

Faculty Development Policy
Procedures & Policy
Approved by Social Work faculty
April 24, 2015

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	2
<hr/>	
ANNUAL EVALUATION TIMING AND DEADLINES	2
<hr/>	
ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES	3
WEIGHTS	3
EVALUATION OF SERVICE	4
SERVICE RUBRIC	6
ANNUAL EVALUATION: EVALUATION OF TEACHING	8
TEACHING RUBRIC	9
ANNUAL EVALUATION: EVALUATION OF RESEARCH	10
RESEARCH RUBRIC	12
ANNUAL REAPPOINTMENT AND THIRD-YEAR REVIEW OF TENURE TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS	12
POST TENURE REVIEW	13
RENEWAL AND COMPREHENSIVE (TERM) EVALUATION: RANKED RENEWABLE TERM FACULTY MEMBERS	13
<hr/>	
TENURE AND PROMOTION: SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK PROCEDURES	14
<hr/>	
GENERAL TIMELINE FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCESS	14
TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCESS IN THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK- TENURE TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS	15
CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION: TENURE TRACK FACULTY MEMBERS	16
PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR	18
PROMOTION PROCESS IN THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK- RANKED RENEWABLE TERM FACULTY MEMBERS	19
CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION: RANKED RENEWABLE TERM FACULTY MEMBERS	20

Introduction

The mission of the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work is to advance relevant and high quality knowledge and values of social work practice useful in preparing competent social workers who can elevate the status of people, populations or communities that experience considerable vulnerability and injustice within Oklahoma and the broader society. This mission is central to what faculty do every day. To this end the School offers two degree programs: the undergraduate major in social work leading to Bachelor of Arts and a graduate program leading to Master of Social work. The mission and goals of the School are consistent with the goals of professional social work education and with those of the University of Oklahoma.

The mission statement of the School is the nexus for the School's activities and is the standard against which the School's success is evaluated. The Faculty Evaluation and Development: Policy and Procedures document emanates from the mission statement.

Faculty member development and evaluation are part of a continuum. Leadership and responsibility for both of these activities rests with the Director and Committee A. Consistent with our focus on goals and goal attainment, all faculty, are required to formulate workload annual plans that help to guide the preparation of materials for annual evaluation and tenure and/or promotion. Annual workload plans constitute a formalized tool designed to help faculty plan for successful academic careers and to help the School meet its goals. Plans are updated annually. The plans are not rigid and inviolate, but rather convey a thoughtful, planned series of activities that is understood, endorsed and supported by the School. Senior faculty members are also encouraged to mentor untenured faculty in research activities. Mentoring may range from inclusion on projects and scholarly work to consultation and advice. Goals, feedback and support are necessary ingredients to effectiveness. The School's Faculty Evaluation and Development: Policy and Procedures document seeks to explain the formal process for feedback and evaluation of faculty in the School.

The School's evaluation and development process will adhere to the procedures, policies, and intent of the Faculty Handbook. Faculty are to be familiar with this Handbook, in with the content of Section 3 "Faculty Policies and Information." Evaluation of faculty performance is carried out by Committee A.

The importance of direct (face-to-face, if possible) communication in faculty evaluation and development is recognized. As such, individual faculty are encouraged to request to meet with Committee A for evaluation or faculty development issues. In the same vein, Committee A is encouraged to request to meet directly with faculty members about any concerns or questions. These meetings are encouraged both during the formal evaluation period and at other times in the year.

Annual Evaluation Timing and Deadlines

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty*			
	Due Dates	Notification & Preparation	Process
Annual Evaluation	Based on calendar year, due mid-January of each year	Faculty notified in December regarding submission of materials, materials reviewed by Committee A & Committee A completes evaluation.	All assistant professors, meet with Committee A, associate/full professors can request meeting. Annual workload meetings follow Committee A evaluations. Final evaluation (CAS form) sent to Dean (candidates should retain their annual evaluation).
Renewable Term Faculty (ranked & unranked)			
Annual Evaluation	Based on calendar year, due mid-January of each year	Faculty notified in December regarding	All renewable term faculty (ranked & unranked)

		submission of materials, materials reviewed by Committee A & Committee A completes evaluation.	members meet with Committee A. Annual workload meetings follow Committee A evaluations. Final evaluation (CAS form) sent to Dean (candidates should retain their annual evaluation).
--	--	--	--

**Assistant professors (tenure track) are also provided with a Progress toward tenure letter annually. This letter is described later in this document in a later section.*

Annual Evaluation Procedures

The annual evaluation period is the calendar year. Annual Evaluation of faculty performance is carried out by the School’s Committee A. It is the responsibility of faculty members to submit evaluation materials at the appropriate time to Committee A. Committee A assigns scores in each area (teaching, research, and service). These numbers are then multiplied by weights to derive an overall number that is a quantitative summary of performance in the evaluation period. In making annual evaluations, Committee A uses the evaluation form provided by the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). It is recognized that this form may change from year to year. The current form has five rating categories, each of which applies, to all three areas. These categories, ordered from highest to lowest are: outstanding; very good; good, meets expectations, marginal, and unacceptable. These categories and scores correspond to the scoring used on the required annual evaluation form by the College of Arts and Sciences.

Score Range	Label
5.0-4.01	Outstanding
4.0-3.01	Very Good
3.0-2.01	Good, Meets Expectations
2.0-1.01	Marginal
1.0-0.10	Unacceptable

In addition to a quantitative evaluation, Committee A produces a brief narrative summarizing performance. Faculty members who are candidates for tenure and/or promotion should recognize that annual evaluations, decisions to reappoint (or not to do so) for another year, and tenure and/or promotion decisions are each distinct procedures. In particular, the rating of good, meets expectations at annual evaluation will not guarantee a favorable recommendation on tenure and/or promotion. Annual evaluation, particularly in the area of research, is designed to promote and award pipeline of research products, candidates for tenure and promotion should be aware that publications are required for tenure and promotion.

At the end of the calendar year, the Director notifies all faculty members of the deadlines and requirements for annual evaluation. Faculty members should follow these instructions and submit all required materials in a timely manner. This generally includes: entering data into the Faculty Activity System (FAS), Mini-Vita, an updated error-free CV, an activity report, and other supporting documents as requested. Committee A reviews these materials and provides an evaluation to each faculty member. All untenured faculty members are required to meet with Committee A to review the evaluation. Associate and Full Professors may request a meeting with Committee A.

Weights

As teaching and research are its primary areas of emphasis, faculty members will devote approximately equal resources to each. Thus, about 40% of the faculty member effort will be devoted to teaching and 40% to research. About 20% of effort will be directed to service. These percentages are intended to be guidelines rather than rigidly set standards. They may shift some according to factors such as: 1) the particular talents and interests of faculty members, and 2) the particular demands (needs) in the three areas of teaching, research, and service.

The typical percentages of effort are based on teaching as anchor, where 10% of effort is devoted to each in-load course taught. The other two weights are variable, although the school makes recommendations about efforts in the three categories to be consistent with expectations by position and rank. For example, the service expectations increase as one progresses through the tenure track and ranked and unranked renewable term faculty members typically have a higher service expectation than tenure-track faculty members. Percentage of responsibility allocated to service is typically 10% for tenure seeking faculty and ranges from 20-50% for renewable term faculty and tenured faculty members. Faculty may adjust weights based on teaching releases, administrative responsibilities, research responsibilities or other duties that warrant changes in weights. All tenure track faculty members must develop a teaching track record over the tenure track. Thus, a faculty member on the tenure track cannot *fully* opt out of teaching and instruction even when possessing external funding that could substitute for teaching responsibilities.

Weights affect the annual evaluation numeric summary because performances in each area (teaching, research, and service) are multiplied by these weights. Weights should also be considered in making evaluative judgments. For instance, suppose that two faculty members produce identical research products in a given year but that weights in research differ. In this situation, the faculty member with the *lower* weight in research should garner the higher rating in this area because the same work was accomplished even though a lower proportion of total effort (as indicated by the lower weight) was directed towards research. This same principle applies to teaching and service ratings. Weights should reflect actual work responsibilities. Where a request for non-standard weights is made, the Director and Committee A will negotiate with the individual faculty member regarding responsibilities and assignments.

The following chart reflects the allowable weights for teaching, research and service within the school.

	Service	Teaching	Scholarship
Tenure track, years 1-3	10%	40%	50%
Tenure track, years 4-5	10-20%	30-40%	40-50%
Tenure track, associate professor	20%	30-50%	30-50%
Tenure track, full professor	20%	30-50%	30-50%
Ranked Renewable term, clinical assistant	20%	70-80%	0-20%
Ranked Renewable term, clinical associate	20%	70-80%	0-20%
Ranked Renewable term, clinical full	20%	70-80%	0-20%
Unranked Renewable term	20-30%	70-80%	N/A

**Note, any faculty members with administrative roles (add 10-20% onto service weight)*

All weights (percentages) must sum to 100. Committee A will support requests for weights other than the standard weights only where such weights do not adversely affect the School's ability to carry out its mission. The assignment of non-standard weights in a given year does not guarantee that these are extended into the next. Changes in School needs or, perhaps, a request for non-standard weights by another faculty are factors that might need to be considered. Faculty requesting a change in weights must make a written request to Committee A by the end of a particular semester. The Director and or Committee A will work with tenure track faculty members to realign weights and workloads in the event of a change in their academic duties. Any changes in distribution must be approved by the Dean.

Evaluation of Service

Service may occur at many different levels, for instance, within the School, the College, the University, the community, the state, nationally, or internationally. There are four areas of service outlined in our annual evaluation: 1) service to the unit, Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work, 2) service to the University and College, 3) service to the profession, and 4) service to the community including human service or other organizations. While no particular level of service is viewed as more important than the other, all faculty members are expected to contribute to the mission of the school through service. Administrative service is distinct and ordinarily such service is carried out by the Director, Assistant Director, program coordinators or by senior faculty members, particularly full or endowed professors. It is recognized that untenured, tenure track faculty members can easily become overly involved in service activities to the detriment, in particular, of research productivity. Therefore, expectations for service are lower for these faculty members than for tenured faculty members.

Service within the four categories: Unit, University/College, Profession, and Community are organized into two major tiers. Tier 1 represents a leadership or major role and Tier 2 represents membership or participation. Tier 1 Leadership activities typically involve chairing committees within the school, college, university, and professional organizations. Leadership may also include planning a conference, editing a journal, developing new community resources, serving on elected or appointed national board, or organizing groups toward advocacy. Tier 2 Membership/Participation activities include active membership/participation on committees within the school, college, university, and professional organizations involves attending each meeting and completing assigned tasks to support the work of the committee outside of the meetings. Additionally, reviewing manuscripts and conference proposals is viewed as Tier 2. The quality of participation is relevant to evaluating service activity. The following further describes activities within the four domains of service.

1. Service to the Unit (AHZSSW)
 - a. Committee/Task Force Chair or membership
 - b. Administration: Continuing Education/Graduate/Undergraduate program area coordination
 - c. Program planning and development
 - d. Authors departmental reports or documents
 - e. Coordinates a special service (e.g. assessment planning)
 - f. Special projects relevant to the School's mission.
 - g. Sponsors a student organization
 - h. Obtain grants to improve programs and curriculum
 - i. Mentors faculty and/or students in significant ways (e.g. Honors program, Fulbright, presentations)
 - j. Supports the strategic plan work
 - k. Continuing education presentation
2. Service to the University/College
 - a. Committee/Task Force Chair or membership
 - b. Serves on Faculty Senate
 - c. Sponsors or presents at faculty seminars
3. Service to the Profession
 - a. Holds office in professional organizations (international, national, state, local)
 - b. Plans a conference or conference chair
 - c. Reviews conference proposals
 - d. Presents or gives invited talks
 - e. Reviewer or editor of a journal
 - f. Consultant to national, state or local agencies
 - g. Service on local, state, national or international commissions, advisory boards or agencies related to the profession
4. Service to the Community
 - a. Serve on agency boards
 - b. Organize fundraising events for local agencies
 - c. Develop new or enhance existing community resources
 - d. Advocacy, social justice or community building work

For those with administrative responsibility, administrative tasks often overlap with School service tasks. For instance, program coordinators typically chair School committees. Given this overlap, administrators are, almost by definition, more involved in school service than are other faculty members unless assigned administrative duties. As such, expectations for such service are higher for those with administrative responsibility than for others. Release time from teaching is also extended to those with administrative service responsibilities. Evaluation weights should reflect the actual balance of work. Administrators are evaluated on their administrative role separately from their service role; however, their administrative score is averaged with their service score to create a total score for service. A separate evaluation of the administrator's is conducted and this evaluation will comprise one half of the total service score.

Sources of evidence for documentation of service activities may include but are not limited to the following:

- a. Activities as indicated on activity report, CV and mini vitae
- b. Letters of recognition, appreciation, and awards
- c. Letters of outreach to communities for partnerships
- d. List of committee members from official source (e.g. professional organization website)
- e. Products of committee work showing duties, duration of assignments, accomplishments, completed tasks
- f. Notes or emails describing accomplishments
- g. AHZSSW Committee chair letter
- h. Evaluation of administrative role

The rubric used for the evaluation of service follows:

SERVICE RUBRIC

	Tenured Professor/**Associate & Full Clinical Professor	Assistant Professor/Assistant Clinical Professor/Instructor
4.01-5.0 Outstanding	<p>Unit: Demonstrates outstanding performance through active participation in a broad range of service to the Unit.</p> <p>University/College: Demonstrates outstanding performance through active participation in a broad range of service to the college and university.</p> <p>Profession: Demonstrates outstanding performance through active participation in professional activities.</p> <p>Community: Demonstrates outstanding performance through active participation in community organizations.</p> <p>Of the above, evidence of at 6, high quality activities across any of the four service categories (at least 2 Tier1 and 4 Tier2)*</p>	<p>Unit: Demonstrates outstanding performance through active participation in a broad range of service to the Unit</p> <p>University/College: Demonstrates outstanding performance through active participation in a broad range of service to the college and university</p> <p>Profession: Demonstrates outstanding performance through active participation in professional activities.</p> <p>Community: Demonstrates outstanding performance through active participation in community organizations.</p> <p>Of the above, evidence of at 5, high quality activities across any of the four service categories (at least 1 Tier1 and 4 Tier2)*</p>
3.01 -4.0 Very Good	<p>Unit: Demonstrates very good performance through active participation in a broad range of service to the Unit.</p> <p>University/College: Demonstrates very good performance through active participation in a broad range of service to the college and university.</p> <p>Profession: Demonstrates very good performance through active participation in professional activities.</p> <p>Community: Demonstrates very good performance through active participation in community organizations.</p> <p>Of the above, evidence of at 5, high quality activities across any of the four service categories (at least 2 Tier1 and 3 Tier2)*</p>	<p>Unit: Demonstrates very good performance through active participation in Service to the Unit.</p> <p>University/College: Demonstrates very good performance through active participation in the college and university.</p> <p>Profession: Demonstrates very good performance through active participation in professional activities.</p> <p>Community: Demonstrates very good performance though active participation in community organizations.</p> <p>Of the above, evidence of at 4, high quality activities across any of the four service categories (at least 1 Tier1 and 3 Tier2)*</p>
2.01-3.0 Good, Meets Expectations	<p>Unit: Demonstrates good performance through active participation in a broad range of service to the Unit.</p> <p>University/College: Demonstrates good performance through active participation in a broad range of service to the college and university.</p> <p>Profession: Demonstrates good performance through active participation in professional activities.</p> <p>Community: Demonstrates very good performance through active participation in community organizations.</p>	<p>Unit: Demonstrates good, meets expectations performance through active participation in Service to the Unit.</p> <p>University/College: Demonstrates good, meets expectations performance through participation in minimal college and university service activities.</p> <p>Profession: Demonstrates good, meets expectations performance through membership in professional organizations.</p>

	<p>Of the above, evidence of at 4, high quality activities across any of the four service categories (at least 1 Tier1 and 3 Tier2)</p>	<p>Community: Demonstrates good, meets expectations performance though participation in one or more community organizations.</p> <p>Of the above, evidence of at 3, high quality activities across any of the four service categories (at least 3 Tier2)*</p>
<p>1.01-2 Marginal</p>	<p>Unit: Demonstrates marginal performance through active participation in a broad range of service to the Unit.</p> <p>University/College: Demonstrates marginal performance through active participation in a broad range of service to the college and university.</p> <p>Profession: Demonstrates marginal performance through active participation in professional activities.</p> <p>Community: Demonstrates marginal performance through active participation in community organizations.</p> <p>Of the above, evidence of at 3, high quality activities across any of the four service categories (at least 1 Tier1 and 2 Tier2)*</p>	<p>Unit: Demonstrates marginal performance through minimal participation in Service to the Unit.</p> <p>University/College: Demonstrates marginal performance through no participation in college and university service activities.</p> <p>Profession: Demonstrates marginal performance through membership in professional organizations.</p> <p>Community: Demonstrates marginal performance though participation in community organizations.</p> <p>Of the above, evidence of at 2, high quality activities across any of the four service categories (at least 2 Tier2)*</p>
<p>0-1.0 Unacceptable</p>	<p>Unit: Demonstrates unacceptable performance through poor participation in Service to the Unit.</p> <p>University/College: Demonstrates unacceptable performance through no participation in college and university service activities.</p> <p>Profession: Demonstrates unacceptable performance through membership in no professional organizations.</p> <p>Community: Demonstrates unacceptable performance though participation in no community organizations.</p> <p>Minimal evidence that faculty member is engaged in Tier 1 activities or minimal participation in Tier 2 activities.</p>	<p>Unit: Demonstrates unacceptable performance through poor participation in Service to the Unit.</p> <p>University/College: Demonstrates unacceptable performance through no participation in college and university service activities.</p> <p>Profession: Demonstrates unacceptable performance through membership in no professional organizations.</p> <p>Community: Demonstrates unacceptable performance though participation in no community organizations.</p> <p>Minimal evidence that faculty member is engaged in Tier 1 activities or minimal participation in Tier 2 activities.</p>

* Faculty members with administrative appoints, score on administrative evaluation is one half of total service score. When a faculty member has a large number of Tier 2 activities judged to be of high quality by committee A, this may be considered.

**Expectation for Tenured is National Organizations; Clinical is Local and State Organizations.

Annual Evaluation: Evaluation of Teaching

The School seeks faculty members who are committed to teaching and to fostering a spirit of intellectual interchange and inquiry. Evaluation of teaching at the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work recognizes the varied contributions faculty members make in instruction. The school recognizes that teaching occurs in multiple contexts across multiple domains and evaluation must account for a varied and nuanced account of individual teaching contributions. Teaching evaluation includes the following domains: (1) Classroom Instruction, (2) Field Liaison Quality, (3) Curriculum and Instructional Development & Mentorship (4) Advising and (5) Theses, directed studies & dissertations.

Teaching evaluation domain	Source Document/Source	Score
Classroom Instructional Quality	OU Teaching Evaluation/students Or Evaluation of field practicum coordinator activities/student	Mean score on quantitative items & summary of qualitative comments
	Peer Teaching Evaluation/faculty, peer	Mean of items, comments
Field Liaison Quality	Faculty Field Liaison Evaluation/student	Mean of items
Curriculum and Instructional Development & Mentorship	Activity report, innovation & contributions to teaching mission of school /candidate	Score (0-5) based on narrative in activity report & materials submitted by candidate
Advising Quality	Activity report, number of advisees, summary of activities related to advising, letters from coordinators and other documentation of advisement activities/student	Score (0-5) based on narrative in activity report & materials submitted by candidate
Theses, directed studies and dissertations	Activity report, involvement in student research, dissertation committees, directed studies and other independent study/student	Score (0-5) based on narrative in activity report & materials submitted by candidate

Classroom Instruction. Classroom instruction is defined as instructional planning and delivery, class management and student learning assessment. Sources of evidence for classroom also vary depending on the faculty role. Evaluation of classroom instruction includes 1) OU teaching evaluations including the mean of quantitative evaluation items and summary of qualitative comments and 2) Peer observations of teaching. Note: the school’s tenure and promotion guidelines state that a promotion and/or tenure candidates quantitative scores on key items on CAS teaching evaluation instrument should be at least reasonably close to school and college means. In assessing the student’s quantitative responses, Committee A will consider potential biases. Such biases include: where initial student interest and/or motivation is low, where instructor rigor is high and/or grading standards are demanding. In interpreting qualitative student responses, Committee A will focus on comments pertaining to factors such as those enumerated above in describing characteristics of effective teaching. Peer evaluation is defined as the active involvement of a faculty peer in the development and evolution of the teaching of a colleague. Evaluation of field practicum coordinators includes evaluation of practicum planning sessions, orientation and advisement sessions pertaining to field and peer evaluations of instruction within these contexts.

Field Liaison Quality. The faculty liaison role is defined as faculty member who acts as co-educator with the field instructor, and who has responsibility for assisting students with linking practicum activities to program competency requirements; and, for maintaining academic oversight and a continuing relationship with the practicum setting, field instructor, and student throughout the course of the practicum placement. Sources of evidence of field liaison quality include student quantitative and qualitative evaluations of the faculty field liaison role. Evidence may also include letters from the field practicum coordinator, administrators, faculty members, community members or activities documented in the annual activity report.

Curriculum and Instructional Development & Mentorship. Sources of evidence of curriculum and instructional development and mentorship include documentation of activities on the annual activity report related to the teaching mission of the school. These may include participation and leadership in activities related to curriculum development, change and evaluation, mentorship of junior or community faculty instructors, conducting peer evaluations, developing new courses, faculty development in teaching, development of experiential activities, service learning or assignments, and technical assistance sessions related to teaching. This may also include contributions to the teaching mission in terms of individual teaching scope (i.e. teaching across foundation and concentration year, teaching both undergraduate and graduate students, teaching or developing new elective courses).

Advising Quality. Advising is viewed as important to the teaching mission of the school. Sources of advisement quality will come from the activity report that lists the number of advisees and significant related activities related to advisement and faculty member explanation of involvement in these activities. Letters of support from coordinators may also be considered.

Theses, directed readings, dissertations. Sources of evidence for theses, directed studies and dissertations will come from the activity report and faculty member explanation of involvement in these activities. This may include a list of student committees on which the faculty member has served, evidence of presentation and publication with students, and dissertations chaired.

The rubric used for the evaluation of teaching follows.

TEACHING RUBRIC

	Tenured Professor/Associate & Full Clinical Professor	Assistant Professor/Assistant Clinical Professor/Instructor
4.01-5.0 Outstanding	Faculty member is rated as outstanding in the areas of: Instruction in the classroom, field and in advisement and has made at least four contributions rated as outstanding in any of the areas of Curriculum and Instructional Development & Mentorship, or theses, directed readings and/or dissertations categories.	Faculty member is rated as outstanding in the areas of: Instruction in the classroom, field and in advisement and has made at least three contributions rated as outstanding in any of the areas of Curriculum and Instructional Development & Mentorship, or theses, directed readings and/or dissertations categories.
3.01 -4.0 Very Good	Faculty member is rated as very good in the areas of: instruction in the classroom, field instruction/liaison, advisement, and has made at least three contributions rated as very good in the any of the areas of Curriculum and Instructional Development & Mentorship, or theses, directed readings and dissertations	Faculty member is rated as very good in the areas of: instruction in the classroom, field instruction/liaison, advisement, and has made at least two contributions rated as very good in the area of Curriculum and Instructional Development & Mentorship, or theses, directed readings and dissertations.
2.01-3.0 Good, Meets Expectations	Faculty member is rated as good in the areas of: instruction in the classroom, field instruction/liaison, and advisement and has made at least two contributions rated as good in any of the areas of Curriculum and Instructional Development & Mentorship, or theses, directed readings and dissertations.	Faculty member is rated as good in the areas of: instruction in the classroom, field instruction/liaison, and advisement and has made at least one contribution rated as good in the area of Curriculum and Instructional Development & Mentorship, or theses, directed readings and dissertations.
1.01-2 Marginal	Faculty member is rated as marginal in the areas of instruction in the classroom, field instruction/liaison and advisement. Evidence suggests that the faculty member requires some development in the area of classroom instruction and/or source documents reveal that faculty member is not fulfilling expectations for advisement or faculty liaison.	Faculty member is rated as marginal in the areas of instruction in the classroom, field instruction/liaison and advisement. Evidence suggests that the faculty member requires some development in the area of classroom instruction and/or source documents reveal that faculty member is not fulfilling expectations for advisement or faculty liaison.
0-1.0 Unacceptable	Source documents indicate that faculty member remains unable to improve classroom instruction	Source documents indicate that faculty member remains unable to improve classroom instruction (and measures

	(and measures of instruction - student evaluations, peer evaluation of teaching) do not indicate improvement after one year and/or source document that faculty member is not fulfilling expectations for advisement or faculty liaison.*	of instruction - student evaluations, peer evaluation of teaching) do not indicate improvement after one year and/or source document that faculty member is not fulfilling expectations for advisement or faculty liaison.*
--	---	---

*Note: in the first year that instructional concerns are noted, faculty member will receive a rating of marginal, in subsequent years, if improvement is not made, score will be adjusted lower

Annual Evaluation: Evaluation of Research

Research is conceptualized broadly, and is better described by the term *scholarship*. It is recognized that scholarly work may advance theory, empirical knowledge, social policy, and/or social work practice. Contributions in all of these areas are viewed as vitally and equally important. The term research can be further expanded to encompass *creative activity*. For instance, the development of a highly innovative computer software program or of a pioneering practice intervention model may be considered in the research area. The School encourages collaboration among faculty members on research projects and seeks to develop a climate supportive of research and creative activity. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches are encouraged.

Though research is conceptualized broadly, scholarly publication remains the key mechanism for evaluation in this area. Scholarship products are divided into two tiers. Products in Tier 1 are more highly rated than Tier 2. Further, in evaluating these activities, Committee A will consider factors such as: quality and prestige of journal/publisher; sole versus lead versus co-authorship; the candidate's role in the work product; the pertinence of the work to social work; scientific and/or scholarly sophistication and rigor; evidence of interdisciplinary collaborations; senior collaboration with junior faculty members; whether presentation was original research/intervention vs. review of literature, etc. For example, although a new edition of a book is in Tier 1, books reporting research findings have a higher standing than textbooks and edited books have a lower standing than non-edited books. Junior faculty members are encouraged to focus on Tier 1 products.

It is recognized that scholarly work in some areas may be more difficult to publish in "traditional," high prestige journals than work in other areas. And, open source publishing is valued equally as long as the quality of the journal or outlet is well established by its peer-reviewed status, standing in the profession, and impact factors. Though credit is given for evidence of ongoing progress in scholarship -- for instance, the submission of a paper for review in a peer-reviewed journal, substantial progress on a book, etc. -- predominant credit accrues in the year of publication.

Faculty members are encouraged to seek financial support for their research and will receive recognition for their effort, products, and the achievement of funding. Grants from external sources, in general, will be evaluated more favorably than those from internal (University sources). Externally funded grants with a strong research and knowledge building focus hold more status than contracts for the provision of services, technical assistance, or training. Ordinarily, greater credit is given to larger grants (in terms of dollars) than to smaller ones. While to some degree an end in themselves, research grants are viewed largely as a route to a product, that product being the published paper or manuscript. It is recognized that availability of funding varies in different areas. This may be considered in evaluative decisions. More credit will ordinarily be extended to a funded grant than to an unfunded grant application. Yet, because grant solicitation is encouraged, some credit will be given to application, even if unsuccessful. Where a grant extends across more than one calendar year, greatest credit will be given in the year of receipt of the grant.

Scholarly Product Tiers

Tier 1 Scholarly Product	Tier 2 Scholarly Products
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invited peer-reviewed published papers • Publication of chapter in peer-reviewed book • Publication of a peer-reviewed Journal article • Publication of peer-reviewed research monograph • Publication of a new edition of a book • Funding of external research grant (first year only), any amount • Training grants/program development grants > \$50,000 • Receipt of a scholarly award • Presentation at national and international: peer-reviewed paper, workshop, symposia, poster-session, etc., at an acceptable academic, professional, or pedagogical conference or meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of manuscript to peer-reviewed or editorial board reviewed journal • Submission of new book to publisher • Submission of paper to peer-reviewed academic, professional, or pedagogical meeting • Submission of an external research grant proposal • Training grants/program development < \$50,000 • Funding of an internal grant • Non-refereed published papers or book chapters • Publication of book review in peer-reviewed journal • Publication of editorials or research comments in professional or academic publication. • Reviewer or editorial board member on peer-reviewed journal • Instructor’s manual • Research report/technical monograph • Book revision • Publication of instructional software/computer program/non-print media/therapeutic games or interventions • Externally-funded research grant (second year and on) • Write a decision case and or teaching note to be used in DP seminar course • Training grants/program development grants > \$50,000 (second year and on)

Notes:

- Other activities may count as Tier 1 or Tier 2 activities, as approved by Committee A.
- The maximum credit for publications is two: one for submission (Tier 2), one for the year published or in press in (Tier 1).
- The primary credit for a funded grant is in year one but multiple year grants can be counted as Tier 2 activities after the first year.
- While the volume of activity will be used to assess faculty performance, committee A will also have the flexibility to adjust for factors such as quality, authorship within the category.
- Also, while the annual evaluation process includes an explicit attempt to award ‘pipeline’ activities (submitted publications, grants), for the purposes of tenure and promotion the expectation will be for publications in print or funded grant proposals.

The following is the rubric used to evaluate research:

RESEARCH RUBRIC

	Tenured Professor	Assistant Professor/All Ranked Clinical Professors/Instructor**
4.01-5.0 Outstanding	Associate/Full Professor Provides evidence of three Tier 1 products and 3 or more Tier 2 products.	Assistant Professor Provides evidence of three Tier 1 products and 3 or more Tier 2 products. Assistant/Associate/Full Clinical Professor: Provides evidence of one Tier 1 and one or more Tier 2 products.
3.01 -4.0 Very Good	Associate/Full Professor Provides evidence of two Tier 1 products and 2 or more Tier 2 products.	Assistant Professor Provides evidence of two Tier 1 products and 2 or more Tier 2 products. Assistant/Associate/Full Clinical Professor: Provides evidence of one Tier 1 OR 2 or more Tier 2 products.
2.01-3.0 Good, Meets Expectations	Associate/Full Professor Provides evidence of one Tier 1 products and 1 or more Tier 2 products.	Assistant Professor Provides evidence of one Tier 1 product and one Tier 2 products. Assistant/Associate/Full Clinical Professor: Provides evidence at least one Tier 2 product.
1.01-2 Marginal	Associate/Full Professor Provides evidence of two or more Tier 2 products. ***	Assistant Professor Provides evidence of at least One Tier 2 product. Assistant/Associate/Full Clinical Professor: Provides evidence of at least one Tier 1 or Tier 2 product that is in progress.
0-1.0 Unacceptable	Minimal evidence of scholarly activity.***	Assistant Professor Minimal evidence of scholarly activity. Assistant/Associate/Full Clinical Professor Minimal evidence of scholarly activity.

* Committee A may adjust scores based on quality factors relating to scholarship such as primary authorship, quality of journals, evidence of interdisciplinary collaborations, senior faculty collaboration with junior faculty members, whether presentation was original research/intervention vs. review of literature, etc.

** Renewable term or instructors may not have weights in research. Absence of activity does not equal the unacceptable rating; this would only be the case if the faculty member chose to have a research weight for the academic year in which the evaluation was conducted.

*** Two consecutive years at this level for tenured senior faculty may result in an increased teaching load of one courses/academic year.

Annual Reappointment and Third-Year Review of Tenure Track Faculty Members

Each year during the probationary appointment, Committee A makes a recommendation to the Director regarding whether the candidate for tenure should be reappointed for another year. The primary consideration in this recommendation is whether adequate progress towards tenure is being made. (The typical probationary period last six years.) While annually each faculty member on the tenure track is evaluated for performance, this evaluation must be consistent with the content of the Progress toward Tenure Letter. This letter is tailored to the performance of the faculty members in relationship to the expectations and standards guiding tenure and promotion. The letter shall identify the overall progress the faculty member is making, communicate Committee A’s concerns about progress, identify specific areas of progress, and detail those areas the faculty member on the tenure track should undertake in the coming year. The Progress toward Tenure Letter shall also review previous performance and the status of the

faculty member's resolution of past concerns. Thus a faculty member's annual evaluation is consistent with the Progress toward Tenure Letter.

The College of Arts and Sciences requires that the progress toward tenure letter for all tenure-track faculty members in their third year represents a comprehensive review of their progress toward tenure. This review takes place in the spring. For faculty members on a shortened probationary period, the third-year review should be conducted at the mid-point of the probationary period. The review should result in a thorough evaluation by Committee A of the faculty member's cumulative teaching, research/creative activity and service, including a summary of the previous annual evaluations and reports on any classroom visits made by members of the faculty for the purpose of evaluating teaching.

Committee A and the Director are responsible for informing the candidate of the third review dossier requirements and relevant timelines. For the third-year review, the candidate submits a comprehensive dossier documenting work completed and achievements in the areas of research and scholarship, teaching and instruction, and service. This includes: annual reviews, reappointment letters, the candidate's research, service and teaching statement, quantitative teaching evaluations, and scholarly work. All of these materials will be available for review by tenured faculty members. As part of the third-year review, Committee A solicits input from tenured faculty members. Progress-toward-Tenure Letters serve a central purpose in assessing the candidate's performance over the first half of the probationary period and providing feedback to tenure track faculty members on cumulative progress toward tenure. If the faculty candidate is not making adequate progress, the candidate should meet with Committee A to develop a performance improvement plan.

Post Tenure Review

Post tenure review is a periodic and peer-based evaluation of tenured faculty members. The purpose is to guide career development and if necessary, support faculty members in the development of a professional development plan. The Post Tenure Review follows the procedures and policies in the OU Faculty Handbook and includes: (1) a retrospective review of faculty member performance in teaching, research and service over the five years preceding the review and (2) a formative evaluation for future professional growth. Post tenure reviews are initiated immediately following the completion of the annual evaluation process. The Office of the senior Vice President and Provost identifies annually the faculty members who must undergo the post tenure review and publish the deadlines and time frame for completing the review. Committee A completes the post tenure review evaluation and the OU Faculty handbook includes all of the elements required for the post tenure review dossier.

The OU faculty handbook indicates that faculty members are expected to perform in all categories of the annual evaluation and achieve a composition evaluation of 2.01 or higher on the scale used for evaluation. The criteria are based on the evaluation criteria highlighted in the policy. When the faculty member evaluation indicates performance below expectations, the faculty member is instructed to develop a professional development plan. The deadlines and components of this plan are highlighted in the OU Faculty handbook and deadlines are provided annually by the Office of the Provost.

Renewal and Comprehensive (Term) Evaluation: Ranked Renewable Term Faculty Members

Term faculty members shall be evaluated annually as part of the process applicable to all faculty members, using criteria listed in this document and as specified in the Faculty Handbook section 3.11. The renewal decision will be accomplished by the same procedure employed for tenure-track faculty members in their probationary period. The faculty member will be notified of the Department's recommendation of annual renewal or non-renewal no later than March 1. During the final year of the term, and prior to notifying the faculty member whether or not he/she will be reappointed to a subsequent term, the faculty member will receive a comprehensive evaluation of his/her performance during the entire term. The faculty member will be notified of the Department's recommendation of term renewal or non-renewal no later

than March 1 of the final year of the term. The Director will accomplish consideration of annual or term renewal, with recommendations from Committee A.

Term faculty members also are eligible for promotion using procedures and criteria in this document and as specified in the *Faculty Handbook*. To be considered for promotion to the rank of Lecturer or Assistant Professor, the candidate must have completed a doctoral degree in a field appropriately related to the programs and needs of the School of Social Work.

Tenure and Promotion: School of Social Work Procedures

General Timeline for Tenure and Promotion Process

Each year the Provost and CAS offices release memos that specify specific dates for submission of materials. This guide below is intended as a general guide for timelines to aid faculty member preparation. All faculty members are responsible for following the Provost and CAS approved dates for submission issued by the Office of the Provost, CAS and as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Tenure Track Faculty members			
	Timing	Preparation	Process
Progress toward tenure letters (PTT)	Provided to tenure track faculty every spring in the years leading to tenure	Committee A & Director write letter based on cumulative performance	Director & Committee A provides letter to candidate, Dean & Provost
Third Year Review	Spring semester of third year of tenure track	Candidate prepares dossier for review by tenured faculty, Tenured faculty provided with CV, brief statements of teaching, research & service & asked for feedback	Director solicits input from tenured faculty, Committee A provides letter to candidate, Dean & Provost
Tenure and Promotion, Assistant to Associate Professor	Spring of the 5 th year of appointment, unless candidate has negotiated different timeline at hire	Candidate prepares dossier for external review, process follows Provost approved tenure and promotion timelines and guidelines, school timeline (appendix a)	Director & Committee A works with candidate to assemble dossier, Committee A and Director provide required letters
Promotion, Associate to Full Professor	In negotiation with Committee A, candidate determines timing for promotion decision	Candidate prepares dossier for external review, process follows Provost approved tenure and promotion timelines and guidelines, school timeline (appendix a)	Director & Committee A works with candidate to assemble dossier, Committee A and Director provide required letters
Post tenure review	Occurs every five years after initial tenure decision	Process follows Provost approved tenure and promotion timelines and guidelines	Director & Committee A works with candidate to assemble dossier, Committee A provides assessment
Renewable Term Faculty (ranked & unranked)			

Term or comprehensive evaluation	Occurs every three years.	Committee A prepares the evaluation & submits to faculty and Provost	Director & Committee A sends letter to candidate, Dean & Provost
Promotion	Timeline depends on record of candidate & preparation for promotion. Promotion plans are discussed in Committee A meeting with individual faculty.	Process follows Provost approved promotion timelines and guidelines	Director & Committee A works with candidate to assemble dossier, Committee A and Director provide letters regarding recommendation

Tenure and Promotion Process in the School of Social Work– Tenure Track Faculty members

The general principles for teaching, research and service outlined in this document apply. Weights should be taken into account but not to the extent that they override basic tenure or promotion expectations. Presuming standard weights for assistant professors (40% teaching, 50% research, and 10% service), service is considered in the decisions but as a secondary factor and accomplishment in teaching and research are the primary considerations in the tenure decision and in the decisions to promote to Associate Professor or Professor. Again, Faculty members who are candidates for tenure and/or promotion should recognize that annual evaluations, decisions to reappoint (or not to do so) for another year, and tenure and/or promotion decisions are distinct procedures. In particular, annual evaluation in the good, meets expectations does not guarantee a favorable recommendation on tenure and/or promotion, since very good is the standard for tenure and promotion. For faculty members hired at the Assistant Professor rank, the decision to award tenure and the decision to promote to associate are based on the same standards and requirements. Thus (for those at the Assistant Professor rank), all comments in this document that pertain to the tenure decision also pertain to promotion to Associate Professor.

External review. For both the tenure and promotion decisions, the candidate’s research/scholarship is sent to at least six scholars outside of the University. Though the candidate may suggest names, primary responsibility for the selection of external reviewers rests with Committee A. The candidate and Committee A develop a list of potential reviewers. The reviewers should be experts in the candidate’s field and should not be closely associated with the candidate on a personal or scholarly basis. Both lists are submitted to the Director, and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences approves both lists prior to contacting potential reviewers. The letter sent to the external reviewers should include all of the required language from the Office of the Provost.

Reviewers are asked to evaluate the candidate’s research record, to assess the record against norms emanating from their own institution, and to recommend whether that record would earn tenure and/or promotion at their own institution. The letters of external reviewers are viewed as a key source of information for both decisions. The following is a list of the documents that are sent to external reviewers by the school:

1. Up to date, error free, CV
2. Copies of publications (PDF format when available)
3. Statement of teaching, service and research. The teaching statement should include a summary of the quantitative scores and a list of courses taught by the candidate.
4. Copy of the school’s tenure and evaluation standards.

The Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost publishes the deadlines and requirements of the dossier each year. Candidates are encouraged to familiarize themselves with all deadlines and requirements and when offered, attend the available workshops for faculty members on the process and dossier requirements. The general timing and guidelines for the assembly of the dossier are highlighted in Appendix A: Social Work Internal Tenure and Promotion Timeline and Checklist and a recommended format for the construction of the external reviewer lists are included in Appendix B.

The candidate, with assistance from the Director, has primary responsibility for developing the dossier. The candidate and Director should work jointly to assure that it is developed in a timely fashion and in accord with College and University guidelines. All tenured faculty vote in the tenure decision. Only Full Professors vote in the decision to promote to Full Professor. The Director is responsible for notifying all eligible faculty members when the dossier is available for review (a minimum of two weeks prior to the vote), setting a meeting for the discussion of tenure/promotion, conducting the voting for tenure/promotion, and notifying the candidate verbally of the school vote, if requested by the candidate.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion: Tenure Track Faculty members

Decisions resulting in tenure and promotion are perhaps the most critical to the school and university as well as a faculty member. Tenure and promotion represent two different benchmarks for tenure track faculty members. First, promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor coincides with the tenure decision recognizes the contributions a faculty member has made across the tenure track. Thus, becoming an Associate Professor indicates the achievement of those requisite standards indicative of promotion to a senior status within the school. Thus, the award of promotion reflects both productivity and performance across the tenure track.

Alternatively, the award of tenure involves an institutional decision concerning the anticipated and continued productivity and performance after a faculty member earns tenure. It reflects a decision of confidence the institution invests in the faculty member mindful that continued performance and productivity is necessary to advance the standing of the university and the school. The institution looks to the peer review process to determine whether a faculty member deserves the award of tenure. From the standpoint of the institutional award of tenure as a relatively permanent recognition of the merit and worth of a faculty member's contributions, the Anne and Henry Zarrow School of Social Work assumes that faculty members will continue their work at a high level of productivity and performance mindful that each faculty member receiving tenure should uphold the implicit contract with the university: that faculty members who are tenured will achieve those expectations annually consistent with their current rank, whether that is at the level of Associate or Professor. The appraisal of the extent to which a faculty member fulfills or meets that expectation is embodied annually in the annual review and every five years through the completion of the process of post-tenure review and assessment.

Normally the productivity, performance and quality of a faculty member's work during the tenure track should mature fairly rapidly and be indicative of the following five expectations. At the time a faculty member completes the tenure track the successful award of promotion and tenure is consistent with the following six expectations:

1. Research and scholarly work meets expectations reflective of a research-focused school of social work ranked nationally in institutions comparable to the University of Oklahoma. There is a record of scholarly productivity that includes a range of 10-15 high quality scholarly publications.
2. The faculty member's engagement in research and scholarly work is consistent across the tenure track and the products of this engagement are visible by the end of the third year of the tenure track.
3. Teaching effectiveness as defined by the school's internal standards and reflects consistency, quality, productivity, and innovation measured by factors outlined in the annual evaluation that is very good with evidence of continual improvement.
4. Service is sound and reflective of the faculty member's commitment to the advancement of the school's capacity, infrastructure, and/or effectiveness.
5. Service to the advancement of the college, university or profession is visible in the faculty member's portfolio.
6. The faculty member's progression of responsibility is visible in workload assignments across the constituent years of the tenure track so that the faculty member's capacity for contributing to a scholarly domain, profession, and school is recognized for its maturation, quality, and centrality to the school's mission.

The six expectations of a faculty member who undertakes the tenure track achieves the following standards in which there is evidence of progression annually as determined by the annual evaluation process and assessment of progress

toward tenure and resulting in reappointment annually in recognition of the substantial progress the faculty member

Expectation	Statements of the Expectation	Standards
1	Research and scholarly work meets expectations reflective of a research-focused school of social work ranked nationally in institutions comparable to the University of Oklahoma. There is a record of scholarly productivity that includes a range of 10-15 (for tenure and promotion to associate) & 20-30 (for promotion to professor) high quality scholarly publications.	The faculty member's research and external funding record reflects (a) inquiry or scholarly work focusing on a substantive area of social work, (b) publication in peer reviewed journals of high standing, (c) presentations at conference forums that are peer reviewed and recognized by the social work research community as possessing high standing, (d) funding through internal, local, community and national public or foundations sources.
2	The faculty member's engagement in research and scholarly work consistently scores as very good across the tenure track and the products of this engagement are visible by the end of the third year of the tenure track.	Annually a faculty member on the tenure track offers a growing body of scholarly work indicative of high productivity during the probationary period, of high quality, and of promising future impact on the profession of social work.
3	Teaching effectiveness as defined by the school's internal standards and reflects consistency, quality, productivity, and innovation measured by factors outlined in the annual evaluation that is very good with evidence of continual improvement.	The faculty member achieves high quality in teaching as measured by the items used to measure teaching in which majority of the items indicate very good performance in classroom teaching and good contributions to the teaching mission of the school.
4	Service is sound and reflective of the faculty member's commitment to the advancement of the school's capacity, infrastructure, and/or effectiveness.	There is evidence after the third year of the tenure track that the faculty member is undertaking service assignments in the school that are meaningful and that contribute centrally to the school's attainment of its mission.
5	Service to the advancement of the College, University or profession is visible in the faculty member's portfolio.	There is evidence after the third year of the tenure track that the faculty member is contributing to the advancement of the College, University or social work profession in ways that are meaningful, within the faculty member's central domain of knowledge building.
6	The faculty member's progression of responsibility is visible in workload assignments across the constituent years of the tenure track so that the faculty member's capacity for contributing to a scholarly domain, profession, and school is recognized for its maturation, quality, and centrality to the school's mission.	There is evidence for an expanding scope of performance on part of the faculty member across each year of the tenure track such that there is a critical mass of scholarship, teaching, and service from which to judge productivity

is making in the achievement of tenure and promotion.

The tenure decision ordinarily takes place during the candidate's sixth year although a shortened tenure consideration period may be granted with permission of the Provost. The decision-making criteria follow and can involve the full scope of the candidate's academic career:

1. The extent to which the faculty member has achieved expectations 1 and 2 and related standards pertaining to research and scholarship.
2. The extent to which the faculty member has achieved expectations 3 and related standards pertaining to teaching and instruction.

3. The extent to which the faculty member has achieved expectations 4 and 5 and related standards pertaining to service.
4. The extent to which the faculty member has performed consistently and productively across the period of the tenure track.

Promotion to Professor

Just as in the tenure decision, teaching and research are the key factors considered in deciding whether to promote to Professor. The primary requirement for promotion is sustained, high quality work in teaching and research. Exceptional performance in one of these areas may compensate to some degree for lesser performance in the other. Service is a secondary factor. Generally speaking, the standards for teaching are much the same as for the tenure decision. The successful candidate should have a sustained record of strong teaching and should contribute to the intellectual life of the School. The faculty member should demonstrate leadership in the curricular area(s) of their expertise.

The evaluation of research covers the full span of the academic career. Most often, the successful candidate will have attained national recognition and visibility in an area of expertise. The successful candidate should have a sustained record of strong research and publication. In most instances, this record will include substantial publication since the award of tenure (or, if hired with tenure, since the date of hiring). The following are expectations for promotion to professor.

1. Research and scholarly work meets expectations reflective of a research-focused school of social work ranked nationally in institutions comparable to the University of Oklahoma. There is a record of scholarly productivity that includes a range of 20-30 high quality scholarly publications.
2. The faculty member's engagement in research and scholarly work is consistent across the tenure track and the products of this engagement have continued to be visible in the period since promotion to associate professor.
3. Teaching effectiveness as defined by the school's internal standards and reflects consistency, quality, productivity, and innovation measured by factors outlined in the annual evaluation that is very good with evidence of continual improvement.
4. Service is reflective of the faculty member's commitment to the advancement of the school's capacity, infrastructure, and/or effectiveness.
5. Service has increased in scope since promotion to associate and service that demonstrates leadership that advances the college, university or profession is visible in the faculty member's portfolio.

The faculty member's progression of responsibility is visible in workload assignments across the constituent years of the tenure track so that the faculty member's capacity for contributing to a scholarly domain, profession, and school is recognized for its maturation, quality, and centrality to the school's mission

As a general guideline, the successful candidate will have demonstrated a consistent and strong research record including a range of 20-30 publications, presentations, funded research or training grants since tenure award. Candidates for professor may have authored a book with a recognized publisher. When this is the case, a lesser number of other publications may suffice. In most instances, the candidate will have experienced significant success in securing funded research. The absence of such could weaken the candidate's record. Further, when it is the case that a candidates have secured large research grants, a lesser number of publications may suffice.

It is expected that candidates for professor have demonstrated a growing level of service to the school, college, university and profession. Mentorship and support of newer faculty members and effective collaboration with faculty are distinct assets. A record of strong, sustained service will be viewed positively but will not outweigh the basic requirements in the teaching and research areas.

Promotion Process in the School of Social Work– Ranked Renewable Term faculty members

A ranked renewable term (RRT) faculty member appointment must be renewed annually to remain in effect. The renewal decision shall be accomplished by the same procedures employed for tenure-track faculty member in their probationary period. Annual evaluations are conducted according to the existing rules and procedures of the University, the College of Art & Sciences, and the School of Social Work. Committee A assesses the individual's performance in the areas of teaching, service, and in knowledge utilization relevant to their service roles, and practice scholarship according to his/her specific distribution of effort.

Consideration of term renewal shall be accomplished as follows: At the beginning of the final year of the term and prior to notifying the faculty member whether or not he/she will be reappointed to a subsequent term, the faculty member will receive a comprehensive and thorough evaluation of his/her performance during the entire term. The process shall begin no later than the start of the semester prior to the last semester of the faculty member's term. The School's Committee A will judge the individual's performance in the areas of teaching, service, and practice scholarship as described above, according to his/her specific distribution of effort.

Both the annual reappointment process and the term or comprehensive evaluation result in a recommendation from Committee A to the Dean to 1) reappoint, or 2) not reappoint. Though the third-year review process has greater depth than annual reviews, Committee A may recommend not to reappoint in any year where the candidate is judged not to be making adequate progress. The deadlines for notification of non-reappointment of the ranked renewable term faculty member contract follow the guidelines in the OU Faculty Handbook and deadlines are provided annually by the Office of the Provost.

A faculty member's organization of a dossier is integral to judging progress on the road to promotion. Each individual being considered for promotion will assemble a dossier in accordance with directives from the Provost. The promotion dossier is the principal set of documents that a faculty member manages so that those administrators and faculty members charged with responsibilities for assessing progress over the career of the candidate can judge the productivity, quality, and potential impact of a ranked renewable term faculty member's scholarly work, teaching, and service. It is the responsibility of the Director and Committee A to work closely with a faculty member in constructing and refining the required documents that comprise the dossier, which contains the following documents:

1. Up-to-date and error free curriculum vitae
2. Current statement of research and evidence of research performance
3. Current statement of teaching and evidence of teaching performance
4. Current statement of service
5. Copies of comprehensive evaluations
6. Annual evaluations of faculty member performance and progression on the tenure track prepared by Committee A.
7. Other documents as required by the Office of the Provost.

Renewable term faculty members interested in promotion should consult with Committee A and the Director to begin to compile documents and review timing for promotion.

External review. For the decision to promote to Clinical Associate or Clinical Professor, the candidate's research/ scholarship is sent to 5-8 scholars outside of the University. Peer evaluations are those from term or clinical faculty members at other institutions of higher education who possess the rank for which the faculty member is applying and whose appointment is within a research intensive University which has a School of social work, or other research unit of a research university, such as a medical school. Thus, in the case of term faculty member applying for the position of full clinical professor, peer evaluators hold the rank of full clinical professor. Though the candidate may suggest names, primary responsibility for the selection of external reviewers rests with Committee A. The candidate and Committee A develop a list of potential reviewers. Both lists are submitted to the Director and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences approves both lists prior to contacting potential reviewers. The letter sent to the external reviewers should

include all of the required language from the Office of the Provost. The reviewers should be experts in the candidate's field and should not be closely associated with the candidate on a personal basis. Reviewers will be asked to evaluate the candidate's teaching, research and service record, to assess the record against norms emanating from their own institution, and to recommend whether that record would earn promotion at their own institution. The letters of external reviewers are viewed as a key source of information for the promotion decision. The following is a list of the documents that are sent to external reviewers:

1. Up to date and error free CV
2. Copies of publications (PDF format when available)
3. Statement of teaching, service and research. The teaching statement should include a summary of the quantitative scores and a list of courses taught by the candidate.
4. Copy of the school's promotion standards for renewable term faculty members
5. Other documents as required by the Office of the Provost.

Faculty members on renewable term appointments are eligible for promotion and should meet with Committee A to discuss a timeline for promotion. For faculty members seeking promotion to clinical associate professor, eligibility for promotion is no sooner than the end of the second three-year contract. All tenured faculty member and RRTs at associate level are eligible to vote in the promotion decisions of RRT faculty members. The decision to promote from associate to full clinical professor ordinarily can occur at the end of the second three-year contract following the first promotion, although a shortened promotion consideration period may be negotiated between the faculty member, the School, and the College.

Criteria for Promotion: Ranked Renewable Term Faculty members

Ranked renewable term faculty members are eligible for promotion. The purpose of a renewable term faculty member position within the school is to advance practice in a manner consistent with a generalist, advanced generalist, or specialist orientation to social work. A renewable term faculty member engages in teaching but also advances innovative forms of pedagogy, models excellence in practice to faculty, students, practicum instructors, and human service personnel whether they are members of the social work profession or other disciplines, and/or advances particular methods of instruction.

The idea of excellence implicates innovation herein considered the search for, demonstration of, and confirmation of novel or original solutions to challenging situations the social work profession must address in practice. Thus, renewable term faculty members not only engage in multiple forms of teaching but also advance the practice knowledge base and even technology useful to the social work profession. Renewable term faculty members are highly involved in service, particularly effort that involves advancing a field of practice, a particular practice domain, or a particular method or set of methods otherwise involving what the profession may consider as a practice model. Senior renewable term faculty members will offer expertise in particular pedagogical, professional development, and/or practice methods and their work will likely come to be seen as models of practice. This considerable experience translates into a meaningful dossier of expertise in social work pedagogy. A term faculty member may specialize in a particular form of teaching, such as clinical case teaching, or may bring numerous teaching assets to the school in the areas of lecturing, experiential learning, service learning, case oriented pedagogy, project-focused teaching, or collaborative education.

Renewable term faculty members bring a body of practice knowledge to the school that is different in quality than the expertise brought by research-focused faculty members. The school highly values term faculty members and their leadership can impact in positive ways the curriculum, teaching culture, and practice knowledge.

The general principles for the evaluation of renewable term members in the areas of teaching, research and service outlined in this document apply. For renewable term faculty members, the weights for teaching, service and research will vary by assignment and interest. Generally, for renewable term faculty members, research is considered in the decisions but as a secondary factor and accomplishment in teaching and service are the primary considerations in the decision to

promote. Again, faculty members who are candidates for promotion should recognize that annual evaluations, decisions to reappoint (or not to do so) and promotion decisions are distinct procedures. In particular, annual evaluation in the good, meets expectations range does not guarantee a favorable recommendation on promotion.

Renewable faculty members shall be eligible for promotion. Promotion procedures are those applicable to all faculty members as specified in the appropriate section of the University of Oklahoma Faculty Handbook. Promotion does not grant tenure nor guarantee movement to a tenure line; and, the faculty member remains on a renewable term appointment. Evaluation for promotion is based upon the following criteria, which clarify standards of performance and sources of information:

In order to receive promotion, renewable term faculty members must demonstrate excellence in all assigned areas involving teaching and service and, when relevant, practice scholarship or practice research. The involvement of a renewable term faculty member in knowledge translation, dissemination and utilization, the intent of which is to improve or otherwise advance practice as its principal aim, is recognized as an important factor influencing promotion. In assessing these areas, the following points should be considered for the purposes of determining promotion:

Teaching. Includes, 1) a history of very good annual teaching reviews by the department; 2) reviews from varied faculty members whether tenured, tenure track, or clinical indicating excellence, creative and/or innovative approaches to instruction; 3) teaching awards and honors; and 4) the development of internal teaching resources (including study guides, multimedia materials, computer-assisted learning materials, web-based materials) although those materials may achieve the status of publications. The scope of teaching for a term faculty member can be broad and can include classroom based forms of instruction, supervision within practicum settings, advisement for the purposes of supporting students' academic and/or professional development, and supervision of students' projects. For promotion to the higher ranks of associate clinical professor or full clinical professor the demonstration of leadership is an important indicator of the contributions a term faculty member makes to the school's advancement of instruction.

Service. Renewable term faculty members seeking promotion must also demonstrate excellence in their service activities to the department, college, university and/or the profession and/or the community. Service can include involvement in departmental committees, college and university committees, service as an administrator, such as academic program coordination, and service to professional organizations at either local, state, national or international levels. For promotion to the higher ranks of Associate Clinical or Full Clinical Professor the demonstration of leadership in service is an important indicant of the contributions a term faculty member makes to the advancement of practice within the state of Oklahoma and nationally. National presence, service and even impact on practice is a requirement for those term faculty members achieving promotion to the rank of full clinical professor.

Scholarship. While this is not a core requirement of the dossiers of term faculty members it does hold importance for those faculty members who pursue promotion to the higher ranks of clinical standing within the school. Renewable term faculty members may create products of their knowledge development immediately useful to the instructional unit and serve as important resources within the school. Or, renewable term faculty members may create products from their knowledge development that achieve publication through journals, books, book chapters, and conference presentations. Engagement in knowledge development strengthens a renewable term faculty member's case for promotion. It does not, however, supersede nor substitute for a renewable term faculty member's achievement of excellence in teaching and service as principal factors governing the evaluation of the member for promotion. For the renewable term faculty member pursuing promotion to the rank of full clinical professor a strong record of practice scholarship of high quality as determined through peer review by full clinical professors who are faculty members in Research I schools of social work is an important requirement of promotion.

From: "Pulat, Pakize S." <pulat@ou.edu>
Date: Friday, May 13, 2016 at 11:06 AM
To: "Dampousse, Kelly R." <kdamp@ou.edu>
Cc: "Miller Cribbs, Julie E." <jmcribbs@ou.edu>, Kelvin White <kwhite@ou.edu>, "Bird, Megan E." <meganbird@ou.edu>
Subject: Re: SWK T&P policy draft

Dear Kelly,

Thank you. I have approved it on behalf of the Provost and will update our files as the most recent criteria for the School of Social Work. Best,

Simin

From: Dampousse, Kelly R.
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 5:22 PM
To: Pulat, Pakize S.
Cc: Miller Cribbs, Julie E.; White, Kelvin L.
Subject: SWK T&P policy draft

Dear Simin:

I am attaching here a draft of the revised Tenure and Promotion Policy for the Zarrow Family School of Social Work. It is my understanding that you have already commented on a previous draft of the policy.

I have approved the new policy and ask that you let Dr. Miller-Cribbs know if you approve it as well.

Best,

Kelly

Kelly R. Dampousse, PhD
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Presidential Professor of Sociology
633 Elm Avenue, 323 Ellison Hall
University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019
(405) 325-2077
kdamp@ou.edu
@kdamp #WeAreCAS
[One College. Infinite Possibilities.](#)