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## UNIT STANDARDS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION \& POLICY (DPAP)

## INTRODUCTION

The standards and procedures contained in this guide for the Department of Public Administration \& Policy are intended to facilitate the achievement of personal and collective goals within the department. The overriding goals are to achieve excellence in teaching, scholarship, institutional service, and public service activities. The faculty and staff associated with the department seek to build the strongest programs possible in order to promote distinction in public and nonprofit education. To that end, we attempt to provide students with an environment, curriculum, and the faculty and staff resources that will allow each to maximize personal and intellectual growth. To support excellence in scholarship and other professional activities, the department attempts to provide the facilities, environment, and collegial support essential to individual achievement. These unit standards are intended to clarify departmental expectations that relate to pursuit of these overriding goals.

The Department of Public Administration \& Policy (DPAP) shall be guided by standards and procedures set forth in the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) signed between the University Faculty Association and the Montana University System regarding faculty performance and review for recommendations of retention, salary increments, promotions, and tenure. In addition, DPAP standards incorporate NASPAA guidelines to maintain conformity with accreditation.

The bargaining unit includes faculty on academic or fiscal year appointment to the rank of instructor, lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor with appointments that are half-time ( 0.5 FTE) or greater (CBA 3.100). The unit standards and procedures discussed below are intended to be in addition to and consistent with those provided in the current CBA, and in the event of any omissions or inconsistencies, the terms of the CBA shall prevail. A faculty member should consult the CBA for procedures relative to the evaluation process beyond the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and to determine procedural requirements for appeals, according to sections 10.260 through 10.330 of the CBA.
I. Qualifications for DPAP Faculty
a. Faculty members (e.g. tenured, tenure track, untenured, or adjuncts) are required to be either be:
i. Professionally qualified: hold at least a master's level degree in their respective area of expertise (e.g. nonprofit administration, public policy, law/policy, public administration) and have at least 5 years of professional experience related to their teaching and research, maintain a commitment to the public service profession (e.g. trainings, professional development); and/or,
ii. Academically qualified: hold a terminal degree (DA, EdD, PhD, JD) in their respective area of expertise related to their teaching and research.
II. Chair/Directors' Duties and Responsibilities
a. The chairperson/director of DPAP is used interchangeably throughout this document and responsibilities defined below.
b. The chair/director must be a tenured faculty member of the department unless there are extenuating circumstances (e.g. sabbatical, no tenured members are part of the department).
c. The duties of the department chair/director include developing and carrying out leadership goals for the department, in consultation with the other faculty. The chair/director also serves as the official channel of communication between the department and the Dean's office, maintains departmental records, oversees budget/travel, meets administrative deadlines, and so forth. In addition to these duties, DPAP faculty members have other expectations, some of which relate to the manner in which the director administers the unit. These expectations may be summarized as follows:
i. The chair/director is responsible for encouraging discussion to develop faculty decisions for conceptualizing and representing the faculty consensus both within and outside of the department, and for implementing that consensus on a day-to-day basis.
ii. The chair/director is responsible for informing faculty members of what transpires at budget unit leader meetings and for providing information from other meetings that affects them personally or as a unit.
iii. The chair/director is responsible for convening regular faculty meetings and other meetings as they deem necessary or if requested by other faculty; for preparing an agenda-including items proposed by other faculty-for distribution at least two days in advance of the meeting. They also are responsible for distributing final minutes to the faculty, and the Dean.
iv. The chair/director is responsible for convening the departmental committees as needed, for providing whatever documentation is necessary for their deliberations, for facilitating the proper consideration of their recommendations, and for implementing the resulting decisions.
v. The chair/director is responsible for maintaining records and assessment for NASPAA accreditation and providing advising for all students in the MPA Program, overseeing marketing, and community partnerships.
vi. The chair/director is responsible for providing constructive feedback, oversight, career planning, and mentorship for junior faculty and adjuncts.
vii. The chair/director is responsible for conducting teaching observations of junior faculty and adjuncts each semester, providing written and constructive feedback for online and in person courses.
viii. In cooperation with the faculty, the director prepares and revises student program guides, departmental curriculum, information for the website, recruits new students, completes student academic program plans, submits departmental budgets, curricular schedules, and
maintains departmental displays for the advertising of students in all programs in the department.
ix. Works with the Baucus Institute Director and Nonprofit undergraduate minor director to ensure collaborative working relationships.
d. Evaluation of the Department Chairperson/Director (CBA 16.240)

1. The evaluation of the departmental chairperson as a faculty member will occur in accordance with CBA Section 10.000. The procedure for further recommendations and appeal will be the same as that prescribed for other faculty.
2. The administrative performance of departmental chairpersons is subject to review at any time by the dean. The results of any such evaluation of the administrative role of each chairperson will be included in the next normal faculty evaluation according to the procedures of Section 10.000. The evaluation will focus on the chairperson's leadership in meeting the goals of the unit and fulfilling the duties outlined in the CBA Section 16.220

## REVIEW PROCESSES, DOCUMENTATION \& EVALUATION

## III. Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

a. Purpose: provides peer review and evaluation of each member in the unit (tenure and non-tenure track)
b. Composition \& Procedures: Per CBA 10.230 the FEC will include three (3) members of the unit, whom must be tenured or tenurable (i.e. tenure-track) and part the MPA Core Nucleus ${ }^{1}$, and one graduate student observer chosen by the FEC chairperson. The FEC chair is determined annually by a majority vote of the MPA Core Nucleus.
i. The student observer does not supplant the Student Evaluation Committee (SEC); they are not eligible to serve as committee chairperson and shall have no voting rights.

## IV. Student Evaluation Committee (SEC)

a. The Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) shall consist of at least three (3) but not more than seven (7) students who are majors and/or graduate students in the respective unit and shall include one (1) faculty observer who shall enjoy all rights of full participation and access to information except voting. The faculty observer shall be chosen from among the tenured or tenurable (i.e. tenure-track) members of the bargaining unit in the department or unit, and appointed by the department chair/director. The purpose of the SEC is to

[^0]provide a summary of the faculty member's electronic student evaluations as specified in the CBA section 10.220 .
V. Process for Evaluation of Teaching
a. Purpose: It is DPAP policy to evaluate all courses taught by unit faculty (including part-time faculty members).The Department chairperson/director will conduct evaluations of courses taught by faculty with less than 0.5 FTE appointments. Faculty with 0.5 FTE or greater will have their course evaluations included in FEC evaluation, except for courses that may not have statistical significance or without sufficient enrollment where evaluations cannot ensure anonymity of students per CBA 10.220.
i. Student evaluation of the courses shall be accomplished through use of a form to be agreed upon by DPAP faculty and administered through UM Online.
ii. The chair/director and the office administrative staff shall arrange for the distribution of the evaluation instrument with UM Online for each course during the final two weeks of each semester and shall utilize graduate assistants, or parties other than the faculty member offering the course, to secure completion of the electronic forms. However, during the interim and summer sessions, faculty members should arrange for third party evaluations of their courses (through UM Online). Whether during a regular semester or interim/summer terms, the administration of course evaluations shall adhere to the following procedure:
iii. The chair/director shall distribute the results of all course evaluations to departmental faculty following the end of the semester after all course grades have been submitted. The chair/director keeps one of the two summary tabulations for each course and, using those summaries, prepares and distributes to DPAP faculty for a departmental compilation of key evaluation measures for each course taught in the semester. Upon completion of this departmental compilation sheet, the chair/director submits the computer summary of each course evaluation to the Dean for inclusion in individual faculty performance records. The chairperson/director shares aggregate level data for course evaluations during a scheduled department meeting. The department discusses areas of improvement to enhance student learning. The chair/director meets individually with faculty to discuss the outcome of teaching evaluations to provide constructive feedback as needed.
iv. Courses taught by ad hoc/adjunct (less than . 5 FTE) instructors will also be evaluated using procedures set forth in this section on a yearly basis.
VI. Preparation of the Individual Performance Record (IPR)
a. Individual Performance Record (IPR): It is the responsibility of every faculty member to prepare their own individual performance record with as full and
complete documentation and evidence, as required by the CBA section 10.210. For a merit increment the documentation shall include performance since the last merit or promotion, or the most recent seven (7) sequential years. For promotion the documentation shall include performance since the last merit or promotion, or the most recent seven (7) sequential years. Failure to submit an IPR is grounds for a less than normal evaluation (CBA 10.100.3.c. and falsification of materials in an IPR is grounds for discipline CBA 18.500).
b. This documentation shall address all three areas of faculty responsibility: (1) teaching and advising, (2) research and scholarly activity, and (3) public service. DPAP encourages, but does not require faculty to use the recommended university template.
c. Performance reviews of faculty shall emphasize flexibility in balancing the contributions of teaching, research and scholarly activity, and public service consistent with duties assigned by the Dean (CBA 6.210) and consistent with their appointment. The individual shall submit this documentation to the chairperson of the FEC by October 15. A cover letter should be included specifying the faculty member's requested evaluation recommendation (e.g. normal, merit, promotion, tenure). The IPR should be prepared in the order of the criteria/areas of performance listed below.
d. The performance/evaluation period, consisting of one or more years of record, to be documented for advancement (i.e., promotion, tenure, merit, normal and less-than-normal) will conform to the requirements of the current CBA section 10.340. Tenured faculty members who have achieved the rank of full professor shall be reviewed every third year, and tenured faculty members who have achieved the rank of associate professor shall be reviewed every second year, assistant and non-tenured faculty are evaluated every year. This evaluation schedule is contingent upon the following conditions: 1 . the faculty member is seeking a normal increase; 2 . the faculty member has not received a less-thannormal recommendation in the past three (3) years; and the unit FEC does not wish to initiate consideration for other than a normal recommendation.

## VII. Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

General Criteria: In this section, the basis for evaluation in each area (teaching, research, and service) is summarized and is followed by a recommended outline of specific topics to be addressed in each area in the IPR. Normal, Above Normal, and Outstanding performance levels are defined. Tenured and probationary (tenure track) faculty are evaluated in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Non-tenured faculty are evaluated based on their letter of appointment - performance in teaching and service, or a combination thereof.

Deadlines: The individual performance records of all faculty members subject to evaluation must be submitted to the FEC by October 15. Additional evaluation materials (solicited by the FEC or unsolicited) must be submitted to the FEC by October 20. The faculty member under evaluation must be notified within 5 days of the inclusion of the additional evaluative material (no later than October 25) and that material must be made available to the faculty member. The faculty member is then given 10 days (or no later than November 5) to prepare a written response that becomes part of the evaluation record. Within 10 days (or no later
than November 15) of receipt of a faculty member's appeal of an evaluation, the FEC shall either grant or deny the requested remedial action, notify the faculty member of the decision, and make the decision a part of the record. The FEC will review and make its final written recommendations by November 15.

The following scale (1-10) will be used by the FEC when evaluating teaching, research, and service. In scoring activities in each category, the FEC will keep in mind the following conventions and meanings:

| Score |  |
| :---: | :--- |
| 10 | Performance in this activity area is truly outstanding and beyond <br> the standards set by the unit. |
| 9 | Performance in this activity is outstanding. <br> Performance in this activity is above normal. |
| 8 | Performance in this activity is slightly above meeting unit <br> standards. <br> Performance in this activity area meets the unit standards. <br> Attempts to maintain normal unit standards performance, but <br> slightly below expectations |
| 6 | Performance consistently below normal unit standards <br> expectations <br> Below unit standards expectations and significant improvement <br> needed <br> An attempt to document activity, but unacceptable performance <br> in this area <br> Minimal documented activity and unacceptable performance in |
| 2 | this area |
| 0 | No documented activity or unacceptable performance in this <br> area. |

At the FEC review meeting, faculty members that are 0.5-1.0 FTE being reviewed shall be given the opportunity to briefly summarize their professional activities for the year and to explain or question any material in the file. Per CBA 10.230, at all times during the evaluation process, from the Faculty Evaluation Committee through the deliberation of the Provost, unsolicited materials may not be used as part of the evaluation unless they are signed. Signed materials thus submitted will be made available to the faculty member being evaluated in accord with the preceding paragraph. Unlike materials solicited by the FEC, unsolicited materials have no expectation of anonymity of the identity of their author. Further, to ensure and encourage candid professional assessment of the individual faculty member performance, materials solicited by the FEC from non-tenure-track, probationary faculty, and students will be guaranteed anonymity. With the exception of solicited material from non-tenure-track, probationary faculty, and students, other persons submitting material to the FEC have no expectation of anonymity and all materials submitted to the FEC will be signed. Student materials submitted to the SEC will be guaranteed anonymity.

The departmental standard for each category (warranting an average score of six) shall be construed as described below. Tenured and tenure track DPAP members will be evaluated in teaching, research, and service. Untenured members that are 0.5-1.0 FTE will be evaluated only in the areas of teaching and service; or their duties consistent with their letter of appointment. Members of the FEC are expected to award scores for faculty member performance within each of these categories and to explain the basis for their assessment of individuals' performance.

The FEC will meet in a closed session meeting (closed to the individual under review) to review individual scores. These judgments and scores are expected to follow a full discussion of each candidate's file in which FEC members are encouraged to consider the reasons for their assessment of the candidate's performance and to review tentative scores. The FEC will then move to an open meeting where the candidate under review can briefly discuss their own file and the FEC explains to the candidate the scores they received. The Committee shall apply the unit standards to review the performance of each faculty member in the unit and make a written recommendation with justification signed by the committee chairperson which shall, where appropriate, specifically address: (1) retention, (2) salary increment, (3) promotion, and (4) tenure, and which shall be forwarded to the department chairperson and the dean by November 15. (CBA 10.230). In this written recommendation the candidate's performance and their FEC average score in teaching, research, and service is provided.

Based on the approved unit standards, on the CBA, and on consideration of the evidence submitted by the faculty member, the Student Evaluation Committee recommendation, the Faculty Evaluation Committee recommendation, and any additional evidence solicited or received and placed in the evaluation report, the department chairperson shall prepare and sign a written evaluation for each faculty member in the unit which, where appropriate, shall specifically address: (1) retention, (2) salary increment, (3) promotion, and (4) tenure. The chairperson may append a written statement of his/her professional opinion and recommendation regarding any matters which he/she may deem to be relevant to the performance or advancement of the individual evaluated. The faculty member shall be given the opportunity to respond in writing to this professional opinion.

The chairperson shall prepare and append a summary list of those the chairperson has recommended for promotion, merit increase, or tenure, respectively. The names on the list of recommendations for merit increase will be ranked in order of priority by the chairperson, taking into account the chairperson's ratings (normal, above normal, outstanding) across the three areas of evaluation. The department chairperson shall make the record of each evaluation available to the respective faculty members to whom they pertain for his/her review and signature. The record shall include, if available: the Individual Performance Record submitted by the faculty member; the Student Evaluation Committee recommendation; the Faculty Evaluation Committee recommendation; the department chairperson's recommendation, and if submitted, the professional opinion with faculty member's response, and any other exhibits or evidence relied upon or incorporated by reference except course evaluation forms. Each recommendation shall be signed by the faculty member to attest that the faculty member has read it. The chairperson shall then forward a copy of the complete record to the dean by December 15 .

Within ten (10) days of receipt of the department chairperson's recommendation, the faculty member may submit a written appeal to the department chairperson regarding any aspect of the chairperson's recommendation or process. The appeal must state any matters which the chairperson is requested to consider as well as the remedial action desired. The appeal may present for consideration appropriate documentation that the faculty member omitted from his/her Individual Performance Record. Within ten (10) days from receipt of the appeal, the chairperson shall either grant or deny the requested remedial action and shall so notify the faculty member and requested remedial action and shall so notify the faculty member and make the decision a part of the record. The dean submits their review by February 15 to the Provost.

## VII. Specific Criteria:

a. Teaching: The department expects each faculty member to strive for excellence in teaching and to be involved in a continuing process of self-improvement, to engage in professional study to maintain currency in teaching fields, to update course syllabi and activities accordingly, to communicate effectively with students, and to encourage comprehension of course content, and skill development in coursework. Evidence of effective teaching will consist of course syllabi; specially prepared teaching materials and pedagogies such as simulations, exercises, case studies, service learning, examinations, study guides, and guides for research papers; and formal evaluations of teaching such as the unit approved student evaluation results. Supervision of independent studies and student internships and service on outside master's thesis or doctoral committees also shall be considered along with evidence of performance in regularly assigned courses. For all courses, including independent study and master's thesis supervision, qualitative evidence (e.g. self or peer midsemester feedback, peer assessments) of performance shall be considered along with quantitative evidence such as student evaluations. Members of the department FEC shall pay particular attention to factors that may affect student evaluation scores, such as the level of the course, its enrollment, and whether it is a general education course or required in one or more programs.
a. Student course evaluation scores are heavily considered in determining the score for teaching, but they are not the only factor in evaluating teaching performance.
i. Outstanding Performance in teaching includes (average score of nine or higher):

1. One's teaching shall be considered "outstanding" if one's teaching contributions far exceeds the normal standard. For instance, one's teaching may be considered outstanding if one demonstrates excellence in several ways such as undertaking new preps, designs a new class, receiving uniformly excellent student evaluations, mentoring student independent studies, significant amount of student advising, teaching above the standard course load, or receiving recognition or award by a professional committee or organization for outstanding teaching.
ii. Above Normal Performance in teaching includes (average score of eight):
2. One's teaching shall be considered "above normal" if one's teaching contributions exceed the normal standard. For example, one's teaching may be considered above normal if one consistently receives very good evaluations and/or if one takes on extra tasks such as undertaking new preps, adopting a new teaching methodology/tool (e.g. service learning, civic engagement, online/active learning mechanism), and/or mentors students' independent study research.
iii. Normal Performance in teaching (average score of six):
3. "Normal teaching" shall consist in teaching needed lower division, upper division, and/or graduate courses according to one's expertise, and directing student research. The courses shall be taught responsibly as indicated by student evaluations, teaching materials, and, where relevant, peer review (CBA $10.100-3 b)$.
4. Each faculty member shall provide the DPAP administrative support staff with a schedule of his/her teaching and office hours each semester, post them outside his/her office, and maintain them regularly or make needed changes. Out of consideration for students, faculty members who are unable to keep scheduled office hours on a given day should post a note to that effect or have the administrative support staff do so if the individual is not on campus. As a rule of thumb, a reasonable number of office hours per week would be three to four (or more) for a full teaching load, but the hours should be set to reflect expected student demand, and adjusted upward if needed.
5. A current syllabus for each course shall be maintained and posted on the departmental website each semester.
b. Research/Scholarship: ${ }^{2}$ Each faculty member is expected to make continuous effort toward advancement of knowledge in their area of specialization or in the subject areas embraced by DPAP and/or relevant disciplinary or problemfocused fields. The efforts of the faculty member should include some tangible results in a form accessible to departmental review. We expect the scholarship requirement to be met for tenure and promotion to associate to include published refereed articles, publications in peer-reviewed journals focused on the scholarship of teaching and learning, or other equivalent scholarly material-such as peer-reviewed published books and monographs, and peerreviewed chapters in edited collections. The required expectation for

[^1]promotion to professor is at least one book manuscript and five additional peer-reviewed articles since promotion to Associate Professor. Since public administration and policy is by nature interdisciplinary, we encourage coauthorship in the aforementioned sources, which are peer reviewed. Recognition by one's peers in the form of invited papers and chapters, papers delivered to meetings of professional societies, grants applied for and received, meeting community needs through research, and service as a peer or technical reviewer also constitute indications of scholarly activity, but these items alone will not meet the standards required for promotion and tenure.
i. Outstanding Performance in research/scholarship includes (average score of nine):

1. One's research shall be considered "outstanding" if one far exceeds normal standards. Examples include:
a. Publishing at a much higher rate than is typical of one's subfield (e.g. more than one peer-reviewed journal article per year, publishing projects of greater scope (book placed with a reputable press),
b. Reputable peer-reviewed book chapters,
c. Publishing or presenting in the most prestigious venues, invited presentations, receiving a peer-reviewed grant from a reputable grantee, indications of high regard from peers in one's subfield such as recognition or award by a professional committee or organization for an outstanding research contribution.
ii. Above Normal Performance in research/scholarship includes (average score of eight):
2. One's research shall be considered "above normal" if one exceeds normal standards by:
a. Publishing more frequently than is typical for one's subfield
b. Publishing or presenting in a prestigious venue indicating a high level of regard from peers in one's subfield.
c. Receiving a peer-reviewed grant from a reputable grantee in one's subfield.
iii. Normal Performance in research/scholarship includes (average score of six):
3. "Normal research" shall consist of maintaining an active research program and periodically publishing (peer-reviewed articles), writing a government report for the public sector, and/or publicly presenting one's research at an academic conference.
iv. DPAP will not penalize the chair/director for their service to the department and realizes that it is unrealistic to expect the chair/director to be heavily involved in research during the tenure of the person's role as chair/director. Therefore, in evaluating the
department chair/director for promotion, merit, advancement, etc., the Faculty Evaluation Committee will consider administrative and leadership performance (as part of service) more heavily than research.
c. Service: Each member of DPAP faculty is expected to participate in shared governance in the department. Within the department, significant initiatives to identify and meet program, curricular, and community needs will be recognized. It is up to each faculty member to provide appropriate documentation of such activity, which may be no more than a descriptive listing of positions held and key activities, but may well include peer evaluations and work products for particularly significant achievements. Institutional service and development may take forms other than participation on shared governance committees. Each member of the DPAP faculty is expected to contribute to the University and community (outside the academic walls) by bringing to bear their special professional competencies with high quality contributions to projects or initiatives that support the public good.
i. Outstanding Performance in service includes (average score of nine):
4. One's service shall be considered "outstanding" if one displays exceptional amounts of service:
a. Serving as department chair and on two committees concurrently);Fundraising to benefit DPAP programming; Service on the major University committees (e.g., ASCRC, Graduate Council, Unit Standards); Serving as a journal editor;
b. Displaying demonstrable leadership in such contexts and continuing contributions to University and community development will be highly valued (e.g. active mentoring of untenured faculty, special support of student organizations, or initiating informal programs, service to the public at large and significant off-campus groups as well as to the academic community beyond the institution).
ii. Above Average Performance in service includes (average score of eight):
5. One's service shall be considered "above normal" if in addition to normal service one undertakes considerable additional service (e.g. very demanding committees, serving as department chair/director, internship coordinator, or undertaking a large amount of departmental or community service).
iii. Normal Performance in service includes (average score of six):
6. "Normal" service shall consist of departmental service (e.g., serving on the FEC and assisting with administrative tasks delegated by the chair/director), professional or community service as appropriate (e.g., reviewing a journal article,
reviewing a community report), and university service (e.g., serving on committee that meets one to two times per year).
7. Each faculty member is responsible to participate in departmental service activities, including service on continuing or ad hoc committees for assessment. For the most demanding of these contributions, serving as chair/director or internship coordinator, the responsibilities will normally be shared on a rotating basis.
d. Tenure (CBA 10.100-2): An untenured faculty member may request of the FEC, in writing, simultaneous award of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor during his/her sixth year-of service (CBA 9.310).
i. Probationary faculty may apply for promotion to Associate Professor (below) and then subsequently for tenure thereafter, but all probationary faculty must receive tenure by the end of their seventh year of service.
ii. A probationary appointee shall be eligible to make an application for tenure after the appointee has completed five (5) years of credited service toward tenure, that is: during the sixth (6) year of credited employment (CBA 9.310).
e. Only tenured and tenure-track members of the FEC may vote on tenure and promotion decisions (CBA 10.230). Decisions are based on the Individual Performance Review file, and no secret ballots are permitted. The individual shall be invited to clarify materials in the file and to answer questions about the file, but otherwise may not participate. During a tenure review, the department chair/director will solicit outside reviews for the individual under consideration for tenure. Names for these outside reviewers will be generated by both the chair/director and the individual seeking tenure. These outside reviewers will primarily comment on an individual's scholarship, but may also comment on areas of teaching and service as appropriate. The outside reviews will be part of the faculty member's official IPR file. The faculty shall have the right to review and respond in writing to any solicited materials including outside reviewers. The unit standards used for tenure review shall be those in effect when the individual was appointed; unless the applicant chooses the current unit standards (CBA 10.200).
f. Tenure decisions are based on both past performance and performance expected in the future. To be eligible for tenure the candidate must:
i. Initiate the application for tenure which shall include at least the following:
8. A statement of the teaching, research and/or scholarly activity, and public service performed by the applicant during the probationary period; a vita of the applicant's publications and/or scholarly works; evidence that the applicant has achieved or is in the process of achieving recognition in the applicant's field of competence beyond the University of Montana; any other information the applicant deems relevant to
the applicant's professional development, competence, or performance. (CBA 9.320)
9. Possess a terminal degree (DA, PhD, JD, EdD); have accumulated a minimum of five years credit toward tenure, three years of which have been accumulated at the University of Montana in the DPAP.
10. Failure to attain tenure by completion of the period noted in CBA 9.300 will result in the issuance of a non-renewable contract. Faculty appointed in fall 2019 or thereafter may apply once; all others (appointed before fall 2019) may apply twice according to CBA 9.340 where they could reapply in their 7th year (if denied in their 6th) and still receive tenure. This person must receive tenure by the end of their 7th year.
11. The requirement for tenure in DPAP is to have published six peer-reviewed articles or three peer reviewed articles and one book manuscript.
12. Faculty may apply concurrently for the rank of Associate Professor and for tenure. However, the granting of tenure is conditional on promotion to Associate Professor.
13. The applicant for tenure is required to include three letters from outside the University that evaluate the applicant's quality of scholarly activities and/or research. The applicant submits a list of five individuals to the department chair/director. The department chair/director can select the outside evaluators (excluding the applicant's graduate mentor and committee members). The chairperson/director shall be responsible for soliciting the outside letters. Letters must be received prior to the FEC meeting at which tenure is considered. (CBA 10.210)
14. The level of performance required for a recommendation for tenure is higher than that required for a recommendation of normal increment (greater than an average of six in each of the following areas: teaching, research, and service as recorded by FEC); merely adequate performance will not suffice. At a minimum, the level of performance for a recommendation of tenure must be consistently in the higher portion of the range required for a normal recommendation. (CBA 9.200). For example, for research/scholarship the applicant is required to have at least a total of six peer reviewed scholarly articles or three peer reviewed articles and one book manuscript.
g. Promotion: The timeline for application for promotion to Associate Professor and to Professor is the same as specified in the CBA. (CBA 10.110). The following University requirements must be met regarding each of the respective types of advancement or salary determination as indicated. (For purposes of determining years in rank, pro rata credit shall be given all fulltime service for any academic term except summer session.)
i. Promotion to Assistant Professor: Requires possession of the appropriate terminal degree or its equivalent as defined by the unit standards of each discipline.
ii. Promotion to Associate Professor: Except in unusual circumstances, four (4) or more years of full-time service in rank as assistant professor are required prior to the date of promotion (application may be made during the fourth year in rank), and possession of the terminal degree in the appropriate discipline is required consistent with applicable unit standards.
iii. Promotion to Professor: Except in unusual circumstances, five (5) or more years of full-time service in rank as an associate professor are required prior to the date of promotion (application may be made during the fifth year) and possession of the terminal degree in the appropriate discipline is required consistent with applicable unit standards. The character of the service in rank as associate professor shall be such that there is a clear demonstration of professional growth and an increasingly valuable contribution to the University. A consistent level of performance in the high portion of the range required for a normal recommendation (greater than an average of six score as recorded by FEC in the following areas: teaching, research, service), and a continued growth in skills and responsibilities are required for a recommendation of promotion to professor. Faculty seeking promotion to professor must demonstrate scholarship specifically by scholarly publication (in peer reviewed journals, books, book chapters, and high level of university/community service, and teaching as described above). The required expectation for promotion to professor is at least one book manuscript and five additional peerreviewed articles since promotion to Associate Professor.
h. Merit: (CBA 10.110-3a) A merit recommendation requires "outstanding" in one area (average score of 9 or more) or "above normal" performance (average score of 8 or higher) in at least two of the three areas of teaching, research, or service. In no area may performance be less than normal.
i. CBA Appendix B procedure for performance awards for non-tenurable faculty
15. Applicants shall submit documentation providing evidence of outstanding performance (higher than 8 average) and current mailing address to unit chairs by May 2018. Chairs will submit their recommendations to Deans by May 15, 2018. Chairs shall rank any multiple Outstanding Performance Award recommendations within their respective units. Deans will rank applicants based on the provided documentation, the Chair's recommendation, and their own assessment based on the general faculty evaluation procedures established in CBA article 10.000. Deans shall forward their rankings to the Provost by

May 22, 2018, who will make the final decision on the granting of awards by June 1, 2018.
i. Non-Renewal Decisions (CBA 10.110-3c):
a. Less-Than-Normal (average scores below six): Performance at a level below that required for a recommendation of normal increment is necessary for a less-than-normal recommendation. (CBA 9.230). A less-than-normal recommendation requires a consistent pattern of inferior performance, or a consistent trend of decline of one's performance pattern to inadequate levels. (CBA 17.000)
b. Non-Renewal: For faculty awarded-continuous tenure, a recommendation of non-renewal requires a level of performance consistently in the low portion of the range required for normal recommendation or below as outlined in section 10.110.3.c of the CBA. For faculty on-continuous tenure, a recommendation of tenure review and possible non-renewal requires a performance level which is consistently in the less-than-normal range for three successive years.
c. Non-Reappointment: A probationary faculty appointee has an annual year contract with the right to serve the specified term (annual year) of the appointment and may not be discharged without cause during that term. An appointee discharged for cause prior to the end of the specified term of the appointment shall be entitled to the same procedural protections afforded tenured faculty members discharged for cause. The university President has the sole discretionary authority for renewal, or non-renewal of probationary annual year faculty contracts without cause (CBA 9.230).

## VIV. Outside Activities and Conflicts of Interest (CBA 12.300)

DPAP members of the faculty are expected to devote primary attention to teaching, research, and other University responsibilities. Faculty members are allowed to engage in outside activities only to the extent that those activities do not significantly affect fulfillment of these primary faculty responsibilities. In order to ensure that outside activities do not exceed acceptable levels, a faculty member who plans to engage in outside activities of an extensive, recurring, or continuing nature should first consult with the department chair/director and file the required university conflict of interest form.

Although this procedures document is intended solely for DPAP, it should be noted that faculty members in the unit are affiliated with a number of other University programs (e.g. law, civic engagement). Each of those programs has its own responsibilities and governance arrangements. Faculty members in DPAP strongly encourage those with administrative authority in one or more of these related programs to work closely with the DPAP chair/director in making curricular, personnel, and budgetary decisions that affect, even if only indirectly, the operation and effectiveness of DPAP.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ MPA Core Nucleus Definition: Employed full-time at the University of Montana. Academically or professionally qualified who are involved directly in governing the MPA program including, for example, participation in decision-making about student admissions; graduation; curriculum changes; and, faculty hiring. Members of the MPA Faculty Nucleus provide support for students, teach 1-2 classes per year for the program, attend monthly meetings, participate in faculty performance reviews, and are regularly involved in program and course level assessment. These individuals can be outside of the bargaining unit (e.g., Law), but if so, they may not vote on faculty performance reviews.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Please note: peer reviewed articles, book chapters, or books that have been accepted for publication will be counted as research/scholarship since there can be a lag time in the publication date.

