I. INTRODUCTION

This document sets forth the criteria and procedures used in the evaluation of non-tenure stream (NTS) faculty at the University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown (Pitt Johnstown) for promotion, and the procedures for appealing a denial of promotion. This document provides guidelines for the promotion of NTS assistant professor to NTS associate professor, and NTS associate professor to NTS professor. These guidelines are in accordance with the general policies established by the University for all academic units, and are similar procedurally to those outlining promotion for tenure stream faculty. While this document outlines the promotion process for NTS faculty, it should be clear that NTS faculty members are not required to seek promotion in rank. The decision to remain in rank is not regarded in any manner as a deficiency for purposes of annual performance evaluation or contract renewal.

II. ROLE OF THE CAMPUS

Pitt-Johnstown was established in 1927 as a regional campus of the University of Pittsburgh. Its primary role was to provide the freshman and sophomore years of a limited number of degree programs offered at the Pittsburgh campus. In 1970, Pitt-Johnstown became a four-year campus of the University. Pitt Johnstown offers degree programs as well as a wide variety of minors and certificates across seven academic divisions, including the Divisions of Business and Enterprise, Education, Engineering and Computer Sciences, Humanities, Natural Sciences, Nursing & Health Science, and Social Sciences.

The mission and goals of the University of Pittsburgh are stated in the Plan for Pitt: Making a Difference Together, Academic Years 2016-2020. The mission of Pitt Johnstown is “to offer a high-quality educational experience in a supportive living-learning environment, that is grounded in the liberal arts and sciences, that is current, and that is responsive both to our students’ personal and professional needs and to our communities’ needs.” Our vision is to be “the regional leader educating for success in the real world.”

Our mission demands that we place the attainment of teaching excellence above all other goals. Appropriately demonstrated research, scholarship, and creative works ensure the vitality of the faculty, promote currency in the faculty members’ disciplines, and make evident a level of professional engagement commensurate with university faculty status. Suitable service to the campus and community adds evidence of commitment to the institution in all its dimensions. Demonstration of such activity at an appropriate level is therefore expected as a qualification for faculty promotion.
III. CAMPUS CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

The campus standards and criteria discussed below are consistent with the minimum criteria established by the University. Although the criteria are discussed without reference to rank, it is understood that a faculty member's performance should meet increasingly higher standards for each rank.

It should be clearly understood that promotion in rank is an accomplishment of considerable status and is not granted for simply routine performance of faculty responsibilities. Recognition of such accomplishment requires the candidate to provide unequivocal demonstration of having met or exceeded the guidelines for NTS promotion in every aspect.

Faculty at Pitt-Johnstown are expected to demonstrate excellence in undergraduate teaching and related academic endeavors such as student academic advising, course and curriculum review, and design and assessment. Faculty are also expected to demonstrate a strong commitment to their own professional development. Peer reviewed success in research and scholarship in the discipline taught, including the pedagogy of that discipline, is a primary criterion for judging professional competence among academics and, as such, is a primary criterion for granting promotion at Pitt-Johnstown. In appropriate cases and disciplines, creative activity (e.g. essays, fiction prose, poetry, art, music composition and performance, theatre) may be interpreted as research and scholarship. Additional professional development activities include advanced study, presentations and attendance at professional conferences and symposia, and contributing significant service to professional associations.

The relative emphasis placed upon each of these criteria may vary among divisions, disciplines, and individual faculty. This variance is necessary and desirable because of the differing nature and role of disparate disciplines and because of the inherent strengths and interests of individual faculty. However, the requirement for excellent teaching must always be satisfied.

A. Teaching

Excellent teaching begins with a sound foundation of knowledge and mastery of the discipline. Excellent teaching is a faculty responsibility and requires constant review and study of important new developments within the discipline and its pedagogy. It requires careful preparation and periodic updating of course content and materials, and a clear and effective presentation of the material. Excellent teaching should stimulate students to acquire knowledge and to utilize their knowledge to think critically and cogently. Faculty should assist students in the acquisition of new concepts while fostering a learning environment marked by both an openness to discourse as well as acknowledging the professor's role as an expert in the field. Excellent teaching should also assist in
developing skills applicable directly or indirectly to the student's future academic and career goals.

Closely associated with the responsibility for one's own teaching excellence is the process of curriculum development. At Pitt-Johnstown, the curriculum and the courses which make up the curriculum are periodically reviewed. Faculty are expected to contribute to this process at all levels: individual courses, curriculum within their discipline, and the undergraduate curriculum across the campus.

Academic advising is a responsibility of all faculty at Pitt-Johnstown. Successful advising requires a thorough knowledge of general curriculum and graduation requirements, the more specified curriculum and academic regulations of one’s own discipline, and a general familiarity with those of other programs at the campus. It requires the advisor to understand the interests and special problems of each advisee, counsel students on the selection of courses and important procedural matters, and bring to the student's attention other options compatible with his/her academic and career goals.

B. Professional Development and Scholarship

Teaching excellence can only be achieved when faculty maintain an active interest in their disciplines and continue to expand and refine their knowledge and understanding of their fields. In recognition of this requirement, Pitt Johnstown expects NTS faculty who seek promotion beyond the rank of assistant professor to demonstrate scholarly achievement, research, and creative endeavors for peer review or public scrutiny by means appropriate for their disciplines. These can include, but are not limited to, books, articles in refereed journals, exhibits of art or other creative work, performance for the public or established adjudicators, application for and receipt of grants and awards, project and technical reports, and presentations at professional conferences or symposia. Consulting is not considered as scholarship unless it can be brought into the classroom and subsequently reported in a scholarly manner. The criteria by which these achievements are evaluated will emphasize clear evidence of progress and refinement of professional growth and development.

NTS faculty seeking promotion at Pitt Johnstown are expected to demonstrate a high level of scholarly achievement, so as to make a strong case not only to all levels of internal campus review, but also to external referees who will provide input on the candidate’s work and contributions to the discipline. In reviewing the case of an NTS faculty member seeking promotion, Peer Review Committee members up to and including Campus Status Committee members may use discretion in assigning weight to various parts of the dossier, including but not limited to applied research, pedagogical accomplishments in candidate’s field, and areas of service that overlap with professional development, such as leadership in professional organizations. Differences between cases of TS promotion and NTS promotion should not be in
the quality of the effort, but rather, perhaps, in the amount of work over time produced by the NTS faculty member. Also, Peer Review Committee members may consider scholarly material completed over a longer period of time than the typical six-year window encompassed by the traditional TS case. In all cases, however, materials in the NTS promotion dossier should reflect the high standards of quality scholarship and rigor expected of Pitt Johnstown faculty.

C. Campus, University and Community Service

Every faculty member should participate in the conduct of business of his/her division, campus, and university. This should include service on division, campus, or University committees. To be effective, this will require a faculty member to be conversant with the goals and problems of the campus and to assume an unselfish attitude reflecting the interests of the institution while assisting in the planning and management of the campus.

Pitt-Johnstown is committed to serving the needs of the community, the region, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This service is performed primarily through formal academic instruction; however, within the limits of available time and resources, the campus encourages its faculty to offer their expertise to better the quality of life in the community. It is understood that some areas of academic expertise lend themselves to this type of service more readily than others, and not all faculty can be expected to engage in this type of service. In all cases where service to the wider community is offered as evidence for promotion, the service should be related either to the candidate’s academic or research discipline or to expertise as a professional educator. Activities of general service to the community of an unrelated nature, such as supporting charitable causes or participating in service clubs, while commendable, will not constitute support for academic advancement.

In circumstances where individual faculty render voluntary service to the community, within the realm of their academic expertise, the campus should recognize and support such activities. Individual faculty should be encouraged to present materials pertaining to community service when being reviewed for promotion.

D. Division and Discipline Criteria

Statements of particular criteria for promotion may be developed by individual academic divisions of Pitt Johnstown. These criteria would reflect the special needs and nature of the individual academic units and may refine, but not supersede or undercut, those stated above. It is the responsibility of division chairs to provide faculty member in the division requesting promotion with information or documents concerning the explicit requirements of the division for promotion. Further policies and procedures may be developed by individual disciplines, but they must be consistent with University, campus and divisional policies, and they must obtain administrative approval before being implemented.
IV. GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE

Because of the difficulty of making evaluative judgments about faculty performance, there may be a misguided tendency to base judgments solely on quantitative considerations, such as years of service and the number of committee assignments, courses taught, papers published and professional society memberships held. In order that a review of faculty performance provide meaningful information, it must be based on fair and considered judgments of the quality of the candidate's credentials and accomplishments made by faculty peers with expertise similar to that of the candidate for reappointment or promotion. Thorough and proper evaluations are difficult and sensitive, but this responsibility is a fundamental responsibility of all faculty and must not be abdicated.

A. Faculty Portfolio

As an aid to the review process, a portfolio will be maintained by the faculty member. The portfolio will contain materials which bear on the faculty member's ability in teaching, course development, advising, professional development, and campus and community service. This portfolio will become the foundation of the promotion dossier. The division chairperson will inform the non-tenure stream faculty member seeking promotion of the obligation in regard to keeping the portfolio current and complete.

Information on teaching effectiveness should include - at a minimum - a teaching philosophy, a list of courses taught for each term (including numbers of sections and enrollment in each), course development, course materials, self-evaluation, colleague evaluations, and measures of student opinion. It may contain grade distributions for courses taught and examples of critiqued or evaluated student work (e.g. papers, exams, directed projects).

The portfolio should also contain evidence of the faculty member's commitment to professional development as demonstrated through scholarly and/or creative activity. The portfolio should include a current curriculum vita including a summary of the faculty member's significant professional activities and evidence of professional recognition. The portfolio should also contain plans for continued scholarly work that is relevant to the discipline and its pedagogy.

Similarly, the portfolio should contain a current record of the faculty member's service to the division, the campus, and the community. This record may include a summary of committee memberships, elective posts held, community activities, etc., as well as an explanation of the significance and pertinence of such posts or services.

Materials contained in the portfolio may not be copied or distributed without the written permission of the faculty member, except those copies maintained temporarily for
examination by faculty members of review committees and those sent to the Provost and other University administrators as may be required.

B. Annual Performance Review

An important part of the review process is the annual meeting of the faculty member and the division chairperson. For non-tenure stream faculty seeking promotion, the division chairperson (or designated representative) should meet with each faculty member to discuss performance with respect to the criteria for promotion: specifically, the reviews will address progress in teaching, scholarship and service, attainment of goals from the past year and future goals as they pertain to the three areas of evaluation. A written summary of the annual performance review, signed by the division chairperson, will be placed in the faculty member's file and copies sent to the faculty member and the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA). Annual reviews may, at the discretion of the candidate, be included in the dossier for committee reviews. Annual Performance Reviews will be placed in the dossier for promotion by the VPAA, prior to sending the dossier to the Campus President.

C. Teaching Evaluation

In the evaluation of teaching, information will be gathered from the faculty member's colleagues and from students. Faculty who take part in the evaluation of teaching will thoroughly familiarize themselves with the candidate's teaching abilities and activities through an examination of course materials and suitable measures of student opinion of teaching effectiveness. The evaluating faculty should arrange for visitation of the candidate's class, at a time agreeable to the candidate. Student opinions are valued, though it should be recognized that these opinions provide an indication of student perception of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. As such, particular attention should be paid to patterns of comments regarding the teacher's effectiveness evident in student opinions. Student opinion will not be used to judge the value, content, or relevance of the course.

D. Evaluation of Scholarship and Professional Development

The evaluation of a candidate's efforts toward professional development and scholarship must be a quality judgment made by colleagues with expertise in the candidate's field. In the evaluation of evidence of professional development and scholarship submitted by the candidate, special attention should be given to the candidate’s awareness and understanding of recent developments in his/her field and to the originality of presentation. Suitable evidence may include published scholarly or creative documents, papers presented at professional conferences or symposia, creative work (e.g. essays, fiction prose, poetry, art, music composition and performance, theatre), reviews of performances or public presentations, or course materials resulting from pedagogical investigations or research. Scholarly or creative
works submitted for review but not yet accepted or published may be submitted, but may carry less weight than material which has met the test of scrutiny by professional reviewers or editorial boards. Proposals for professional development projects and grants that have not yet been initiated or awarded can be considered as an indication of a plan for future direction of scholarship or creativity. Funded grants should include the proposal, results, applicable publications and accounting of expenditure. Consulting, which may be considered professional development, will not be considered as scholarship in and of itself. Faculty members are encouraged to pursue the highest levels of scholarly achievement, research and creative endeavors and seek peer review on every scholarly or creative endeavor.

V. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW FOR PROMOTION

Note: In this document, the terms "Status Committee" or "Campus Status Committee" refer to a standing committee of the Pitt Johnstown Faculty Senate and is so recognized in the Pitt Johnstown Faculty Senate by-laws. The thirteen-member committee is constituted as follows: Chair, Vice-Chair, and Past Chair all elected by the Faculty Senate for a three-year term; one representative from each of the seven Academic Divisions elected by the respective Division for a 3-year term; and three additional individuals from the Senate membership approved by the ten aforementioned members to serve a one-year term.

A. Review for Promotion

A formal request for review for promotion by a non-tenure stream faculty member is generally submitted after 12 semesters of full-time employment as a faculty member at Pitt-Johnstown. A subsequent request for review for promotion is generally submitted only after three years have passed since a previous promotion. Exceptions to these recommended guidelines can be made for cases with special circumstances. For example, a faculty member may be hired at the rank of assistant professor, but with substantive experience and scholarly production either on our campus or at another university. In some cases, an NTS faculty member may be ready for promotion review within a shorter timespan than what is recommended in these guidelines.

A review by the division, Faculty Status Committee, Division Chair, VPAA and Campus President will be conducted prior to the formulation of a recommendation to the Provost of the University. The division review will be initiated by the division chairperson in sufficient time to allow subsequent review actions to be effected prior to the established deadline dates. The "rank above" principle will be followed for all cases and at all levels of the review. All faculty within the candidate's division not meeting the "rank above" principle will have an opportunity to provide input to the Peer Review Committee; however, individuals not meeting the "rank above" principle are not to have access to the confidential materials in the
dossier, nor are they allowed to vote at any level. As an example, an NTS associate professor could sit on the Peer Review Committee for an NTS assistant professor requesting promotion to NTS associate professor. Similarly, NTS associate professors within a specific division would have voting rights on the Division Status Committee for an NTS assistant professor candidate for promotion in that division.

Special criteria and procedures imposed by divisions may be discussed in the policies and procedures documents of the divisions. However, the following policies and procedures are common to all divisional reviews.

1. **Peer Review Committee**

Three to five faculty members from the candidate's discipline and/or related fields will be appointed by the division chairperson, after consultation with the candidate, to form the Peer Review Committee. In the case of disciplines where there are few faculty in the discipline, the committee should be chosen among faculty with related disciplines or those with experience in the field. During this consultation, the candidate may challenge the appointment of any peer reviewer; however, the final authority rests with the division chairperson. Peer Review Committee members from related disciplines may also be appointed. Peer Review Committee members will be selected on the basis of their qualifications to judge the quality of the various areas of faculty responsibility and performance; however, care must be taken so as not to create a potential conflict of interest situation. For example, a co-author of the candidate's published work would not be an appropriate person to serve as on the Peer Review Committee. The goal is to form a committee of individuals who will perform the task in a professional manner. One of the members of the Peer Review Committee will be designated by the division chairperson as the chair. All Peer Review Committee appointments should be made at least one full term prior to the scheduled term for the presentation of the Peer Review Committee report to the division chairperson.

2. **External Referees**

The primary responsibility for conducting the review and evaluation rests with the Peer Review Committee. However, evaluation of the candidates' record of scholarship and professional development by at least six suitably qualified experts from outside the Johnstown Campus of the University of Pittsburgh is also required. The division chairperson will make arrangements for this step in consultation with the candidate. Three or more external referees will be selected by the division chairperson from a list provided by the candidate; an additional three or more will be selected by the division chairperson without
discussion with or input from the candidate. The resulting letters from external referees, assessing the candidate's professional performance and potential, will be sent to the division chairperson for inclusion in the candidate's promotion dossier. The candidate will not be allowed access to the external referees’ letters.


a. The division chairperson will provide each of the Peer Review Committee members with a copy of the University, Pitt Johnstown, and any division policies and procedures for promotion.

b. The Peer Review Committee members will familiarize themselves with all aspects of the candidate's responsibilities and performance through personal observation of classes, review of scholarly works, and letters from external referees. The chair of the Peer Review Committee will extend an invitation for comment to all faculty members in the division holding “rank above” the candidate. The Peer Review Committee will summarize the input and include it in its written report. They will meet to discuss the case and develop a written report on the candidate's past performance and potential for contributions in the years ahead. This report will include reference to all materials used in the evaluation, without identifying the originator of any comment or recommendation. These materials will consist of primary documents supplied by the candidate along with the letters from external referees. The Peer Review Committee report will conclude with a recommendation for support or non-support for promotion. The report should be extensive, detailed and thorough, as it is the primary basis upon which others will form their judgments. No vote will be taken at this time. The Peer Review Committee will function as a fact-finding and evaluation committee. The document may include a minority report; however, all Peer Review Committee members sign a single document (report). The Peer Review Committee report will be given to the division chairperson.

c. The division chairperson will make the candidate's dossier, including the Peer Review Committee report, available to all faculty members within the division who hold “rank above” the candidate. This group, the Division Status Committee, must have a chairperson who is selected according to procedures established by the division. After reading the materials in the dossier, all faculty members holding “rank above” the candidate will be invited to meet and discuss the case. They will vote by secret ballot and the result of this vote is recorded in a report written by the chairperson of the Division Status Committee. The report should provide a summary of the discussion of the case by the members at the committee meeting. If there is disagreement, an effort should be made to represent the range of opinion to the satisfaction of all. If that is not possible, dissenting statements may be appended. The signature of the committee chair
affirms that all faculty members who were in attendance had an opportunity to read the final version.

If the Peer Review Committee members are members of this division, they have the right to vote at the division level, as they did not vote as members of the Peer Review Committee, since the Peer Review Committee is a recommending body. (As in all promotion votes, the principle of "rank above" must apply.) Division Status Committee members who are also members of the Campus Status Committee but are not Peer Review Committee members may participate in the divisional discussions, but their votes are cast only at the Campus Status Committee. Division Status Committee members who are members of the Campus Status Committee and are Peer Review Committee members may cast their votes only at the Division level. (This is because it would be inappropriate for an individual to review his/her own report.) The Division Status Committee report is sent to the division chairperson who puts it into the dossier.

d. The division chairperson—in addition to his/her own comments—will prepare a summary of the Peer Review Committee report and Division Status Committee report in detail without identifying the originator of any comment or recommendation and will conclude with a recommendation for promotion or non-promotion.

e. The division chairperson will discuss his/her recommendation with the candidate and provide the candidate with a copy of the summary letter. In discussing the results of the review with the candidate, the division chairperson does not associate individual reviewers with specific comments. The summary letter is also put into the candidate's dossier and a copy placed in the candidate's file. All copies will be initialed by the candidate as an acknowledgment that the summary letter has been reviewed.

f. At the time established by the Campus Status Committee, the Division Chair, and the Peer Review Committee Chair will appear before the Campus Status Committee to answer questions regarding the material presented and the recommendations. The committee will review the material and ensure that the policies and procedures delineated in this document have been followed, and that uniform standards of excellence as established by Pitt Johnstown and the University are being upheld. A vote is taken and the result of this vote is recorded in a report written by the chairperson of the Campus Status Committee. Committee members who are also Peer Review Committee members may participate in committee discussions but cannot vote. During its review, the committee may request additional information such as clarification from the Division Status Committee chairperson and/or the
Peer Review Committee chairperson. After its review, the committee will forward the materials used in the review and a recommendation to the VPAA. The committee will recommend support or non-support for promotion. The committee will also inform the division chairperson and the candidate when it has made its final recommendation to the VPAA.

g. The VPAA will review the materials and recommendations submitted by the Campus Status Committee. The VPAA will recommend to the Campus President support or non-support for promotion. The VPAA may ask for further information such as clarification from the Campus Status Committee, the Division Chair and/or the Peer Review Committee chairperson. In cases in which the VPAA's recommendation differs from that of the Campus Status Committee, the VPAA will come before the committee to discuss the recommendation prior to submitting it to the Campus president. Following the review, the VPAA will send to the President a recommendation along with all of the materials assembled in the review process. The candidate will be informed of the VPAA's recommendation.

h. The Campus President will review the case and notify the candidate of the recommendation. The President’s recommendation will be sent to the Provost of the University.

**NOTE: Non-support of a recommendation for promotion will not affect the current or any future non-tenure stream contracts.**

VI. PROCEDURES FOR APPEALING DENIAL OF PROMOTION OR REAPPOINTMENT

The general appeal policy and procedure are stated in *University Policies and Procedures: Faculty Review and Appeals, 02-02-10* (http://cfo.pitt.edu/policies/policy/02/02-02-10.html and http://cfo.pitt.edu/policies/procedure/02/02-02-10.html). See, in particular, Section IV.C. of *Procedure 02-02-10*. The Procedure provides for informal means of review and appeal through the division chairperson. The Procedure also provides for formal means of review, which may include requesting a written statement of reasons for the denial, requesting reconsideration from the campus President, appealing to the Provost, and/or appealing to the Chancellor, and which may utilize an Appeals Panel, at the discretion of the Provost, and/or a Hearing Board, at the discretion of the Chancellor. If an appeals panel is constituted at Pitt-Johnstown, it will draw from all tenured faculty according to the “rank above” principle, with the exception of the following: division chairs, VPAA, campus President and faculty who have been involved in the faculty review process at any level. If an Appeals Panel is constituted by the Provost, or a
Hearing Board is constituted by the Chancellor, the process described in Procedure 02-02-10 will be followed.
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