable.

7.1.3 Required Background Information from Librarians

7.1.3.1 Official description of position responsibilities.

7.1.3.2 Current curriculum vitae or professional resume for the faculty member.

7.1.3.3 Copies of all program, Library Review Committee, Library Administrator, and Provost letters of evaluation, including, including rebuttal letters, since the faculty member's employment at the College, arranged chronologically with the most recent on top. Tenured faculty members seeking promotion should provide these documents from their most recent review.

7.2 FILE, PART II a: Report on Achieving the Plan's Goals and Objectives (omitted in the case of faculty members in their first year of service)

7.2.1 After the first year as a full time faculty member, files shall include a statement of reflection discussing, among other things, the quality of the accomplishment of their goals and objectives, as outlined in the section describing the Faculty Plan. To assure each faculty member is evaluated as fairly as possible, the self-evaluation should include documentation of excellence in teaching, scholarly/creative work and service that meets all applicable standards in each area..

7.2.2 Attention should be paid to any pattern of concern in the previous evaluation(s).

7.2.3 Faculty should strive for clarity and brevity in their statements.

7.3 FILE, PART II b: (omitted in the case of faculty members in their first year of service.) Effectiveness in Teaching

Evidence of teaching performance should be demonstrated by a teaching portfolio, as outlined below, which should contain the following:

- A self-evaluation of teaching
- Student evaluations of teaching and preceptorial teaching
- Peer evaluations of teaching
- Other evidence of effectiveness in teaching

7.3.1 Self-Evaluation of Teaching

The self evaluation of teaching should briefly explain one's educational goals, articulate how one's pedagogy attempts to meet those goals, and assess how well those goals have been met. The candidate should explain how additional documentation in the portfolio supports his/her self-evaluation.

7.3.2..Student Evaluations of Teaching

Results of formal student evaluations of teaching shall be included. For probationary, XIII (D), XIII(O) and visiting faculty all results are included. For other faculty, results are included since the last positive personnel action or for the past five years, whichever is shorter.

7.3.3. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

7.3.3.1 Prior to each review, other than the first year review, all probationary faculty shall be observed and evaluated in at least two classes annually by a tenured faculty member chosen by the consensus of the faculty member to be observed, the Dean, and a tenured faculty member mutually selected by the faculty member and the Dean. Should the three persons not be able to reach consensus in a timely manner, the matter of selection of evaluator shall be referred to the Provost who will meet with the candidate, the selecting faculty member, and the Dean, and will render a decision. If requested by the candidate, a union observer may be present during this meeting. No evaluator will be selected over the objection of the candidate to be observed. Up to two additional observations may be requested by the probationary faculty member

7.3.3.2 Peer evaluation of teaching shall be based on a review of syllabi, assignments and other course materials, and by direct classroom observation by the peer evaluator as set forth in this section.

7.3.3.3 Observations shall take place in a class and at a time mutually agreed upon between the candidate and the evaluator.

7.3.3.4 Within the context of the course objectives outlined in the syllabus or other course materials, observers shall describe and evaluate the quality of teaching in writing, with reference to all applicable standards for excellence in teaching. This statement shall be shared with the faculty member being evaluated within two weeks of the classroom evaluation.

7.3.3.5 At least once prior to tenure, all probationary faculty shall be observed teaching one of his/her General Studies courses by a faculty colleague chosen in the manner described above in section 7.3.2.1.

7.3.3.6 In the year(s) in which the evaluation of General Studies teaching take(s) place, this/these observation(s) and evaluation(s) will be counted as one of the two annual evaluations.

7.3.3.7 Written peer evaluations of teaching of both program and General Studies courses shall be parts of all evaluation files.

7.3.3.8 Tenured faculty seeking promotion may request observations and peer evaluations of their teaching by any member of their Program Review Committee and/or by any tenured Stockton faculty member.

7.3.4 Student Evaluations of Precepting

Results of formal student evaluations of precepting shall be included. For probationary, XIII (D), XIII(O) and visiting faculty all results are included. For other faculty, results are included since the last positive personnel action or for the past five years, whichever is shorter.

7.3.5 Additional Evidence: Examples of additional evidence that may be used in the Portfolios to document one's self-assessment include such items as:

- Syllabi
- Assignments
- Student feedback – solicited and unsolicited
- Student projects and/or performances
- Grading samples
- Peer reviews (review of portfolio or course materials, review of scholarship of teaching)
- Discussion of goals and steps taken toward improvement and evidence of subsequent improvement in teaching
- Relevant materials from available program assessment activities that shed light on student learning, including any available feedback from graduates in various stages of their careers.
- Handouts, manuals, etc., prepared for students
- Evidence of course or curriculum development.

7.4 FILE, PART II c: (omitted in the case of faculty members in their first year of service.) Quality of Scholarship or Creative Activity

7.4.1 Applicants should include a short statement of their overall program of scholarship and/or creative activity, a self-assessment of their progress, and evidence to support their assessment. Evidence of scholarship or creative activity may be demonstrated by:

7.4.1.1 Samples of scholarly/creative work. Whether the work was juried, adjudicated, invited, competitive, refuted or otherwise professionally reviewed

and acknowledged should be noted. These will be returned to the faculty member when the review process is over.

7.4.1.2 If a faculty member cites a review of his/her work by a publication reviewer, panel respondent, grant reviewer, theatre or dance adjudicator or the like, then copies of such reviews should be included in the Appendix to the file.

7.4.1.3 Where required, i.e. for tenure and/or promotion, the solicited external letters from respected members of the field as set forth in Section 6.2, evaluating the quality of the faculty member's work .

7.5 FILE, PART II d: (omitted in the case of faculty members in their first year of service.) Contributions to Campus and/or Community

7.5.1 An applicant should include a statement of one's goals for service to college and/or community, and a self-assessment of one's effectiveness in meeting those goals.

7.5.2 Evidence of effectiveness of service should demonstrate the significance of the contribution and the impact of such service on the College, and its students, or on the communities, the professions or the disciplines for which such service was provided. Testimony from internal or external sources should focus on the impact and results of the service.

7.6 FILE, PART III: Other Items

7.6.1 The faculty member may include other items, at her or his discretion, which demonstrate achievement in activities related to the evaluation criteria. This may include items that become available after the closing of files.

7.7 EVALUATION FILE FOR LIBRARY FACULTY

To assure that the service of each library faculty member is evaluated as fairly as possible, documentation of library service excellence should include a self-evaluation of aims, goals, and accomplishments. Discussion of goals, steps taken toward improvement and evidence of subsequent improvement should be included. In addition,

materials such as handouts, reports, Web pages, student and faculty feedback, service assessment and other relevant documentation should be included in the library faculty member's file.

7.7.1 External evaluation of scholarship for library faculty will follow the procedures for the external evaluation of scholarship for faculty in general. The Director of the Library will perform the functions of the Dean as described in Procedure 6.2.

7.7.2 Peer evaluation of teaching by library faculty with teaching responsibilities

7.7.2.1 Library faculty who teach full term courses will have those courses evaluated following the same procedures for evaluation of teaching of adjunct faculty.

7.7.2.2 Library faculty who provide bibliographic or other instruction as parts of courses where a different faculty member is the teacher of record are not required to have peer evaluation of this classroom teaching. The excellence of their teaching will be evaluated by means of the other methods described in this document, including a teaching portfolio. They may include optional peer evaluations as part of the portfolio.

8.0 The Faculty Plan

8.1 The Faculty Member's "Plan" is a statement of intent to meet all applicable standards over a designated period of time in a specific manner. As such it will contain anticipated activities and a delineation of the evidence/measurable outcomes that might be used to judge the quality of their achievement.

8.2 Individual faculty plans will be constructed on the basis of all applicable standards involving teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, as well as the general responsibilities of a faculty member, but variance may result from such factors as:

- The nature of one's work before one's original appointment at the College
- Previous evaluations at various levels of review.
- Approved changes in previous plans
- New challenges and opportunities
- Particular contractual obligations, including those in the initial appointment

8.3 Preparation and Approval of the Initial Faculty Plan for Non-Tenured Faculty

8.3.1 During the early Spring of the first academic year, the faculty member should begin to put together such a Faculty Plan in consultation with the Program Review Committee and the Dean. A draft plan should be completed by the end of March of the first year, and should contain specific goals and expectations, a description of the evidence to be used to measure the quality of their having been accomplished, and a timeline and general steps for reasonable attainment of those goals. These Plans must be approved by the Program, Dean, and Provost, in that order, who will render their judgments on the appropriateness of the plan within the context of the criteria noted above.

8.3.2 By the middle of April, the Program Review Committee and Dean shall meet with faculty members in their First Year to discuss their draft PLANS, make suggestions for changes, and to discuss the types of evidence that will demonstrate that goals have been met. After this discussion, the candidate shall generate a final draft of the PLAN, consulting with the Program Review Committee members and the Dean as necessary. Once completed, the Program Review Committee will bring the Proposed PLAN forward to all of the tenured members of the program for a vote as to whether the goals and expectations in the plan are acceptable.

8.3.3 If the candidate and the Program Review Committee cannot agree on the specifics of the Proposed PLAN, the candidate can request a vote by all of the tenured members of the program on the acceptability the Proposed PLAN. If a simple majority

of the tenured faculty votes to accept the plan, it is accepted. If less than a simple majority vote to accept the plan, it is returned to the candidate and Program Review Committee for revision. If revisions are recommended, it is incumbent on the tenured faculty to provide a specific list of areas that need to be strengthened or otherwise changed. It is not the responsibility of the tenured faculty members to make the specific revisions, however they may make very specific recommendations. If changes are deemed necessary, then after the PLAN is revised it will again go back to the tenured faculty members for a vote.

8.3.4 The plan as accepted by the program will be forwarded to the Dean for review and comment and eventual approval; the plan as finally accepted by the Dean will be forwarded to the Provost for review and comment and eventual approval. If the Dean or the Provost disagrees with the proposed plan sent forward, he or she will outline concerns in writing and work with the relevant faculty member, Program or (in the case of the Provost) Dean to resolve any differences. The Provost has final approval of the Faculty Plan.

8.3.4.1 It is the responsibility of the tenured members of the Program faculty to make themselves available for meaningful consultation and discussion with the candidate and among themselves until a Plan is approved by all parties in the approval process.

8.3.5 If the Dean or the Provost disagrees with the proposed plan sent forward, he or she will outline concerns in writing and work with the relevant faculty member, Program or Dean to resolve any differences. The Provost has final approval of the Faculty Plan.

8.4 Preparation and Approval of the Revised Faculty Plan for Non-Tenured Faculty

8.4.1 Faculty members whose reviews during their third year of appointment are positive and who receive contracts extending through their fifth year of appointment will develop a Revised plan, following the above procedures, which shall outline the Faculty member's goals and objectives in all three areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, which are consistent with the criteria of established by the College, Division, and Program for excellence in these areas, as well as for meeting the usual responsibilities of faculty members as outlined in Policy_____. A draft plan should be completed by early April of the third year.

8.4.2 By the middle of April, the Program Review Committee and Dean shall meet with faculty members in their Third Year to discuss their draft PLANS, make suggestions for changes, and to discuss the types of evidence that will demonstrate that goals have been met. The process follows the steps in the approval process for the initial Plan, through approval by the Provost.

8.4.2.1 It is the responsibility of the tenured members of the Program faculty to make themselves available for meaningful consultation and discussion with the candidate and among themselves until a Plan is approved by all parties in the approval process.

8.5 Preparation and Approval of the Faculty Plan for Faculty Seeking Promotion Only

Faculty not under review for reappointment or reappointment conferring tenure and who intend to seek promotion may submit such a plan to their programs and respective deans before seeking promotion, in order to provide adequate time for accomplishing with excellence the goals of the plan prior to the actual promotion application. Newly tenured faculty are encouraged to begin development of their Plans to Promotion in the year following tenure's being awarded. The approval process for a Plan to Promotion follows the same process as that of the initial faculty plan.

8.6 Use of the Plans in Review Cycles

8.6.1 In the faculty member's performance reviews he or she will report on the accomplishment of those goals as well as of the quality of their having been accomplished, on progress in meeting all applicable standards leading toward tenure, and such other activities as seem appropriate.

8.6.2 Candidates will be evaluated on the extent and quality of their performance on the evaluation criteria established by the College, Division, and Program, in the professional academic judgments of the reviewers and should document their accomplishments accordingly.

8.6.3 Under normal circumstances, strong positive performance in accomplishing the comprehensive goals outlined in the Plan--in all three areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, which are consistent with the criteria of established by the College, Division, and Program for excellence in these areas--and for meeting the usual responsibilities of faculty members as outlined in Policy_____.
will lead to reappointment, reappointment with tenure, and/or promotion , but under no circumstances will such actions be guaranteed.

8.6.3.1 For faculty hired at the Associate level or above, promotion concurrent with the awarding of tenure is not the norm.

9.0 REVIEW CYCLE FOR UNTENURED FACULTY

9.1 In accordance with the Master Agreement, all untenured faculty shall receive yearly performance reviews, whether or not they are applying for a reappointment.

9.2 The following table summarizes the review cycles for untenured faculty. Dates in the table and in the text below are approximate and are included in order to suggest the sequence of the various reviews. The timing of reviews is dependent on at least the following considerations: adequate time for candidates to prepare their files; availability of relevant information such as student evaluations of teaching; appropriate time intervals for reviews at each level; the need to provide candidates with timely notification of recommendations and results; the need for timely recommendations to the Board of Trustees; and efficient distribution of review cycles across the academic year. Specific dates will be included in each year's Personnel Actions Calendar, which will be prepared by the College after appropriate consultations.

Type of Faculty Review	Basis for Review	Order of Review	Additional Steps if Negative Review	Positive Recommendation to Board of Trustees
First Year performance (Jan- early Feb)	Program, Division & College Standards (focus on Teaching)	Program Dean	FRC Provost President	President @ Feb Board Possibilities: 1) non-renewal 2) renewal for yrs 2 & 3 with or w/o cautions
Development of Faculty Plan (Mar-May)	Program, Division & College Standards	Program Dean Provost		
Second Year Feedback review (Jan- Feb.)	Program, Division & College Standards; quality of performance on Faculty Plan to date	Program Dean [Cautions or negatives shared w/Provost and FRC]	FRC Feedback only Provost Feedback only	
Third year (Full) Performance review (Mar-Apr)	All standards, quality of plan accomplishments, progress toward tenure	Program Dean FRC Provost	President	President @ May Board Possibilities: 1) 1-yr terminal contract issued 2) contract for yrs 4 & 5 issued with or w/o cautions
<i>If renewed through year 5, Development Extended Faculty Plan toward tenure (April-May)</i>	Program, Division & College Standards	Program Dean Provost		
<i>If renewed through year 5, Fourth year Review (tenure/ promotion) (Mar-Apr)</i>	Program, Division & College Standards, Quality of Plan Achievement in light of standards for tenure	Program Dean FRC Provost President		President @May Board Possibilities 1) contract not renewed beyond yr 5; could request fall review year 5 1a) request accepted-based on new information to become available; limited to scholarly/creative work 1b) request denied 2) contract for year 6 awarding tenure, possibly promotion (norm)
<i>Note—fifth year reconsideration review, if granted, would take place in the fall for</i>				

<i>action at the December Board meeting</i>				
---	--	--	--	--

9.3. FIRST YEAR PERFORMANCE REVIEW:

9.3.1 Early in the Spring Term of the first year, each faculty member will receive a First Year Performance Review by the Program Review Committee and the Dean. The review is based on all applicable standards, with a focus on teaching. Based on this review, the faculty member's contract may not be renewed, or may be renewed for years 2 and 3.

9.3.2 Faculty members renewed through years two and three should prepare Faculty Plans as described in Section 8.0.

9.4. SECOND YEAR "FEEDBACK" REVIEW:

9.4.1 Faculty are hired with an initial one year appointment, then may be renewed for two years, so the Feedback Review during the second year is not the basis for any decision about reappointment; rather, it is an opportunity for constructive feedback.

9.4.2 Early in the Spring Term, the candidate submits to the PRC a review file that consists of their PLAN, IDEA results for three terms, and a record of achievement in the general format of a curriculum vitae. These documents serve as the basis for a serious conversation ("Feedback Review") between the candidate and the PRC regarding progress toward reappointment and tenure. The purpose of this face-to-face conversation is to encourage the candidate in his or her professional development, to offer honest feedback and constructive advice, and to provide structure to the Program's responsibility to mentor its untenured faculty members.

9.4.3 This conversation is then summarized in the form of a letter to the candidate from the PRC. Coordinators/Directors should note that the discussion should be a meaningful one, and that the letter (about 1-2 pages) should characterize the conversation and address both strengths and weaknesses of the review file. This letter shall include the phrase, "by signing this letter, I agree that its contents summarize the discussion between the PRC and the candidate" and should be signed by all members of the PRC and the candidate.

9.4.4 The Candidate has the right to respond formally to this letter. The response will be included as part of the candidate's review file. The Dean is also sent a copy of all correspondence.

9.4.5 The Dean reviews the PRC letter and the faculty member's file. Should the Dean have concerns about the content of the letter or its clarity, the Dean may elect to meet with the PRC and the candidate for additional conversation. The Dean issues a written acknowledgement to the candidate and the PRC, with a copy to the Provost.

9.3 YEAR THREE--FULL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

9.5.1 In the Spring of the third year, the faculty member will undergo a Full Performance Review which can result in appointment for a fourth, terminal year or reappointment for a fourth

and fifth year. This review is initiated by the candidate creating a Review File as described earlier in this document.

9.5.2 The Program Review Committee shall review the file, meet to discuss and deliberate the merits of the case for appointment for a fourth, terminal year or reappointment for a fourth and fifth year. Each eligible faculty member casts a vote for either a terminal one-year renewal, or for reappointment to a fourth and fifth year. The alternative with a simple majority of votes becomes the PRC's recommendation. A tie vote results in a recommendation for a terminal one-year appointment, which is treated as a negative vote relative to triggering a review process.

9.5.3 The vote and recommendation regarding reappointment are recorded in a letter that reflects its assessments of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative to all applicable standards and should point out specific areas where the faculty member is not making satisfactory progress toward tenure. Where the candidate's performance on any aspect of her or his PLAN were not met, the Program Review Committee should make specific recommendations to meet program standards that should be included in any subsequent plan.

9.5.4 If the Program Review Committee recommends a single-year terminal contract, its letter should make its reasons transparent. The letter is to be signed by the members of the Program Review Committee and transmitted to the Dean and the faculty member in a timely fashion as determined by the personnel calendar. In all cases where a member(s) of the Program Review Committee dissent(s) from the majority vote, the dissenting member(s) has/have the option to write and sign a dissenting letter to be transmitted to the Dean and the faculty member in a timely fashion as determined by the personnel calendar.

9.5.5 The Dean shall review the file, including the recommendations of the Program Review Committee and make a recommendation whether or to appoint for a fourth, terminal year or reappoint for a fourth and fifth year. That recommendation shall be made in a letter that assesses the candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative to all applicable standards and should point out specific areas where the faculty member is not making satisfactory progress toward tenure. Where the candidate's performance on any aspect of her or his PLAN were not met, the Dean should make specific recommendations to meet Divisional standards that should be included in any subsequent plan. Where the Dean recommends appointment for a fourth, terminal year, the letter should make his/her reasons transparent. The letter should be transmitted to the candidate and the FRC in a timely fashion as determined by the personnel calendar.

9.5.6. The FRC shall review the file including the recommendations of the Program Review Committee and the Divisional Dean, and meet to fully discuss it in light of all applicable standards. A vote will be taken in accordance with the established bylaws of the FRC. The vote shall be recorded as part of a letter reflecting the vote and an assessment of the applicant's strengths and weaknesses relative to all applicable standards and should point out specific areas where the faculty member is not making satisfactory progress toward tenure. Where the candidate's performance on any aspect of her or his PLAN needs improvement, the FRC should make specific recommendations to meet all applicable standards that should be included in any subsequent plan. Where the FRC recommends appointment for a fourth, terminal year, the letter should make their reasons transparent. In all cases, the letters should be transmitted to the candidate and to the Provost in a timely fashion as determined by the personnel calendar.

9.5.7 The FRC recommendation of appointment for a fourth, terminal year or reappointment to a fourth and fifth year is transmitted to the Provost, who will undertake an independent review of the candidate's file and make a recommendation to the President for appointment for a fourth, terminal year or reappointment for a fourth and fifth year. The Provost's recommendation regarding reappointment are recorded in a letter that reflects her/his assessments of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative to all applicable standards and should point out specific areas where the faculty member is not making satisfactory progress toward tenure. Where the candidate's performance on any aspect of her or his PLAN were not met, the Provost may make specific recommendations to meet all applicable standards that should be included in any subsequent plan. The Provost's letter should be transmitted to the candidate and to the President in a timely fashion as determined by the personnel calendar.

9.5.8 If at any stage in the review process a recommendation is made for a fourth, terminal year, the President shall review the file as she/he deems appropriate, and shall transmit a recommendation of reappointment for a fourth or fourth and fifth year to the Board of Trustees for action at its May meeting. Prior to making her/his recommendation, and by the date as determined by the personnel calendar, the President shall indicate in writing to the candidate whether or not she/he intends to recommend reappointment. If the President does not intend to recommend reappointment, the candidate may request and be granted a meeting with the President, within three working days of having received the President's notification.

9.5.9 If all stages of the review process result in a recommendation for a reappointment to a fourth and fifth year, the Provost transmits the file to the President for her/his recommendation to the Board of Trustees for action at its May meeting.

9.6.0. FOURTH YEAR REVIEW AND REAPPOINTMENT (to a Sixth Year) WITH TENURE AND PROMOTION

9.6.1. Fourth year faculty who have been reappointed for their fifth year will undergo a Fourth Year Review in the spring of their fourth year, as determined by the personnel calendar. Because this review is considered a tenure review, all levels of review including the President will make independent evaluations. In addition, the assessments of external reviewers will be used in judging whether the candidate has met all applicable standards for scholarship/creative work.

9.6.2 Normally, it is expected that those not deemed eligible for promotion will not be recommended for tenure. However, all evaluations will provide separate recommendations on tenure and promotion.

9.6.3 As a tenure review, it is incumbent upon all internal evaluators (Program Review Committee, Dean, FRC, Provost, and President) that their letters provide a full and fair assessment of the applicant's strengths and weaknesses relative to the appropriate standards. The reasons for denying reappointment for a sixth year and/or promotion should be transparent and evaluators should be as clear as possible.

9.6.4 Positive recommendations for reappointment to a sixth year with or without promotion are transmitted by the President to the Board of Trustees at the May Board meeting.

9.7.0 FIFTH YEAR RECONSIDERATION REVIEW

9.7.1 Fifth year faculty who were not reappointed for a sixth year may apply for a Reconsideration Review for REAPPOINTMENT WITH TENURE and PROMOTION in the Fall of their Fifth year, as determined by the college personnel calendar. The request for such a Reconsideration Review may or may not be accepted. The granting of a reconsideration review will be based on anticipated new accomplishments by the candidate, documentation for which will be available before the closing date of the reconsideration review file as specified on the college personnel calendar and will provide new evidence of the candidate's meeting all applicable standards for tenure by the time of the reconsideration review. Application for a Reconsideration Review shall be made to the Provost no later than late May, as designated by the annual personnel calendar.

9.7.2 The application for a Reconsideration Review will indicate how the faculty member intends to meet the relevant standards by the closing of that file during the subsequent Fall term.

9.7.3 Within three business days of having received the letter the Provost will meet with the Program Review Committee and the Dean to hear their recommendations concerning the granting of the Reconsideration Review. The Provost will, based on her/his best professional judgment, render a decision and will notify the candidate in writing of her/his decision within three business days of the group's having met. This decision concerning the granting or non-granting of as Reconsideration Review is final and not subject to appeal.

9.7.4 If granted, the Reconsideration Review takes place in the following fall as determined by the college personnel calendar. The review replicates steps of the full Fourth Year Review except that additional external evaluations of scholarship will not be required. The applicant will submit her/his 4th year review file, all recommendations related to the fourth year review, and new material that provides evidence relative to the basis of the Reconsideration appeal.

9.7.5 In light of the contents of the review file of the applicant up for Reconsideration Review, a decision will be made regarding reappointment for a sixth year, conferring tenure, with or without promotion, and the applicant will be notified in a timely fashion as determined by the personnel calendar

9.7.6 Faculty beginning College employment mid-year will follow the transition pattern as applied to faculty beginning College employment the previous September, except that faculty who begin employment mid-year will be granted an automatic reconsideration review if denied tenure in their fourth year.

1.0 Librarians

10.1 The table below summarizes types of library faculty reviews

Nature of the Review	Order/Stages of Review	Additional Steps in Case of Negative Reviews	Positive Recommendation to Board of Trustees

First Year	Supervisor Library Personnel Committee (LPC) Director of Library	Provost President	President, if appropriate
Second Year	Supervisor LPC Director of the Library Provost	President	President, if appropriate
Third Year	Supervisor LPC Director of the Library	Provost President	President, if appropriate
Fourth Year	Supervisor LPC Director of the Library Provost	President	President, if appropriate
Fifth year	Supervisor LPC Director of the Library Provost President		President, if appropriate
Promotion* (*Growth promotions subject to contractual timelines)	Supervisor LPC Director of the Library Provost	President	President

10.2. The table below summarizes phases in the evaluation of library faculty

Phase of Evaluation	Responsible Party
I. Notification of Evaluation	Director of the Library notifies affected faculty regarding reappointment and tenure
[II through V—apply to tenure and/or promotion reviews only, consistent with sections 7.7.1 and 6.2] II. Compile list of potential evaluators	Candidate
III. Select outside evaluators	Candidate, Tenured Faculty, Director of the Library (In case of Promotion to full: Candidate and Director of the Library)
IV. Submit scholarly/creative material to be considered by External Evaluator to Dean	Candidate

V. Send materials to External Evaluators	Director of the Library
VI. Preparation of Evaluation File According to Established Format	Affected Library Faculty
VII. Review of Evaluation File and Signature Attesting to the File's Completeness and Accuracy	Faculty Member under review
VIII. EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBER	SUPERVISOR (ASSOC. DIR. LIBRARY)
IX. Ensuring a Properly Established Library Personnel Committee	Director of the Library
X. Thorough and Timely Reading of Evaluation Files and Supporting Materials in Light of Established Standards	Associate Director of the Library (Immediate Supervisor) writes letter prior to meeting of Library Personnel Committee
XI. Meeting together to discuss and deliberate the merits of each faculty member's case for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. To take a vote that reflects its collective academic judgment and to record this vote, along with the text of a letter reflecting its assessments of each candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative its established standards. This letter to be signed by the members of the Library Personnel Committee so that it may be transmitted to the Director of the Library and the affected faculty member in a timely fashion.	Members of the Library Personnel Committee
XII. Preparation of a letter of dissent by a member who disagrees with the majority vote of the Program Review and add distribution of letter to file, affected faculty member	Dissenting Member of the Library Personnel Committee Director of the Library
XIII. Preparation of a Letter of Rebuttal to the Evaluation of the Recommendations of the LPC and/or Associate Director of the Library and adding this Letter to the File.	Affected Library Faculty
XIV. Thorough and Timely Reading of each Evaluation File in Light of Established Standards	Director of the Library
XV. Using his/her best academic judgment, assess of each candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative to the Divisional standards and prepare a letter summarizing this assessment so that it may be added to the file as well as transmitted to the Provost and the affected faculty member in a timely fashion.	Director of the Library

XVI. Preparation of a Letter of Rebuttal to the Evaluation of the Director of the Library and addition of the letter to the file	Affected Library Faculty
XVII. Thorough and Timely Reading of each Evaluation File in Light of College Standards	Provost
XVIII. Using his/her best academic judgment, assess of each candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative to the College standards and prepare a letter summarizing this assessment so that it may be added to the file as well as transmitted to the President and the affected faculty member in a timely fashion	Provost
XIX. Preparation of a Letter of Rebuttal to the Evaluation of the Director of the Library and the addition of this Letter to the file.	Affected Library Faculty
XX. The President will review all personnel recommendations. Normally, the President will undertake an independent assessment of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses relative to the College standards only in those cases where a negative recommendation has been made at any stage of the review process, where the review involves questions of tenure or promotion to the rank of Librarian I. However, he/she retains the right to review any decision.	President
XXI. The President will notify the affected faculty members of the nature of his recommendation in a timely fashion.	President
XXII. Affected Faculty Member may Request a Meeting with the President to Discuss his/her Evaluation	
XXIII. Recommendation to the Board of Trustees	President
XIV. Action by the Board of Trustees on Affirmative Recommendations	Board of Trustees

11.0. Faculty on Article XIII (D) and (O) appointments, Visiting appointments, or Joint Appointments with an External Organization

11.0.1 This faculty will be reviewed each year through the level of the Dean. Faculty members submit a file including evidence of effective teaching, scholarship, and service appropriate to the nature of their appointments, along with the materials in Part I: Preliminary Information of the faculty file. In cases of a negative evaluation on a XIII (O) appointment by the Program or the Dean, the procedure used for negative recommendations in the case of part-time faculty will be followed.

11.1 Faculty Holding Joint Appointments in more than one College Program, or Reassigned Faculty

11.1.1 The Program active in the faculty member's performance review is the Faculty member's primary program.

11.2 Affiliated Faculty

11.2.1 This faculty will be reviewed informally by the Dean three months before the conclusion of the appointment. The Dean may consult with others as appropriate and necessary, including appropriate faculty. At the conclusion of the review the Dean may recommend to the Provost that the appointment of the affiliated faculty member be renewed for a specified period of time. The Provost will consider the request and bring a recommendation to the President, who will make a decision and notify the Provost. Recommendations to renew such appointments are taken to the Board of Trustees for formal action.

12.0. Review for promotion (See separate section on Promotional reviews for Library Faculty)

12.1 General promotional procedures for faculty eligible for promotional considerations are governed by the Agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Council of New Jersey State College locals. The College procedure for promotion to specific ranks follows below.

12.2 Assistant Professors normally apply for and are reviewed for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor concurrent with their reviews for tenure, and normally the advancement in rank is awarded concurrent with tenure. In accordance with the Master Agreement, Assistant Professors who are tenured and who meet the qualifications for the higher rank may request consideration for promotion to the level of Associate Professor at any time, following the procedures, including the provision of external letters outlined in Section 6.2.

12.3 Associate Professors who meet the qualifications for the higher rank may request consideration for promotion to the level of Professor at any time, by following the procedures and schedule outlined for promotion consideration, including the provision of external letters, outlined in Section 6.2. Those promoted prior to tenure will be judged for tenure at the higher rank. For Faculty hired at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, promotion to a higher rank concurrent with the awarding of tenure is not the norm.

12.4 Professors who meet the qualifications for Distinguished Professor must be nominated by a minimum of three current faculty members who hold the rank of Professor. The candidate will submit a file of achievements that substantiate and verify the extraordinary contributions that warrant such recognition. The file will include:

12.4.1 A narrative description of the contributions that fulfill the expectations for the award.

12.4.2 A current curriculum vitae or professional resume.

- 12.4.3 Examples of those contributions that have been regarded as exemplary or significant to the respective award.
- 12.4.4 External letters evaluating and commenting on the candidate's meeting all expectations for the rank of Distinguished Professor. The procedures for selecting the reviewers and soliciting the letters follows the procedures for such letters set forth in Section 6.2.

13.0 Faculty Plans for Faculty Seeking Promotion outside the Tenure Review Process

13.1 Faculty not under review for reappointment or reappointment conferring tenure and who intend to seek promotion may submit a Plan (see Section 8.5) to their programs and respective deans before seeking promotion. Newly tenured faculty are encouraged to begin development of their Plans to Promotion in the year following tenure's being awarded. The approval process for a Plan to Promotion follows the same process as that of the initial faculty plan.

14.0 Files for Faculty Seeking Promotion to Senior Rank separate from the Tenure Review Process

14.1 Faculty not under review for reappointment or reappointment conferring tenure and who intend to seek promotion to senior rank (Associate or Full Professor) will prepare a complete evaluation file covering the period since their last promotion or range adjustment, if applicable. This process is similar to that followed by a faculty member seeking tenure.

15.0 Availability of previous files: Reappointment, Tenure, Promotional Reviews

15.1 All those involved in the review processes for faculty and library faculty will have access to previous evaluation files of the faculty member being reviewed, including letters written by all individuals and groups involved in the review.

16.0 Additional verification: Reappointment, Tenure, Promotional Reviews

16.1 The Provost or the President may seek additional verification beyond information submitted in the file.

17.0 Promotional Procedure for Library Faculty

17.1 The Table below outlines the process of review for library faculty seeking promotions

Stages in Review for Promotion	Responsible Party
Announcement of Promotional Opportunities as Specified in the Master Agreement, including an indication of whether the opportunity is for a growth promotion or a structural promotion	President

Application for Promotion by November 1 for Growth Promotions and by Specified Deadlines for Structural Promotion through the preparation and submission of a portfolio to the Director of the Library	Library Faculty Members meeting established criteria
Review of applications for promotion [as in the evaluation of files for reappointment or tenure] in light of established standard and criteria. Rank ordering of all acceptable applications and preparation of a letter summarizing each candidate's strengths and weaknesses. One ranking for each available structural promotion and one overall ranking for any available growth promotions. Submission of all materials to the Director of the Library (no later than February 1 for growth promotions and within 30 days of application closing date for structural promotions) with a copy of summary evaluation to affected faculty member.	Associate Director of the Library (Immediate Supervisor) writes letter prior to meeting of Library Personnel Committee
Review of Applications for Promotion and Transmittal of an Independent Evaluation to the Provost with a Copy to the Affected Faculty Member	Director of the Library
Review of Applications for Promotion and Recommendation to the President with a Copy to the Affected Faculty Member	Provost
Recommendation to the Board of Trustees on any Structural or Growth Promotion.	President

18.0 The Table below summarizes information on other types of reviews that occur

18.1 REVIEW OF NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

REVIEW TYPE	REVIEWER	IF NEG	BOARD ACTION
Half Time Faculty	Program Dean FRC	Provost President	Provost through the President
Half Time Faculty Informal Review	Dean	FRC Provost President	As above

<i>NOTE: In alternate years, half-time faculty with five or more consecutive years of service may, at the invitation of the dean, agree to participate in the "less formal" evaluation process as agreed to by the College and the SFT in June, 2000.</i>			
XIII (D), XIII (0), Visiting, and Joint Appointments	Program Dean	Provost	As above

18.2 OTHER TYPES OF REVIEWS

Mid –Year Appointments	Program Dean	Provost President	Provost through the President
Promotion to Associate Professor (separate from tenure)	Program Dean FRC Provost	President	As above
Promotion to Professor or Distinguished Professor	Program Dean FRC Provost President		As above

19.0 Range adjustment

19.1 The opportunity for a range adjustment is provided to members of the faculty. The procedures for the request and awarding of a range adjustment are provided in a separate policy.

20.0 Post-tenure review

20.1 All faculty and library faculty members who have been awarded tenure at the College will be reviewed every five years, through the Career Development Program as provided through the Master Agreement covering July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2007, or as amended in subsequent statewide agreements.

21.0 Letters of reappointment (AFT Negotiations Unit)

21.1 The content of the reappointment letter is prescribed in the Master Agreement.

21.2 The Master Agreement provides that members of the AFT negotiations unit shall be provided with a letter of reappointment that shall include: (a) the name of the College; (b) the dates for which the letter of appointment or reappointment is effective; (c) the title for the position; (d) the salary rate; and (e) a list of the field or fields in which he or she is expected to teach or work. Each employee upon initial appointment shall also be provided with a copy of the Master Agreement and the current salary schedule.

21.3 The letter of appointment for members of the AFT negotiations unit will state that the faculty member will be subject to a performance review on an annual basis pursuant to the reappointment procedures established herein.

21.4 All appointments and reappointments are subject to the appropriation of appropriate funding by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; and letters of appointment shall so state.

22.0 Effective Date of These Procedures and their Review

22.1 Except as set forth in a separate agreement regarding the Transition to New Policies and Procedures, these procedures shall become effective immediately upon approval by the SFT and the College President and shall remain in effect for five full academic years.

22.2 During the fifth year, these procedures shall be reviewed by the College and the Stockton Federation of Teachers and appropriate changes made in the manner prescribed under the Master Agreement.

22.3 A separate agreement regarding the Transition to New Policies and Procedures shall set forth the applicability of these procedures to faculty currently in their first four years of teaching at Stockton, and to tenured faculty seeking promotion.