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Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

**APSCUF** – Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties, the faculty union that negotiates the requirements and procedures for promotion.

**AWE** – Alternative Workload Equivalent, also AWA (Alternative Workload Assignment).

**CBA** – The [Collective Bargaining Agreement](http://www.passhe.edu/inside/hr/syshr/Pages/unit_info.aspx?q=apscuf) between APSCUF and PASSHE, the agreement that governs all other procedures under which we operate.

**DPC** – Department Promotion Committee, an elected committee that reviews the materials of and makes the departmental recommendations for candidates applying for promotion.

**Meet and Discuss** – The local management and APSCUF group that reviews changes in the process.

**S3P** – The [Statement of Promotion Policies and Procedures](https://www.iup.edu/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=186297&libID=186314) (2016)**,** a locally approved document which outlines IUP’s promotion process within the framework of general state guidelines.

**PASSHE** – Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education.

**President’s Designee** – According to the CBA, Article 16, B.1: “Promotions at each university shall be granted by the President only in accordance with the approved and published Statement of Promotion Policies and Procedures for each university.” According to the IUP Statement of Promotion Policies and Procedures, Part II, section D, number 1, the President may, in writing by November 1 of each academic year, “designate this authority to someone else, in which case he/she will also provide the name and title of the designee.” In practice the “President’s designee” usually refers to the Provost.

**Promotion Application** - refers to Required Materials (no page limitation), the Statement of Promotability (an up to ten-page document), and the Supporting Documentation (an up to forty-page document) submitted by the candidate by the November 1 deadline. Promotion applications that exceed the page limits for the Statement of Promotability (no longer than 10 pages) or the Supporting Documentation (no longer than 40 pages) will not be considered. While candidates may include links or reference other materials, these external documents are not part of the candidate's promotion application. Reviewing bodies, may, but are not required to, review and consider those documents.

**Recommendation** –When used in this document the term refers to the assessment of a promotion candidate’s Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities, Continuing Scholarly Growth, and University/Community Service prepared by the Department Chair and the Department Promotion Committee (DPC) and the Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor), and the Provost. When used in this manner, a “recommendation” need not be positive. The other context in which the word is used is when “Recommend” refers to the categories (Highly Recommend, Recommend, Not Ready At This Time) into which the University Wide Promotion Committee distributes and rank orders candidates at the completion of its review. These lists are then forwarded to the University President or the President’s Designee.

**Required Materials** – Refers to forms, curriculum vita, all student evaluation summary sheets (for both the course and semester), job description (if applicable), and Alternate Workload Reports (no page limitation).

**Statement of Promotability (SP)** – An up to ten-page document, prepared by the candidate, which highlights the candidate’s strengths; it is due by November 1.

**Student Evaluation Summary Sheets** – Computer printouts of the student evaluations that are available to faculty members at the end of each semester in which they are requested. These summary sheets are available to faculty in either an online or hard-copy form.

**Supporting Documentation (SD)** –An up to forty-page document, prepared by the candidate, containing evidence of various types in support of the claims made by the candidate in his or her Statement of Promotability.

**UWPC** – University-Wide Promotion Committee, an elected group of faculty members who recommend the ranking of candidates to the President.

Section I:

 Process Overview

# Introduction

These guidelines are meant to assist everybody in going through the new promotion process.

Once a decision is made to seek promotion, candidates must read the S3P (2016) and this document for guidance. This document provides assistance in making the promotion process clear and understandable. It will also assist candidates in preparing and organizing material for inclusion in the Promotion Application.

**Operating Principles**

1. Everyone has a fair and equal opportunity to be promoted. Standards and criteria acceptable to the academic community will be used in the promotion process.
2. The UWPC should be as open and as public as possible while respecting the legal and contractual rights and privacy of individuals.
3. Constructive feedback should be provided to candidates on their Promotion Application if they are not promoted.
4. For teaching faculty, effective teaching is a necessary prerequisite for promotion. Student evaluations are only one component of the materials that will be considered in assessing effectiveness in teaching. Appropriate levels of scholarly growth and service are expected from all candidates.
5. Errors in the application process or promotion documents are considered inadvertent unless evidence is found to the contrary. Such errors should not jeopardize a candidate's opportunity to be promoted.

## Timeline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Task** |
| **February 15** | Revised forms submitted to local Meet & Discuss |
| **April 15** | Promotion documents posted on website |
| **Between April 15 and May 1** | UWPC informational meeting for the candidates planning to seek promotion in the next academic year  |
| **September 1-30** | DPC formed by each department with election of the chair by 9/30 |
| **October 1** | DPCs send a roster of their membership to the UWPC Chair |
| **November 1** | * President informs UWPC and department Chairs of designee
* Candidate applications are due
* No changes to the Promotion Application may be made after November 1.
* No work completed after November 1 will be considered in the promotion process.
 |
| **November 5** | * DPC will contact UWPC chair of any changes to the DPC membership

In case a member decides to be a candidate between Oct 1 and Nov 1 or is ineligible to serve. |
| **January 25** | * Draft of DPC’s recommendation for candidate review
* Draft of Chair’s recommendation for candidate review
* Draft of Dean’s recommendation for candidate review
 |
| **February 1** | * Recommendation of DPC due to Provost and UWPC
* Recommendation of Chair due to Provost and UWPC
* Recommendation of Dean due to Provost and UWPC
 |
| **Between February 2 and March 15** | Candidates can meet with UWPC |
| **February 14** | * Draft of Provost’s recommendation for candidate review.
 |
| **February 15** | * Candidate rebuttal to the DPC recommendation due to the DPC, Provost, and UWPC.
* Candidate rebuttal to the Chair recommendation due to the Chair, Provost, and UWPC.
* Candidate rebuttal to the Dean recommendation due to the Dean, Provost, and UWPC.
 |
| **February 21** | Recommendation of Provost to UWPC (if written)  |
| **March 1** | Candidate rebuttal to the Provost recommendation (if written) due to the Provost and UWPC. |
| **April 1** | UWPC notifies candidates who are deemed “Not Ready at This Time” |
| **April 15** | “Not Ready at This Time” candidate rebuttal due to President |
| **April 15** | UWPC recommendation due to the President or designee |
| **July 15** | President notifies candidates of the promotion decision |
| **July 31** | Term ends for UWPC members |

**Note: “If a due date falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or any day when the university's administrative offices are closed, documentation will be due the next regular business day (S3P, 2016, preamble).”**

## Eligibility

Two documents govern the promotion process. Familiarity with both is advisable. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) Article 12, “Performance Review and Evaluation of Faculty”, and Article 16, “Promotions,” establish the basic principles which are the basis for the IUP Statement of Promotion Policies and Procedures (S3P, 2016).

## Length of Service

Generally, candidates will not apply for promotion before their fifth year of service at IUP. Exceptions to this rule are sometimes granted by the Provost (S3P, 2016, Part I. C.).If a candidate believes that he or she may be eligible for early promotion, then he or she must apply to the Provost in writing prior to October 1 using the “Request for Approval for Early Application for Promotion Form” (attached at the end of this document).

## Degree and Teaching Experience

**Assistant Professor:**

1. Master's Degree plus 10 semester hours of graduate credits.
2. At least four years of teaching. Candidates may include the year in which they apply. Part-time teaching should be listed as credit hours. Graduate teaching assistantships are counted on a two–for–one basis for up to two years. Do not count graduate research assistantships.

**Associate Professor:**

1. Earned Doctorate\*, or Master's plus 40 hours of additional graduate credit, or total of 70 hours of graduate credit including a Master's degree, or all course work toward Doctorate completed and certified (ABD).
2. At least five years of teaching.

**Professor:**

1. Earned Doctorate\*. Exceptions to the earned Doctorate requirement have been made under the 3% clause of Act 182. Please consult APSCUF or the Provost for possible exceptions.
2. At least seven years of teaching.

\*Certain “terminal degrees” may substitute for an earned Doctorate; these include a J.D. and an M.F.A. Candidates should consult the UWPC or the Provost for further information.

## Responsibilities of the Candidate

1. The candidate will read carefully the IUP Statement of Promotion Policies and Procedures (S3P, 2016) and all promotion forms and documents, including those providing guidance to the Department Promotion Committee (DPC), the Department Chair, the College Dean, and the Provost.
2. The candidate will determine his or her eligibility for promotion.
3. The candidate will correctly complete all forms and documents. "For faculty whose primary responsibilities are outside the classroom or who teach primarily non-credit bearing courses, the university is required to provide a written job description (CBA Article 16.A.3). The candidate will include this job description (Form #3) in his or her promotion application (see Part II, H.2.). Responsibilities delineated in the official job description become the basis of evaluation for those faculty members in the place of Teaching Effectiveness (S3P, Part I.D.)."
4. All documents are due to the UWPC Chair through MyIUP on or before 4:30 PM, **November 1**. Instructions for uploading files are provided online at https://www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/get-support/its-services/iforms-services/promotions/. Candidates will upload one PDF document consisting of three parts: Required Materials; Statement of Promotability; and, Supporting Documentation.
5. The candidate must verify that his or her personnel file is complete and up to date with respect to academic credentials. When examining a candidate’s personnel file the UWPC expects to find: Letter of Appointment, the official IUP document indicating that the candidate is employed at the University; Promotion Letter from a previous promotion (if this is second or third promotion), the formal notification from the President to the candidate that he or she has been promoted; and, Official degree-conferred transcripts, to verify that the degree(s) conferred by the official transcript(s) agrees with the candidate’s claimed degree(s). The Letter of Appointment and/or a Promotion Letter are used to determine whether the candidate is eligible for promotion based on either number of years at IUP or the number of years in the current rank. A candidate can access his or her personnel file in the Office of Human Resources.

## Rights of the Candidate

1. Candidates have the right to review the recommendations of the DPC, Department Chair, and Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor) **before February 1**.
2. Candidates have the right to review the recommendation of the Provost before its submission on **February 21**.
3. If a candidate disagrees with or is concerned about the recommendation of the DPC, Department Chair, Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor), or Provost he or she has a right to appear before them in a timely fashion.
4. The candidate may choose to respond in writing to any of the recommendations written by the DPC, department Chair, or Dean on or before **February 15.** These rebuttal statements are uploaded through MyIUP so that they are available to the UWPC, UWPC Chair, and to the President or the President’s designee (typically the Provost).
5. The candidate may choose to respond in writing to the Provost’s recommendation (unless the President has named the Provost his or her designee, in which case there will be no recommendation from the Provost) on or before **March 1**. Responses are uploaded through MyIUP so that they are available to the UWPC and the President (or Provost).
6. Candidates have an unambiguous right to appear before the UWPC before it submits its recommendation to the President. This right may be used to comment on the recommendations by the DPC, department Chair, Dean, or Provost (when applicable). Such meetings will occur between **February 2 and March 15**.

## Responsibilities of the Department Promotion Committee (DPC)

1. The department chairperson shall convene an organizational meeting of the DPC annually, conduct the election of a chairperson, and notify the chairperson of the UWPC of the results of this election and the membership of the DPC by **October 1.** If a member of the DPC decides to become a promotion candidate or otherwise become ineligible to serve after the October 1 deadline, the DPC has until November 5 to notify the UWPC Chair of the change in membership.
2. The DPC will comply with the DPC membership restrictions in the S3P, Part II, A. (2016).
3. The DPC will inform all candidates that Promotion Application materials can be accessed on the Academic Affairs website ([http://www.iup.edu/academicaffairs/resources).](http://www.iup.edu/academicaffairs/resources%29)
4. The DPC will verify, review, and evaluate all the evidence available and make an independent recommendation to the UWPC based on specific reference to the evidence. Members of the DPC should bear in mind that it is not the role of the DPC to act as an advocate for the candidate but rather, to make an evaluative judgement as to the promotability of the candidate. The DPC letter should go beyond simply using SEI data or in making general statements. The letter should not assume that the UWPC understands how a particular department or college views effective teaching, service and scholarship items. The UWPC is often greatly assisted by letters that explain a candidate’s role, impact, and importance in helping to determine an item’s value. The required material and Supporting Documentation submitted by the candidate on or before **November 1** is accessible to all members of the DPC electronically through MyIUP.
5. The DPC will write a recommendation of not more than three pages for each candidate (single- sided, 12-point standard font, one-inch margins, six (6) lines to the vertical inch).
6. The DPC will provide the candidate with a draft copy of its recommendation on or before **January 25**, and with an opportunity to meet with the committee and sign the Recommendation Transmittal Form prior to the recommendation submission date (on or before **February 1**). The DPC will further advise the candidate of his or her right to prepare and submit a response to the DPC recommendation (on or before **February 15**), and to appear before the UWPC (between **February 2 and March 15**).
7. The DPC will submit to the UWPC through MyIUP, on or before **February 1** a not more than three-page recommendation for each candidate, and one (1) copy of the DPC Transmittal Form which will indicate, for each candidate, whether the candidate is "Recommended," or deemed "Not Ready for Promotion At This Time” by the DPC. For Administrative Faculty, the DPC will also submit one (1) copy of its Criteria for Evaluation. Instructions for uploading files are provided https://www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/get-support/its-services/iforms-services/promotions/

## Responsibilities of the Department Chair

1. The Department Chair will comply with the guidelines in Part II.B. of the S3P (2016).
2. The Department Chair will independently evaluate all the evidence available and make an independent recommendation to the UWPC based on specific reference to the evidence. Department Chairs should bear in mind that it is not the role of the Department Chair to act as an advocate for the candidate but rather, to make an evaluative judgement as to the promotability of the candidate.
3. The Department Chair will write a recommendation of not more than two pages for each candidate (single-sided, 12-point standard font, one-inch margins, six (6) lines to the vertical inch). The Chair should emphasize fulfillment of professional responsibility, but may also wish to discuss teaching, scholarship, and service. As with the DPC letter above, the letter should not assume that the UWPC understands how a particular department views effective teaching, service and scholarship items. The UWPC is often greatly assisted by letters that explain a candidate’s role, impact, and importance in helping to determine an item’s discipline-specific value. The letter should go beyond simply using SEI data or in making general statements.
4. The Department Chair will provide the candidate with a draft copy of the Chair’s recommendation on or before **January 25** and an opportunity to meet with the Department Chair and sign the Recommendation Transmittal Form prior to the recommendation submission date (on or before **February 1**). The Department Chair will further advise the candidate of his or her right to prepare and submit a response to the Chair’s recommendation (on or before **February 15**), and to appear before the UWPC (between **February 2 and March 15**).
5. The Department Chair will submit to the UWPC a recommendation of not more than two-pages through MyIUP for each candidate on or before **February 1**. Instructions for uploading files will be provided online at https://www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/get-support/its-services/iforms-services/promotions/

## Responsibilities of the Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor)

1. The Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor) will conduct an independent review and consideration of the candidate's Promotion Application. Academic Deans (or Appropriate Management Supervisors) should bear in mind that it is not the role of the Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor) to act as an advocate for the candidate but rather, to make an evaluative judgement as to the promotability of the candidate. As with the DPC letter above, the letter should not assume that the UWPC understands how a particular college views effective teaching, service and scholarship items. The UWPC is often greatly assisted by letters that explain a candidate’s role, impact, and importance in helping to determine an item’s discipline-specific value. The letter should go beyond simply using SEI data or in making general statements.
2. The Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor) will write a recommendation of not more than two pages for each candidate (single-sided, 12-point standard font, one-inch margins, six (6) lines to the vertical inch).
3. The Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor) will provide the candidate with a draft copy of the Academic Dean's (or Appropriate Management Supervisor's) recommendation on or before **January 25** and an opportunity to meet with the Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor) and sign the Recommendation Transmittal Form prior to the recommendation submission date (on or before February 1).
4. The Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor) will submit a recommendation of not more than two-pages for each candidate to the UWPC chair through MyIUP on or before **February 1**. Instructions for uploading files are provided online at https://www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/get-support/its-services/iforms-services/promotions/

## Responsibilities of the Provost\*

1. The Provost will conduct an examination of the candidate's Promotion Application, DPC, Chair, and Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor) recommendations, and any rebuttals submitted by the candidate. The Provost should bear in mind that it is not his or her role to act as an advocate for the candidate but rather, to make an evaluative judgement as to the promotability of the candidate.
2. The Provost will provide the candidate with a draft copy of the Provost’s recommendation on or before **February 14** and an opportunity to meet with the Provost and sign the Recommendation Transmittal Form prior to the recommendation submission date (on or before **February 21**).
3. The Provost will submit a one-page recommendation for each candidate to the UWPC chair through MyIUP on or before **February 21**. Instructions for uploading files are provided https://www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/get-support/its-services/iforms-services/promotions/

\*This applies only when the Provost is not acting as the President’s designee in rendering promotion decisions.

## Responsibilities of the UWPC

1. The UWPC will oversee the publication and distribution of the S3P (2016) and all necessary application forms and instructions.
2. The UWPC will verify the minimum qualifications of the candidate (S3P, 2016, Part I.A. and Part I.C.).
3. The UWPC will review in detail all Required Materials, Statement of Promotability, and Supporting Documentation submitted by the candidate, the candidate’s department Chair, DPC, Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor), the Provost, and any candidate submitted rebuttal letters to determine the degree to which the candidate has met the criteria appropriate for rank.
4. The UWPC chair will inform the candidate that he or she has a right to appear before the UWPC between **February 2 and March 15**.
5. The UWPC will submit to the President three lists of candidates for each rank sought: "Highly Recommend," “Recommend," and "Not Ready at This Time." Within the "Recommend" and "Highly Recommend" lists the UWPC will rank candidates in the order that the committee believes best reflects the merit of the documents submitted in support of the request for promotion.
6. The UWPC will use three categories for ranking candidates. Although these categories are listed in the S3P (2016), there is little explanation of what they mean. In order to help candidates understand these evaluative statements the UWPC offers the following definitions.
	1. **HIGHLY RECOMMEND** – Based on the materials presented to the UWPC, the candidates placed in this group have been deemed by the committee to have met and exceeded the requirements for promotion to the rank sought.
	2. **RECOMMEND** – Based on the materials presented to the UWPC, the candidates placed in this category have been deemed by the committee to have met, at least, the minimum requirements for promotion to the rank sought. These candidates are recommended for promotion. It is often difficult to generalize the point of separation between any given candidate on the “Highly Recommend” list from any given candidate on the “Recommend” list. For that reason the UWPC may, if a candidate seeks it, provide individual feedback what the committee perceived to be the strengths and weaknesses in the materials reviewed.
	3. **NOT READY AT THIS TIME** – Based on an especially careful review of materials (see the information provided in the section titled "How does the UWPC make its decision?") the UWPC did not find evidence of consistent Teaching Effectiveness and/or did not find evidence of Continuing Scholarly Growth and Service of sufficient quality to merit promotion. After careful review, the UWPC has then deemed the candidate "Not Ready at this Time" for promotion to the rank sought. Please note that by making this determination the UWPC does not question the candidate's commitment to his or her discipline, department, college, or to IUP generally. Neither does the determination reflect a belief that the candidate lacks the potential to ultimately be promoted. The decision does reflect the UWPC's judgment that the candidate does not warrant promotion, based on the sum of all the evidence presented, in the current promotion round.

7. The UWPC will provide written feedback, if requested, to any candidate who is Highly Recommended or Recommended but not promoted. These candidates may request an opportunity for in-person feedback from the UWPC.

## How does the UWPC make its decisions?

The same process is used for all ranks. After carefully reviewing all materials submitted for each candidate and determining an independent ranking, UWPC members meet and vote in three steps. First, a "Not Ready At This Time" group is discussed and a vote is taken. In general, arguments are made to keep people out of this group. Each UWPC member votes his or her own conscience in a secret ballot. Second, a vote is taken for all remaining candidates to determine the "Highly Recommend" list. Candidates who are "Highly Recommended" are then numerically ranked. Finally, the remaining "Recommended" candidates are numerically ranked.

**Although the UWPC discusses candidates, it does so based only on the information presented to it.** **At no point is personal knowledge or hearsay, positive or negative, permitted to enter the process.**

In evaluating the evidence each candidate presents, the committee searches for quality, thoughtfulness, and signs of commitment. A well-ordered and logically coherent Promotion Application is extremely important. Good organization permits UWPC members to more clearly concentrate on the strengths that candidates intend for the committee to see.

A more detailed explanation of the workings of the UWPC decision process follows.

**1. Setting**

* 1. The UWPC Chair shall schedule, organize, and run the meetings and shall be responsible for communicating the results of the meetings.

**2. “Not Ready At This Time”**

* 1. Thorough consideration of submitted materials.
	2. Vote individually on candidates.
	3. Record vote and save ballots.
	4. Candidates with 5 or more votes out of 7\* for “Not Ready At This Time” are given no further consideration.

\*Note: In the event there are fewer than 7 subcommittee members, two-thirds of the members must vote to designate a candidate “Not Ready At This Time.”

**3. “Highly Recommend”**

* 1. Thorough consideration of submitted materials.
	2. Vote individually on candidates.
	3. Record vote and save ballots.
	4. Candidates with 4 or more votes out of 7\* are placed on the “Highly Recommend” list.
	5. Candidates with 3 votes out of 7\* are given further reconsideration (further analysis of submitted materials).
	6. Vote individually on candidates (noted in b. above).
	7. Record vote and save ballots.
1. Candidates with 4 or more votes out of 7\* are placed on the “Highly Recommend” list.
2. Additional consideration of submitted materials of “Highly Recommend” candidates.
3. Rank individually candidates (noted in h. above).
4. Record rankings and save ballots.
5. For each candidate in this category, remove the highest rank. If there are ties, then remove only one of them. Remove the lowest rank. If there are ties, then remove only one of them. Then average the remaining ranks.
6. The final ranks will be determined by the average rank from l. above.
7. For each candidate in this category, record and save average rank and final rank.

\* Note: In the event there are fewer than 7 subcommittee members, two-thirds of the members must vote to “Highly Recommend”.

**4. “Recommend”**

* 1. Further consideration of submitted materials for remaining candidates (those that are neither “Not Ready At This Time” nor “Highly Recommended”)
	2. Rank individually candidates (noted in a. above).
	3. Record rankings and save ballots.
	4. For each candidate in this category, remove the highest rank. If there are ties, then remove only one of them. Remove the lowest rank. If there are ties, then remove only one of them. Then average the remaining ranks.
	5. The final ranks will be determined by the average rank from d. above.
	6. For each candidate in this category, record and save average rank and final rank.

The S3P (2016) gives the UWPC clear guidance and clear expectations of performance by rank. All candidates will consult the S3P (2016, Part I) to find these expectations.

## Deliberation

The information contained in this document will assist each candidate in “making his or her best case” for promotion. Candidate materials will be judged and ranked by seven peers. The UWPC will discuss factual statements in the evidence about candidates and review them based on the individual value sets of committee members. The UWPC will assure that a fair weighing of the evidence is made. All voting takes place by secret ballot.

## Notification and Feedback

Faculty determined to be “Not Ready At This Time” for promotion will receive a letter of notification, by means of MyIUP, which includes a detailed rationale for the decision from the UWPC by **April 1.**

Notification of candidate category and rank within category will be available on or before April 15. A “Recommended” candidate who is not ultimately promoted may receive, upon request, written feedback from the UWPC after **July 15** and/or may, upon request, receive an opportunity for in-person feedback from representatives of the UWPC after **July 15.**

Section II:

Making The Case For Promotion

# General Comments

The UWPC believes that most candidates merit promotion and wants to help candidates prepare materials in a way that most effectively achieves that desired outcome.

All parts of the Promotion Application - the Required Material, the Statement of Promotability, the Supporting Documentation - are to be submitted electronically. Instructions for uploading files are provided online at https://www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/get-support/its-services/iforms-services/promotions/. Candidates will upload a single PDF document consisting of three parts: Required Materials; Statement of Promotability; and, Supporting Documentation.

All candidate produced documents, to include the Required Materials, Statement of Promotability and Supporting Documentation, are to be in at least 12-point font, have one (1) inch margins, and have no more than six (6) lines per vertical inch. In addition, candidates will use only one (1) side of each page. Candidates will further hold themselves to the following page limitations: Required Materials have no page limitations; the Statement of Promotability is limited to no more than ten (10) single-sided pages; the Supporting Documentation is limited to no more than forty (40) single-sided pages. If a candidate's Statement of Promotability or Supporting Documentation exceeds the ten (10) or forty (40) page maximums, the application will not be considered. If a candidate's Statement of Promotability or Supporting Documentation does not fill ten (10) or forty (40) pages, the unused pages on one document cannot be applied to the other.

**Each candidate should make his or her best case for promotion in both the Statement of Promotability and Supporting Documentation without reliance on any externally linked materials. If candidates choose to include links they should be used sparingly and only to substantiate claims. Reviewers may but are not required to review and consider externally linked materials.**

## The Promotion Application

The Promotion Application consists of three parts: Required Materials, Statement of Promotability, and Supporting Documentation.

**I. The Required Materials**

The Required Materials are forms that confirm eligibility for promotion along with a current CV, teaching report, AWE report, and Job descriptions for faculty with formal job descriptions.

**II. Statement of Promotability**

The intent of the Statement of Promotability is to allow candidates to highlight their Teaching Effectiveness and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities, Continuing Scholarly Growth, and Service. The candidate’s goal should be to help the UWPC understand the importance, significance, and coherence of his or her work. It is the most important part of the promotion application and it is where candidates will describe, rationalize, defend, justify and support the case for promotion. It is the foundation that will substantiate the evidence presented in the Supporting Documentation. Statements should be precise and factual. Candidates should carefully read the Evaluative Components of the Promotion Application below.

**III. Supporting Documentation**

The intent of Supporting Documentation is not to be forty pages of narrative, instead it should include evidence that best illustrates Effective Teaching, Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities, Continuing Scholarly Growth, and Service. Candidates may include many different kinds of evidence in the Supporting Documentation, such as examples or excerpts from teaching materials, documents, letters, emails, committee reports, conference programs, table of contents from journals, letters of support etc. Such evidence should be accompanied by brief explanations tying the evidence back to the Statement of Promotability. In presenting this evidence, candidates should follow the same order as that used in the Statement of Promotability. Finally, candidates should carefully read the Evaluative Components of the Promotion Application below.

## The Evaluative Components of the Promotion Application

The evaluative components on which the promotion process rests are described in Article 12 of the CBA, "Performance Review and Evaluation of Faculty." In section B, those components are identified as: Teaching Effectiveness and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities; Continuing Scholarly Growth; and, Service (see also CBA 16.A.2.). What follows is a review of the kinds of information a candidate may wish to cite/include in each category when preparing promotion applications.

**1. Teaching Effectiveness and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities**

1. **Teaching Philosophy - Although there is no requirement to do so, candidates may find the inclusion of a brief statement of teaching philosophy a useful organizing strategy. Candidates can show how the teaching philosophy is reflected in the materials presented in their Promotion Application.**
2. **Effective teaching includes, but is not limited to:**
* Delivery: the skills and characteristics that both clearly communicate information, concepts, and techniques; and promote or facilitate learning through the creation of an appropriate learning environment. Candidates are expected to submit student evaluation summary sheets (only) for the three most recent semesters in which evaluations were administered and within five years of the date of the promotion application and/or since the candidate's last successful promotion application.
* Design: the skills and competencies required to both design effective instructional experiences along with the strategies to properly sequence and present those experiences to promote learning; and the design/development of assessment strategies to measure and confirm learning.
* Expertise: the quality of the skills, competencies and knowledge in the specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced training or education.
* Management: the quality and execution of logistics and record-keeping related to the teaching of students and the timely distribution of feedback to students.

Applications may address elements of the following (some of which refers to teaching faculty only):

1. A careful and honest consideration of Student Evaluation data (from the required three semester SEI summary sheets). No single number or composite of numbers is used by the UWPC. In fact, summary “numbers” tend to vary widely among candidates who demonstrate the required Teaching Effectiveness.
2. Student Comments — reference to these can be helpful in adding context to the picture of classroom teaching that is not necessarily provided by numbers alone. Given page limitations on Supporting Documentation, it is not possible to include student comment sheets. A Candidate may wish to extract comments or include a summary of comments if he or she feels that such an inclusion provides necessary support to the Statement of Promotability.
3. Syllabi, tests, exercises, and student products — reference to these can also provide a fuller picture of the quality of the candidate’s instruction. Supporting Documentation may include a particularly thoughtful and up–to–date syllabus, challenging and relevant class assignments/exercises, and evidence of innovative teaching techniques. Involvement in teaching projects or collaborations might also be referenced. Candidates may wish to focus on the particular courses, student work, projects, and/or innovative classroom approaches of which they are most proud.
4. Teaching Portfolio – candidate may find that a teaching portfolio is a good way to organize Supporting Documentation for teaching. It could include items such as those listed above within a textual framework that explains their importance.
5. Peer and Chair evaluations — reference to these can also be used to provide context and support for the candidate’s teaching approach and classroom rapport.
6. Participation in teaching colloquia, discussion groups, training sessions, etc.
7. Awards — when appropriate, information about when and why a candidate’s teaching was recognized can be helpful.
8. **Professional Responsibilities include, but are not limited to:**
* Preparing for and meeting assigned classes or fulfilling a primary assignment
* Conferring with and advising students
* Holding office hours at least five hours per week on no fewer than three different days of the week.
* Evaluating students fairly and reporting promptly on their achievements.
* Participating in group deliberations which contribute to the growth and development of students and the University.
* Accepting those reasonable duties assigned within their fields of competence.

When faculty hold positions for which they receive an Alternate Workload Equivalency (AWE), the duties of that position that are administrative in nature and that contribute to the operation of the university should be considered under the category of primary assignment. Other activities shall be considered under scholarship or service as appropriate.

Primary assignments include elected department positions and temporary assignments in administrative offices that carry release time, and administrative positions that constitute a faculty member’s primary assignment as defined in the appropriate job description. Professional responsibilities are those secondary tasks/duties that are part of the primary assignment and support and enhance department, division, or university operation and goals.

Applications may address elements of the following:

1. Evidence of effective student advisement or other professional responsibilities: materials developed to help students, solicited and unsolicited student feedback, and work products related to professional responsibilities can be used to reinforce a candidate’s performance of professional responsibilities.
2. AWE: as part of the required application material, faculty receiving alternative workload assignments or who have non-teaching assignments, should provide clear documentation of those activities. This makes it easier for the committee to evaluate both the quality and the time commitment demanded by the AWE or non-teaching assignment.
3. Doctoral release time: a letter from the graduate coordinator of the department listing the candidate's thesis committees, comprehensive exam committees, program responsibilities, and course development are possible ways of documenting the use of this time. To the extent the time has been used to improve and update graduate courses syllabi and reading lists could be referenced.
4. Chair: The candidate's DPC should speak directly to the routine fulfillment of chair’s responsibilities. To the extent a candidate has gone beyond the minimum contractual obligations of a chair, that fact should be documented here.
5. Other contractual and exceptional AWE: If a candidate has been given an AWE to accomplish a particular task; e.g., a Five-year Plan, reference to that work could be included here.
6. **Continuing Scholarly Growth**

According to the CBA Continuing Scholarly Growth:

*“will be indicated … by such items as: development of experimental programs (including distance education); papers delivered at national and regional meetings of professional societies; regional and national awards; offices held in professional organizations; invitational lectures given; participation in panels at regional and national meetings of professional organizations; grant acquisitions; editorships of professional journals; participation in juried shows; program related projects; quality of musical or theatrical performances; participation in one person or invitational shows; consultantships; research projects and publication record; additional graduate work; contribution to the scholarly growth of one's peers; and any other data agreed to by the Faculty and Administration at local meet and discuss.”*(CBA, Article 12.B.2, p. 28)

The clear CBA statement to all evaluators is recognized by the UWPC as well. The CBA tells evaluators to "give greater weight to the quality of the performance reflected in the data, than to the quantity of the data" (CBA, Article 12.B, p. 27).

All scholarly activity such as those listed in the CBA (Article 12. B. 2.) is valued at all ranks. All these forms are considered by the UWPC within the context of the discipline. In general, the areas of focus include:

* Intended audience;
* Level of review process;
* Impact of (as distinct from the "Impact Factor" used in the evaluation of an academic journal); and,
* Scope of influence (audience reach).

Candidates may find Ernest Boyer's four-fold definition of scholarship from *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate* (1991) useful in making determinations about whether aspects of their work can be appropriately termed scholarly growth. The definition arises out of an attempt to broaden the definition of scholarship to what most faculty actually do, rather than hold them solely to a "Research University" standard of "the scholarship of discovery" rarely found at any level of academia. Boyer defines scholarship in four ways:

1. **The Scholarship of Discovery:** the disciplined research "at the very heart of what it means to be a scholar." It is the first element in the advancement of knowledge. "What Max Weber spoke of as the ecstasy that could occur on the cutting edge of specialization – original research" (Rice, E. 1990. “Rethinking what it means to be a scholar.” Teaching at UNL 12, 1:2 – 6.).

2. **The Scholarship of Integration:** scholarship that moves knowledge "beyond the isolated facts, makes connections across disciplines, seeks patterns, synthesis, relationships, and helps shape a more coherent view of knowledge." It is a scholarship that seeks knowledge close to the "deeper yearnings of the human spirit" (Boyer, E. 1990. Closing Address, National Conference on the Scholarship of Teaching, Iona, NY, October 20.).

3. **The Scholarship of Application:** scholarship that relates theory to the "realities of life." This is knowledge applied to and born out of action; applied research.

4. **The Scholarship of Pedagogy:** "scholarship means not only the ability to discover, integrate, and apply knowledge; it also under girds great teaching... A teacher to be most effective, must be, as Pat Cross suggests, a classroom teacher – someone who is involved in the evaluation of her own teaching and learning, even as it is taking place." The scholarship of teaching is the discovery of the means by which we engage in "the sacred act of conveying knowledge: of creating a new generation of scholars" (Boyer, E. 1990).

By defining scholarship broadly in this way, the UWPC credits classroom research, critical essays, consulting, contracting, and disciplinary work for popular audiences as legitimate scholarship. Most of these forms are present in the CBA description of Continuing Scholarly Growth. The framework provided here is meant to help candidates argue for the relevance and importance of different forms of scholarly activity.

The kinds of Supporting Documentation candidates may find most useful in the area of Continuing Scholarly Growth might include some, but not necessarily all, of the following:

1. Evidence of regional and national conference presentations.
2. Evidence of publication that has undergone some form of review process.
3. Evidence of grant activity that clearly shows the contribution of the grant to Continuing Scholarly Growth.
4. A consideration of the candidate's contributions to the scholarly growth of others through leadership positions, newsletter editorships, colloquia, sponsored workshops, etc.
5. Focus on a single important work, (e.g., a book, monograph, a longer article) that clearly demonstrates the major thrust of the candidate's research agenda.
6. A focus on forms of scholarship in the arts; e.g., musical compositions, juried art show participation, invited performances, commissioned works.
7. Awards for scholarship may be referenced. Such references can be helpful in determining the value of a candidate's work to the larger scholarly community.
8. Evidence reflecting the fact that scholarly contributions resulted from a specific invitation, and any other form or status or merit that can be claimed for a scholarly work.
9. Letters from conference organizers or editors.
10. Letters from co-presenters or co-authors.
11. An index of citations of the candidate's work.
12. Letters from other scholars, and comments on scholarly work in print can be useful measures of quality.
13. For artwork candidates may wish to include pictures.
14. For scholarly efforts such as design or lighting, programs and a description of the work may be valuable.

In every case, the UWPC expects a candidate’s scholarly work to be connected to his or her discipline. Candidates should remember that they are not only documenting what they did, but also the quality of what was done.

**Juried Work**

One potentially important indicator of quality is the review and acceptance of scholarly work using a selective process. Narrowly defined, this means published work in a journal which selects articles in a blind peer review process. In the spirit of a broader way of looking at scholarship that better fits the mission of IUP and Boyer's four-fold definition, the UWPC rejects a narrow definition of "juried" or "validated" work. Validation by one's peers in a selective or competitive process may take many forms. The definition below is an effort to give candidates a sense of how the UWPC interprets this kind of evidence.

Juried work: scholarly work of some form which has been reviewed by peers in a selective process and found to have sufficient merit for inclusion or reward. Examples might include:

* a successful grant;
* a peer reviewed publication;
* a conference presentation when papers are reviewed and rejected;
* an award for artistic work;
* inclusion in a juried show;
* a performance selected for presentation in a competitive process; and/or
* technical work subject to external scrutiny by experts in a forum where acceptance and rejection are possible outcomes.

All of these examples share a common feature: a candidate has risked appraisal by colleagues in a competitive process and been found to have merit.

Even though the make-up of the committee is diverse across departments and colleges, the UWPC does not possess expertise in every field. The committee relies on external review and endorsement of scholarship (including that provided by DPCs, Chairs, and Deans) as means of adducing quality. For work that is not juried, candidates (and their reviewers) need to help the UWPC by making clear and convincing cases for the inclusion and quality of any cited scholarly activity.

In making their case for including any particular scholarly activity, candidates may wish to provide some or all of the following clarifying details:

1. Title**:**  title of article, presentation, play, work of art, grant, contract, book, etc.
2. Forum: in what forum was this work presented or reviewed: conference, journal, show, etc.
3. Dates: since all work submitted for promotion must be completed prior to November 1, this is an important inclusion. Further, if the work is forthcoming, it is important to emphasize that and include the date of final acceptance. To provide a fuller picture of a scholarly agenda, a candidate may refer to work not yet completed, but should keep in mind that the current promotion will only take into account work accepted by November 1.
4. Type**:** this section has attempted to identify a wide range of different types of scholarly activity. If the candidate feels that another, unspecified type exists, it can be added with a brief explanation of its significance to the claimed activity.
5. Audience**:**  is a particular claimed activity aimed at a local, regional, national, or international audience? Is the audience most appropriately described as academic, practitioner, student, lay or other? To whom was the work presented? Since the categories are not mutually exclusive, candidates may wish to adopt a more inclusive description of audience.
6. Review Process: in addition to more conventional review processes (editor, peer, panel) there are a variety of non-traditional ones that may serve as indicators of quality. Artistic work that has been publicly praised by a critic or reviewer may constitute one such indicator. Involvement in a grant or contract whose product had to undergo a critical acceptance process may be another.
7. Selectivity**:** if a candidate’s work went through a selection process, candidates should say something about selection rates, e.g., what percentage of materials submitted are generally accepted in the process. Similarly, invited work or presentation may also be indicator of selectivity.
8. Some Additional Clarifications**:**
9. Co-authored work may be described by the nature and extent of the candidate’s relative contribution to it.
10. For work started prior to a candidate's appointment at IUP, but completed while serving at IUP, a candidate should explain how much of this work was accomplished at IUP.
11. Candidates may wish to describe a publication/paper theme for work that is presented/published in similar form (except for minor changes) but in different venues or given to a different audience. If such redundancy has particular merit (invited paper, summary of earlier works in a more prestigious journal, unusual audience), candidates may wish to make that clear.
12. There are a variety of different ways to describe grant activity. Some are primarily enabling for others rather than geared to a candidate's personal research agenda. A candidate may write a PASSHE grant to help a graduate student undertake a research project. A grant may be written to secure equipment. A grant may be written to develop or extend a pedagogical approach. All types are meritorious scholarly activity but depart from the "usual" understanding of grant activity. Candidates may wish to consider these issues.
13. Candidates may also wish to consider the tie between research and the enhancement of their teaching.
14. **Service: Contributions to the University and/or community**

The CBA defines service as:

*“…quality of participation in program, department, college, and university and/or state system committees; APSCUF activity contributing to the governance of the university and/or state system; development of new course(s) or program(s); training or assisting other faculty members in the use of distance education technology; participation in university-wide colloquia; voluntary membership in professionally oriented, community-based organizations reasonably related to the faculty member’s discipline; lectures and consultations; consulting with local and area agencies and organizations; participation in accreditation work in support of department or university service; offices held in professional organizations (if appropriate to this category); and any other data agreed to by the Faculty and Administration at local meet and discuss.”* (CBA, Article 12.B.3, p. 28)

Candidates are reminded that only service relevant to the discipline is referenced here. Girl Scouts, Little League, church activities, civic and fraternal organizations are certainly important, but they are only relevant in this context if the activity ties reasonably, clearly, and directly to a candidate's discipline.

Service is further distinguished as the intentional (paid and unpaid) activities that contribute to the university, the community, or the profession.

All service activities such as those listed in the CBA (Article 12.B.3.) are valued at all ranks. The UWPC considers all these forms within the context of the candidate’s discipline. In general, the areas of focus include:

* Expanded impact;
* Quality of Leadership/Specific Contribution;
* Sphere/scope of influence (audience reach); and
* Sustained activity.

Supporting Documentation may include some, but not necessarily all, of the following:

1. Evidence of continuous departmental service.
2. Evidence of service at the college and university level.
3. Evidence of service to the campus and local community.
4. Evidence of service to the profession or discipline.
5. Evidence of development of new courses or programs of study or revision of courses or programs of study.
6. Letters of support for the most significant service items.
7. A discussion of specific leadership contributions to a particular service activity.
8. Examples of products that result from a service activity.

Work done under alternative workloads is contractual and correctly identified as professional responsibility. Candidates have been asked to document that separately. To the extent that candidates have gone beyond the contractual obligations of an AWE, say as a chair who is active in the Council of Chairs, or restructures a curriculum, they may wish to make the argument that the work goes beyond the minimum requirements attached to the AWE. Candidates may wish to have the DPC, Chair, Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor), or Provost verify this extended commitment.

When discussing service activities, a candidate may wish to emphasize his or her unique or special contribution or involvement, the time and commitment involved, and/or the quality of the work.

Section III:

Candidate Forms

**INSTRUCTIONS**

**Due Date**: **November 1 by 4:30 PM (EST)**

**Where:** MyIUP

**What:**  Application

PART I: Required Material

**The Promotion Application: What to submit**

As part of the Required Materials (Part I), all candidates will submit the following forms. There is no overall page limit to the Required Materials, but candidates should be careful not to include any materials not explicitly requested. If a form does not apply to a candidate, that form need not be included among the forms submitted.

## I. Form 1 (three pages) – Eligibility for promotion

1. Self-evident.
2. Self-evident.
3. Eligibility requirements for each rank can be found in Part I of the S3P (2016) or in the Getting Started section of promotion guidelines.
4. Date of appointment in a tenure track position at IUP and date of promotion to current rank if applicable. Candidates generally apply for promotion in their fifth or tenure year. Non-tenured faculty members may apply early for promotion before their fifth or tenure year, but only upon approval by the Provost. If a candidate has applied for and been granted a waiver by the Provost, he or she should type "waiver granted" above the date and attach a copy of the waiver to the form.
5. Only completed degrees may be included. Any equivalence in lieu of graduate education requires a written application to and approval by the Provost.
6. Candidates must not include any summer teaching or any part-time teaching that were in addition to a normal full-time load. Otherwise, part-time teaching should be indicated as the fraction of full-time load it represents. Any equivalencies for experience granted by management must be verified.
7. Self-evident.
8. Self-evident.

## II. Form 2 (three pages) – Teaching Faculty Report

A candidate should list his or her workload for the same three semesters as the student evaluations being submitted, and any clarification needed. In addition, candidates must attach an original of **each course summary AND semester summary report** of the student evaluation sheets for the three most recent semesters in which they were administered. For any discrepancies in the student evaluation printout sheets; e.g. larger number in sample than enrolled, provide an explanation on the workload forms. If for some reason student evaluations were not administered in the three most recent semesters, submit class summaries for the last three semesters in which student evaluations were administered together with an explanation on the workload forms. In general, summer sessions are not to be included. Exceptions could include doctoral courses and courses which are part of a special summer program and part of regular load.

## III. Form 3 (one page) – Faculty with a Job Description

A candidate must submit his or her official job description(s) and provide a statement explaining any changes that were made, their effective dates, or other issues in order to render a clear picture of job requirements and expectations.

## IV. Form 4 (one page) – Alternative Workload Report

Submit copies of alternate workload reports for the same three semesters as the student evaluations being submitted. For any assignments in lieu of classroom teaching, indicate the nature of the assignment on this form.

## V. Form 5 (number of pages may vary) – Curriculum Vitae

The candidate should submit a copy of his or her current curriculum vitae. Items on the CV that are being considered for this promotion (since your appointment date or time of last promotion) will be highlighted in yellow or otherwise clearly indicate items under review. Only work completed wholly or in part AFTER your appointment date or last successful promotion application can count toward promotion. Proper formatting for your discipline should be followed (i.e. including dates; co-authors; type of scholarship: article or presentation; identification of presenters; and identification of student researchers). Information such as review process and acceptance rate should be contained in the Statement of Promotability or the Supporting Documentation. The CV WILL NOT contain any narrative, statements toward promotion, or be considered as a source of documentation.

## **VI. Form 6 (two pages) – Candidate Checklist**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** |   |  Form 1 |
| **2021 - 2022** |  | **Page 1 of 3** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Name: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2. | Department: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3. | Rank Sought: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4. | Effective Appointment Date |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To IUP: |  | To Current Rank: |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Permission to Apply for Early Promotion Granted: | Yes |  | No |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5. | List all graduate education completed through **November 1**. List Degrees. Number of credits is necessary only if it affects eligibility for rank. List in reverse chronological order, most recent first. The UWPC will verify completed education after **November 1**. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | If more space is required, check here, then attach additional pages as needed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1st Degree or Number of Credits |  | Month/YearAwarded |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | School |  | Discipline |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2nd Degree or Number of Credits |  | Month/YearAwarded |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | School |  | Discipline |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Any equivalence in lieu of graduate education requires a written application to and approval by the Provost. Check here if you have applied to the Provost and include a copy of the application in your Promotion Application. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** |  | **Form 1** |
| **2021 - 2022** |  | **Page 2 of 3** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 6. | List all teaching or academic administrative experience in reverse chronological order, most recent first. Graduate student assistantship teaching may be counted for up to two years of teaching experience on a one-for-two basis (one year of assistantship teaching is equivalent to one-half year of teaching experience for promotion purposes). |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | If more space is required, check here, then attach additional pages as needed. |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Year (or Part Year) |  | School |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Any equivalence in lieu of graduate student assistantship teaching requires a written application to and approval by the Provost. Indicate here on the space provided that you have applied to the Provost and include a copy of this application in your Promotion Application. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 7. | Including this year, how many years are you claiming? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8. | I hereby grant the UWPC access to my official personnel file for the purpose of verifying the information in my application (CBA Article 13.B.5). |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | (Signature of Candidate)\* |  | (Date) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | \* If you wish not to grant the UWPC access to your official personnel file, then write the phrase “**DO NOT GRANT”** in place of your signature. It will be your responsibility to make arrangements with your DPC to provide verification of the minimum requirements for promotion to the UWPC. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** |  | **Form 1** |
| **2021 - 2022** |  | **Page 3 of 3** |

**Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities**

Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities is a prerequisite for consideration for promotion. The UWPC, therefore, asks candidates to attest to the fulfillment of those responsibilities here. A candidate’s DPC and Department Chair will verify these statements in their recommendations (to be submitted on or before **February 1**.

I attest that I have:

* 1. Shown a willingness to accept departmental work assignments.
	2. Executed work assignments in a timely fashion.
	3. Prepared for and met with classes (teaching faculty only).
	4. Advised students (teaching faculty only).
	5. Held posted office hours: five hours on three different days of the week (teaching faculty only).
	6. Evaluated students fairly and promptly reported student achievement (teaching faculty only).
	7. Participated in group deliberations which contribute to the growth and development of the students and the University.
	8. Accepted reasonable duties assigned within the fields of competence.
	9. Attempted honestly and in good conscience to achieve, preserve, and defend the goals of the University, without being restricted in the right to advocate change.
	10. Fulfilled all contractual obligations with a professional standard of excellence.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | (Signature of Candidate) |  | (Date) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | **Teaching Faculty Report** | Form 2 |
| **2021 - 2022** |  | **Page 1 of 3** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |

On this form, candidates must provide workload for the first most recent semester in which student evaluations were administered. Include any and all AWEs.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Semester |  | Dept. |  | Course # |  | Section |  | Workload Hours |  | Contact Hours |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Clarification:

Were there any unusual or special features about this semester that need clarification such as a discrepancy between academic credit and contact hours; e.g., 3/2 hours? If necessary, provide reasons for not having SEI data for the three most recent semesters. Use additional space as needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | **Teaching Faculty Report** | **Form 2** |
| **2021 - 2022** |  | **Page 2 of 3** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |

On this form, candidates must provide workload for the second most recent semester in which student evaluations were administered. Include any and all AWEs.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Semester |  | Dept. |  | Course # |  | Section |  | Workload Hours |  | Contact Hours |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Clarification:

Were there any unusual or special features about this semester that need clarification such as a discrepancy between academic credit and contact hours; e.g., 3/2 hours? If necessary, provide reasons for not having SEI data for the three most recent semesters. Use additional space as needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | **Teaching Faculty Report** | **Form 2** |
| **2021 - 2022** |  | **Page 3 of 3** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |

On this form, candidates must provide workload for the third most recent semester in which student evaluations were administered. Include any and all AWEs.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Semester |  | Dept. |  | Course # |  | Section |  | Workload Hours |  | Contact Hours |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Clarification:

Were there any unusual or special features about this semester that need clarification such as a discrepancy between academic credit and contact hours; e.g., 3/2 hours? If necessary, provide reasons for not having SEI data for the three most recent semesters. Use additional space as needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | **Faculty with a Job Description** | Form 3 |
| **2021 - 2022** |  | **Page 1 of 1** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |

If a candidate has an official job description, a copy should be provided here. Use additional space as needed.

If a candidate does not have an official job description, then the supervisor must provide a complete list of formal duties.

**\*Candidates that neither possess nor require an official job description need not include this page.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | **Alternative Workload Report** | Form 4 |
| **2021 - 2022** |  | **Page 1 of 1** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |

An Alternative Workload Equivalency (AWE) is a contractual obligation between the University and a faculty member. Promotion candidates who receive AWE’s are neither advantaged nor disadvantaged, and it does not affect their chances of being promoted. List in reverse chronological order (the most recent first) all AWEs that have been received for the same three semesters for which student evaluations were administered. The candidate should include the position or job description, date, and purpose for all AWEs. The candidate should also provide a narrative describing what was accomplished for all AWEs (use additional space as needed). Candidates may wish to include documentation of achievements in the Supporting Documentation part of the Promotion Application.

**\*Candidates receiving no AWEs need not include this page.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | **Curriculum Vitae** | Form 5 |
| **2021 - 2022** |  | **Page 1 of 1** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |

Candidates must provide a current copy of their Curriculum Vitae.

Items on the CV that are being considered for this promotion (since your appointment date or time of last promotion) will be highlighted in yellow or otherwise clearly indicate items under review. Only work completed wholly or in part AFTER your appointment date or last successful promotion application can count toward promotion.

Proper formatting for your discipline should be followed (i.e. including dates; co-authors; type of scholarship: article or presentation; identification of presenters; and identification of student researchers).

Candidates ***should not*** use the Vitae as a narrative vehicle for adding information in addition to that provided in the Statement of Promotability and the Supporting Documentation. Information such as review process and acceptance rate should be contained in the Statement of Promotability or the Supporting Documentation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | **Candidate Checklist** | Form 6 |
| **2021 - 2022** |  | **Page 1 of 2** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |

Complete this checklist, by placing a checkmark (✓) in the space provided. The check list is part of the Required Materials and should be submitted with the Promotion Application. If necessary, explain any exceptions to the items below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1. | My Statement of Promotability AND Supporting Documentation uses a standard  |
|  |  | 12-point font, one-inch margins, and at most 6-lines of text per vertical inch. I understand that my Chairperson, DPC, Dean, Provost, UWPC, and president will not consider any pages that do not conform to this format. |
|  |  |  |
|  | 2. | I have completed all relevant forms among the required forms (Form 1 – Form 6). |
|  |  |  |
|  | 3. | If my primary responsibilities are outside the classroom or I teach primarily non- |
|  |  | credit bearing courses, then I have provided a copy of my university-issued official job description (CBA, 16.A.3). I understand this official job description becomes the main criterion upon which my evaluation will be made, replacing the area of Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities (S3P, Part I.D). |
|  |  |  |
|  | 4. | I have included copies of the student evaluation summary sheets for **each**  |
|  |  | **course AND semester** during the three most recent academic year semesters for which the evaluations were administered.  |
|  |  |  |
|  | 5. | I have cited only work done at IUP after my date of appointment, or after |
|  |  | November 1 of the year prior to my last promotion, and completed before the **November 1**, deadline. I understand that my evaluators will verify dates from my supporting documentation and through online sources.  |
|  |  |  |
|  | 6. | I have submitted my application for promotion on MyIUP including this checklist |
|  |  | by **November 1, no later than 4:30 PM (EST)**. |
|  |  |  |
|  | 7. | I understand that the DPC is required to make a specific judgment, either |
|  |  | “Recommend” or “Not Ready at This Time”, and submit its recommendation supporting this judgment to the UWPC by **February 1**. I also understand that I have the right to review the DPC’s judgment and recommendation at least one week in advance of this due date and that I have the right to meet with the DPC to discuss the recommendation and judgment before submission. Lastly, I understand that my signature on the DPC Transmittal Form indicates that my rights above have not been infringed, but does not necessarily indicate my agreement with the judgment or recommendation. |
|  | 8. | I understand that the Department Chair is required to make a specific judgment, |
|  |  | either “Recommend” or “Not Ready at This Time”, and submit his or her recommendation supporting this judgment to the UWPC by **February 1** . I also understand that I have the right to review the Department Chair’s judgment and recommendation at least one week in advance of this due date and that I have the right to meet with the Department Chair to discuss the recommendation and judgment before submission. Lastly, I understand that my signature on the Department Chair Transmittal Form indicates that my rights above have not been infringed, but does not necessarily indicate my agreement with the judgment or recommendation. |
|  |  |  |
|  | 9. | I understand that the Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor) is required to  |
|  |  | make a specific judgment, either “Recommend” or “Not Ready at This Time”, and submit his or her recommendation supporting this judgment to the UWPC by **February 1.**  I also understand that I have the right to review the Dean’s (or Management Supervisor) judgment and recommendation at least one week in advance of this due date and that I have the right to meet with the Dean (or Management Supervisor) to discuss the recommendation and judgment before submission. Lastly, I understand that my signature on the Dean (or Management Supervisor) Transmittal Form indicates that my rights above have not been infringed, but does not necessarily indicate my agreement with the judgment or recommendation. |
|  |  |  |
|  | 10. | I understand that unless the President has named the Provost as his or her |
|  |  | designee, the Provost is required to make a specific judgment, either “Recommend” or “Not Ready at This Time", and submit his or her recommendation supporting this judgment to the UWPC by **February 21**. I also understand that I have the right to review the Provost’s judgment and recommendation at least one week in advance of this due date and that I have the right to meet with the Provost to discuss the recommendation and judgment before submission. Lastly, I understand that my signature on the Provost Transmittal Form indicates that my rights above have not been infringed, but does not necessarily indicate my agreement with the judgment or recommendation. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | (Signature of Candidate) |  | (Date) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Candidate’s Contact Information** |
|  |  |
| **Campus Address:** |  |
|  |  |
| **Campus Phone Number:** |  |
|  |  |
| **Campus E-mail Address:** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | Part II |  |
| **2021 - 2022** | Statement of Promotability | **At Most 10 Pages** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |

Candidates must submit a Statement of Promotability, not to exceed 10 single-sided and single-spaced pages. The purpose of the Statement of Promotability is to clearly demonstrate why the candidate believes that he or she should be promoted, and to convey the candidate’s reasons for that belief.

For teaching faculty members, the Statement of Promotability should address the candidate’s qualifications and achievements in the three primary areas of evaluation: Teaching Effectiveness and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities, Continuing Scholarly Growth, and Service. Candidates should convey their Teaching Effectiveness and the extent to which they have fulfilled professional responsibilities; address those scholarly academic achievements of which they are most proud (or which candidates believe to be most indicative of their promotion worthiness); and address service activities that candidates believe to be most important (S3P, 2016, pp. 3-6). For other scholarly growth and service items, candidates may provide a list, by category, and a brief explanation as part of the Supporting Documentation.

For faculty members whose primary responsibilities lie outside the classroom, the Statement of Promotability should address the extent to which the required duties and obligations, as outlined in the official job description, have been fully and successfully performed.

The candidate’s Statement of Promotability should begin with the next page.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | Part III |  |
| **2021 - 2022** | Supporting Documentation | **At Most 40 Pages** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |

Provide Supporting Documentation. The candidate’s Supporting Documentation should begin with the next page.

SECTION IV:

EVALUATOR INSTRUCTIONS AND TRANSMITTAL FORMS

# DEPARTMENT PROMOTION COMMITTEE

# Guidelines and Transmittal Form

## Guidelines for Department Promotion Committees

The University-Wide Promotion Committee (UWPC) must evaluate numerous applications for promotion each year in a short period of time. The task is complicated by the variety and scope of disciplines. Accordingly, the UWPC needs the best, most objective advice possible from each DPC.

The UWPC seeks a meaningful evaluation of a candidate’s application. The DPC recommendation should clearly and precisely characterize a candidate’s qualification for promotion within the context of the department and a larger academic discipline. As noted in the S3P (2016, Part II, preamble), the members of the DPC “are members of the same department of the candidate and should, therefore, be able to assess the candidate within the framework of the discipline and within the context of the academic department.” The UWPC is often greatly assisted in determining an item’s value by letters that explain a candidate’s role, impact, and importance as it relates to the context of the academic department. The DPC letter should go beyond simply using SEI data or in making general statements. The letter should not assume that the UWPC understands how a particular department or college views effective teaching, service and scholarship items.

This document is an attempt to explain how DPCs can help the UWPC achieve the mutual goal of a fairer promotions procedure for IUP faculty. The following describe the promotion-related tasks assigned to the DPC.

1. The DPC must hold an annual organization meeting. The S3P sets forth organizational rules by which the DPC is established and under which they operate (2016, Part II.A and B). Please read these sections carefully. Note that non-tenured faculty members, candidates for promotion, and the immediate family members or the significant others of promotion candidates are not eligible to serve on the DPC. Also note that all DPCs must send a roster of their membership to the UWPC Chair by **October 1**.
2. "For faculty whose primary responsibilities are outside the classroom or who teach primarily non-credit bearing courses, the university is required to provide a written job description (CBA Article 16.A.3). The candidate will include this job description in his/her promotion application (see Part II, H.2.). Responsibilities delineated in the official job description become the basis of evaluation for those faculty members in the place of Teaching Effectiveness (S3P, Part I.D.)." The DPC will use this official job description as the basis for evaluating the faculty member.
3. Candidates must complete and submit all Required Materials, a Statement of Promotability (not more than 10 pages) and Supporting Documentation (not more than 40 pages) on or before the **November 1**. All materials are to be submitted via MyIUP. A candidate’s application will be made available to the entire DPC by November 15 by means of MyIUP.
4. All members of the DPC must thoroughly review and verify all of the information contained in the Required Material, the Statement of Promotability, and the Supporting Documentation for each candidate. Only work completed since the candidate's last advancement in rank can be considered. **The DPC recommendation should identify and correct any errors of fact or misrepresentation of fact that may exist in any candidate-submitted documentation.**
5. With respect to the evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities, remember that these are not to be evaluated “based on a single datum. A combination of all appropriate data will be used to give sufficient evidence for an overall judgment of Teaching Effectiveness and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities. Failure to meet the requirements under Teaching Effectiveness and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities shall preclude consideration for promotion (S3P, 2016, Part I.D.1.)”
6. **Do not simply restate a candidate’s record or accomplishment as it appears in the candidate-submitted documentation; the UWPC expects the DPC to consider and explain the significance of such claims.**  The UWPC needs and will rely upon the assistance of the DPC in assessing the value of various contributions to a specific discipline as it relates to the context of the academic department. The committee’s recommendation might include such things as:
* Which professional meetings are most significant
* Which journals are most widely read and respected
* Does a publication show original insights or spur further research and publications by others
* Does an article appear on course readings lists at other institutions or has it largely gone unnoticed
* When work was jointly authored, what was the nature and extent of the candidate’s contribution
* Does a particular accomplishment go beyond what would be routinely expected in the department or discipline? Such assessments are especially critical in content areas with which UWPC members are not likely to be familiar
* Student evaluation data as it relates to the context of the academic department (i.e. NOT simply restating numerical data)
1. DPC recommendations should be reported in three pages, using 12-point font, one-inch margins, and not more than six lines per vertical inch. The recommendation should be organized according to CBA established criteria for promotion: Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities, Continuing Scholarly Growth, and Service. The recommendation must include a very brief description of the methods used by the DPC in evaluating candidates (e.g., was the candidate evaluated by, and the recommendation written by, a subcommittee of the entire DPC? Was there a vote of the committee, or of the entire faculty, on the recommendation?) A wide variety of approaches exist, and the UWPC would like to know which methods are being used.
2. The DPC must submit its recommendation not later than **February 1**. The entire, signed transmittal form, followed by the recommendation, will be uploaded to MyIUP as a single PDF by the DPC Chair. Also bear in mind that the DPC recommendation must be available to the candidate seven days in advance of the due date. The candidate must be afforded adequate time to exercise his or her right to meet with the DPC to discuss the recommendation and to sign the Department Promotion Committee Transmittal Form before the recommendation is forwarded to the UWPC. There may seem to be ample time between November 1 and February 1 to accomplish these tasks, but final exams and the semester break take their toll. It is important to begin the evaluation process as soon as possible.
3. The DPC is expected to make a specific recommendation for each candidate: "Recommend," for promotion or "Not Ready (for promotion) At This Time." A place is provided on the DPC Transmittal Form to record the decision. At the end of the three-page DPC document, there should be a brief description of how the decision was reached. The UWPC will take the DPC recommendation seriously but, as required under current policy, will arrive at an independent judgment based on the materials presented by the candidate.
4. Since the CBA requires "separate" recommendations, the DPC’s recommendation is to be totally separate and independent from the recommendation submitted by the department Chair. There should be no mutual review or inspection of recommendations.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | **DPC** | Form DPC |
| **2021 - 2022** | **Transmittal Form** | **Page 1 of 2** |

Complete this 2-page form together with an up to three-page recommendation for the candidate for promotion and submit both to the UWPC Chair via MyIUP as a single PDF file.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Name: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2. | Department: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3. | Rank Sought: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4. | The DPC’s judgment for the candidate. Place a checkmark (✓) in the space provided. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Recommend |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Not Ready at This Time |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5. | Signatures and dates of the DPC Committee Members\* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | DPC | Signature |  | Date |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Member |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Member |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Member |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Member |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Member |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Member |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Chair |  |  |  |

\* If there are more DPC members than space provided, attach another sheet of paper to this form on which the remaining members may sign and date.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | **DPC** | **Form DPC** |
| **2021 - 2022** | **Transmittal Form** | **Page 2 of 2** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |

Have the candidate confirm the items on the checklist below by placing a checkmark (✓) in the space provided and signing below. Submit this 2-page Transmittal Form along with the 3 page letter as a single PDF file through MyIUP by **February 1, by 4:30 PM (EST)**. If necessary, explain any exceptions to the items below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1. | I received a copy of the DPC recommendation by **January 25**. |
|  |  |  |
|  | 2. | I was given an opportunity to review the DPC recommendation and to meet with |
|  |  | the DPC to discuss the recommendation prior to its submission. |
|  |  |  |
|  | 3. | I understand that my signature on the DPC Transmittal Form does not necessarily |
|  |  | indicate my agreement with either the judgment or the recommendation made by the DPC. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | (Signature of Candidate) |  | (Date) |

# DEPARTMENT CHAIR

# Guidelines and Transmittal Form

## Guidelines for Department Chairs

The University-Wide Promotion Committee (UWPC) must evaluate numerous applications for promotion each year in a short period of time. The task is complicated by the variety and scope of disciplines. Accordingly, the UWPC needs the best, most objective advice possible from each Department Chair.

The UWPC seeks a meaningful evaluation of a candidate’s application. The Department Chair's recommendation should clearly and precisely characterize a candidate’s qualification for promotion within the context of the department and a larger academic discipline. As noted in the S3P (2016, Part II, preamble), because the Chair and the candidate “are members of the same department [the Chair] should, therefore, be able to assess the candidate within the framework of the discipline and within the context of the academic department.” In particular, the Department Chair’s letter should emphasize the candidate’s fulfillment of professional responsibility. That said the Department Chair’s recommendation should also assess the candidates Teaching Effectiveness and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibility, Continuing Scholarly Growth, and Service.

The following describe the promotion-related tasks assigned to the Department Chair:

1. The Department Chair convenes an organizational meeting of the DPC annually and conducts the election of a committee chairperson. The Department Chair must thereafter notify the chairperson of the UWPC of the results of this election and specify the membership of the DPC by **October 1**.
2. The Department Chair ensures compliance with the DPC membership restrictions stated in the S3P, Part II.A. (2016).
3. Since the CBA requires "separate" recommendations, the Department Chair's recommendation of each promotion candidate is to be totally separate and independent from the recommendation submitted by the DPC. There should be no mutual review or inspection of recommendations.
4. "For faculty whose primary responsibilities are outside the classroom or who teach primarily non-credit bearing courses, the university is required to provide a written job description (CBA Article 16.A.3). The candidate will include this job description in his/her promotion application (see Part II, H.2.). Responsibilities delineated in the official job description become the basis of evaluation for those faculty members in the place of Teaching Effectiveness (S3P, 2016, Part I.D.)." The Department Chair will use this official job description as the basis for evaluating the faculty member.
5. The Department Chair must then prepare a two-page recommendation for each promotion candidate. That recommendation should be reported in a document using 12-point font, one-inch margins, and not more than six lines per vertical inch. The recommendation should be organized according to CBA established criteria for promotion: Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities, Continuing Scholarly Growth, and Service. The Chair should emphasize fulfillment of professional responsibility, but may also wish to discuss teaching, scholarship, and service. As with the DPC letter, the letter should not assume that the UWPC understands how a particular department views effective teaching, service and scholarship items. The UWPC is often greatly assisted by letters that explain a candidate’s role, impact, and importance in helping to determine an item’s value from the context of the academic department. The letter should go beyond simply using SEI data or in making general statements.
6. The Department Chair must submit a recommendation for each candidate for promotion not later than **February 1**. Also, The Department Chair's recommendation must be available to the candidate seven days in advance of the due date. The candidate must be afforded adequate time to exercise his or her right to meet with the Department Chair to discuss the recommendation and to sign the Department Chair Transmittal Form before the recommendation is forwarded to the UWPC. There may seem to be ample time between November 1 and February 1 to accomplish these tasks, but final exams and the semester break take their toll. It is important to begin the evaluation process as soon as possible.
7. The Department Chair is expected to make a specific recommendation for each candidate: "Recommend," for promotion or "Not Ready (for promotion) At This Time." A place is provided on the Department Chair Transmittal Form to record this decision.
8. The Department Chair's recommendation and transmittal form is forwarded to the UWPC through MyIUP. The signed transmittal form, followed by the recommendation, will be uploaded to MyIUP as a single PDF by the Department Chair.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | **Department Chair** | Form Department Chair |
| **2021 - 2022** | **Transmittal Form** | **Page 1 of 1** |

Complete this form together with an up to two-page recommendation for the candidate for promotion and submit both to the UWPC Chair via MyIUP as a single PDF file.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Name: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2. | Department: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3. | Rank Sought: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4. | The Chair’s judgment for the candidate. Place a checkmark (✓) in the space provided. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Recommend |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Not Ready at This Time |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5. | Signature |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | (Signature of Department Chair) |  | (Date) |

Have the candidate confirm the items on the checklist below by placing a checkmark (✓) in the space provided and signing below. Submit this Transmittal Form along with a two page letter as a single PDF file through MyIUP by **February 1, by 4:30 PM (EST)**. If necessary, explain any exceptions to the items below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1. | I received a copy of the Chair’s recommendation by **January 25**. |
|  |  |  |
|  | 2. | I was given an opportunity to review the Chair’s recommendation and to meet with |
|  |  | the Chair to discuss the recommendation prior to its submission. |
|  |  |  |
|  | 3. | I understand that my signature on the Department Chair Transmittal Form does  |
|  |  | not necessarily indicate my agreement with either the judgment or the recommendation made by the Department Chair. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | (Signature of Candidate) |  | (Date) |

# ACADEMIC DEAN (OR APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT SUPERVISOR)

# Guidelines and Transmittal Form

## Guidelines for Academic Deans (or Appropriate Management Supervisors)

The University-Wide Promotion Committee (UWPC) must evaluate numerous applications for promotion each year in a short period of time. The task is complicated by the variety and scope of disciplines. Accordingly, the UWPC needs the best, most objective guidance possible from each Academic Dean or Appropriate Management Supervisor.

The UWPC seeks a meaningful evaluation of a candidate’s application. The Academic Dean's or (Appropriate Management Supervisor's) recommendation should clearly and precisely characterize a candidate’s qualification for promotion within the context of the entire college. As noted in the S3P (2016, Part II, preamble), "the Dean is able to assess the candidate from the broader perspective of the entire college." The Academic Dean's or (Appropriate Management Supervisor's) recommendation should assess the candidate's Teaching Effectiveness and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibility, Continuing Scholarly Growth, and Service.

The following describe the promotion-related tasks assigned to the Academic Dean or (Appropriate Management Supervisor):

1. Since the CBA requires "separate" recommendations, the Academic Dean or (Appropriate Management Supervisor's) recommendation of each promotion candidate is to be totally separate and independent from the recommendation submitted by the DPC and Department Chair. There should be no mutual review or inspection of recommendations.
2. "For faculty whose primary responsibilities are outside the classroom or who teach primarily non-credit bearing courses, the university is required to provide a written job description (CBA Article 16.A.3). The candidate will include this job description in his/her promotion application (see Part II, H.2.). Responsibilities delineated in the official job description become the basis of evaluation for those faculty members in the place of Teaching Effectiveness (S3P, 2016, Part I.D.)." The Academic Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor) will use this official job description as the basis for evaluating the faculty member.
3. The Academic Dean or (Appropriate Management Supervisor) must then prepare a two-page recommendation for each promotion candidate. That recommendation should be reported in a document using 12-point font, one-inch margins, and not more than six lines per vertical inch. The recommendation should be organized according to CBA established criteria for promotion: Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities, Continuing Scholarly Growth, and Service. The recommendation should not assume that the UWPC understands how a particular college views effective teaching, service and scholarship items. The UWPC is often greatly assisted by letters that explain a candidate’s role, impact, and importance in helping to determine an item’s value from the context of the academic college. The letter should go beyond simply using SEI data or in making general statements.
4. The Academic Dean or (Appropriate Management Supervisor) must submit a recommendation for each candidate for promotion not later than **February 1**. The Academic Dean’s or (Appropriate Management Supervisor's) recommendation must be available to the candidate seven days in advance of the due date. The candidate must be afforded adequate time to exercise his or her right to meet with the Academic Dean or (Appropriate Management Supervisor) to discuss the recommendation and to sign the Academic Dean or (Appropriate Management Supervisor) Transmittal Form before the recommendation is forwarded to the UWPC. There may seem to be ample time between November 1 and February 1 to accomplish these tasks, but many other tasks take their toll. It is important to begin the evaluation process as soon as possible.
5. The Academic Dean or (Appropriate Management Supervisor) is expected to make a specific recommendation for each candidate: "Recommend," for promotion or "Not Ready (for promotion) At This Time." A place is provided on the Academic Dean or (Appropriate Management Supervisor) Transmittal Form to record this decision.
6. The Academic Dean’s or (Appropriate Management Supervisor’s) recommendation and transmittal form is forwarded to the UWPC through MyIUP. The signed transmittal form, followed by the recommendation, will be uploaded to MyIUP as a single PDF by the Academic Dean or (Appropriate Management Supervisor’s).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | **Academic Dean (or Mgmt. Sup.)** | Form Academic Dean |
| **2021 - 2022** | **Transmittal Form** | **Page 1 of 1** |

Complete this form together with an up to two-page recommendation for the candidate for promotion and submit both to the UWPC Chair via MyIUP.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Name: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2. | Department: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3. | Rank Sought: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4. | The Dean’s judgment for the candidate. Place a checkmark (✓) in the space provided. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Recommend |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Not Ready at This Time |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5. | Signature |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | (Signature of Dean) |  | (Date) |

Have the candidate confirm the items on the checklist below by placing a checkmark (✓) in the space provided and signing below. Submit this Transmittal Form through MyIUP by **February 1, by 4:30 PM (EST)**. If necessary, explain any exceptions to the items below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1. | I received a copy of the Dean’s recommendation by **January 25**. |
|  |  |  |
|  | 2. | I was given an opportunity to review the Dean’s recommendation and to meet with |
|  |  | the Dean to discuss the recommendation prior to its submission. |
|  |  |  |
|  | 3. | I understand that my signature on the Academic Dean Transmittal Form does  |
|  |  | not necessarily indicate my agreement with either the judgment or the recommendation made by the Dean (or Appropriate Management Supervisor). |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | (Signature of Candidate) |  | (Date) |

# PROVOST

# Guidelines and Transmittal Form

## Guidelines for the Provost

The procedures described in this section apply only when the Provost is not acting as the President’s designee in rendering promotion decisions.

The University-Wide Promotion Committee (UWPC) must evaluate numerous applications for promotion each year in a short period of time. The task is complicated by the variety and scope of disciplines. Accordingly, the UWPC needs the best, most objective advice possible from the Provost.

The UWPC seeks a meaningful evaluation of a candidate’s application. The Provost’s recommendation should clearly and precisely characterize a candidate’s qualification for promotion within the context of the entire university. As noted in the S3P (2016, Part II, preamble): "While the DPC, Department Chair, and Dean do not have the opportunity to review each other's recommendations, the Provost is able to review the DPC, Department Chair, and Dean recommendations in making his/her recommendation. This lens allows the Provost to make his/her recommendation from the broader perspective of the total University." The Provost's recommendation should assess the candidate's Teaching Effectiveness and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibility, Continuing Scholarly Growth, and Service.

The following describe the promotion-related tasks assigned to the Provost.

1. "For faculty whose primary responsibilities are outside the classroom or who teach primarily non-credit bearing courses, the university is required to provide a written job description (CBA Article 16.A.3). The candidate will include this job description in his/her promotion application (see Part II, H.2.). Responsibilities delineated in the official job description become the basis of evaluation for those faculty members in the place of Teaching Effectiveness (S3P, 2016, Part I.D.)." The Provost will use this official job description as the basis for evaluating the faculty member.
2. Unless the Provost has been named as the President’s designee, he/she shall submit, by **February 21,** a not more than one (1) page, recommendation for each candidate for promotion to the UWPC after examining the candidate's Promotion Application, the recommendations of the DPC, department chair, and the academic dean (or appropriate management supervisor), and any rebuttals submitted by the candidate.
3. The Provost's recommendation should be reported in a document, using 12-point font, one-inch margins, and not more than six lines per vertical inch. The recommendation should be organized according to CBA established criteria for promotion: Effective Teaching and Fulfillment of Professional Responsibilities, Continuing Scholarly Growth, and Service.
4. The Provost must submit a recommendation for each candidate for promotion not later than **February 21**. The Provost's recommendation must be available to the candidate seven days in advance of the due date. The candidate must be afforded adequate time to exercise his or her right to meet with the Provost to discuss the recommendation and to sign the Provost Transmittal Form before the recommendation is forwarded to the UWPC.
5. The Provost is expected to make a specific recommendation for each candidate: "Recommend," for promotion or "Not Ready (for promotion) At This Time." A place is provided on the Provost Transmittal Form to record this decision
6. The Provost's recommendation and transmittal form is forwarded to the UWPC through MyIUP. The signed transmittal form, followed by the recommendation, will be uploaded to MyIUP as a single PDF by the Provost.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion Application** | **Provost** | Form Provost |
| **2021 - 2022** | **Transmittal Form** | **Page 1 of 1** |

Complete this form together with an up to one-page recommendation for the candidate for promotion and submit both to the UWPC Chair via MyIUP.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Name: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2. | Department: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3. | Rank Sought: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4. | The Provost’s judgment for the candidate. Place a checkmark (✓) in the space provided. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Recommend |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Not Ready at This Time |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5. | Signature |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | (Signature of Provost) |  | (Date) |

Have the candidate confirm the items on the checklist below by placing a checkmark (✓) in the space provided and signing below. Submit this Transmittal Form through MyIUP by **February 21, by 4:30 PM (EST)**. If necessary, explain any exceptions to the items below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1. | I received a copy of the Provost’s recommendation by **February 14**. |
|  |  |  |
|  | 2. | I was given an opportunity to review the Provost’s recommendation and to meet  |
|  |  | with the Dean to discuss the recommendation prior to its submission. |
|  |  |  |
|  | 3. | I understand that my signature on the Provost Transmittal Form does not |
|  |  | necessarily indicate my agreement with either the judgment or the recommendation made by the Provost. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | (Signature of Candidate) |  | (Date) |

Request for Approval for Early Application for Promotion

 **Promotion Cycle**

Please note that "promotability" is **NOT** a criterion in evaluating this request. This is a request for approval to apply early. Therefore, it is important for the applicant to provide appropriate documentation in relation to such factors as: rank and tenure held at other institutions, changes in hiring practices in the discipline, or other evidence that would support the request.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**\*Attach to this form an updated copy of your curriculum vita.**

Rationale for Requesting Permission to Seek Early Promotion:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(Signature of Candidate) (Date)