

**2020 - 2025**

**School of Social Work**

**The University of Montana**

**UNIT STANDARDS FOR FACULTY EVALUATIONS**

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to describe the policies, procedures, and evaluative standards the School of Social Work will apply to evaluate faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. These standards comply with the University of Montana's Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and should be employed concurrently with the CBA to ensure that both standards are met. If discrepancies between the school's standards and the CBA occur during the evaluation process, the CBA shall serve as the governing document.

UNIT PHILOSOPHY

The School of Social Work is committed to teaching and modeling the core values of the profession: service, social justice, dignity and worth of the person, importance of human relationships, integrity, and competence to ensure that graduates can effectively address the personal and social needs that impact the people they serve (NASW, 2017). The School of Social Work is further committed to the principles and practices of anti-racism. Realization of these commitments calls for 1) an organizational culture and climate that reflects these values and 2) active engagement of roles, resources, and relationships to uphold these values and dismantle systemic racism and other forms of oppression.

Faculty members in the School of Social Work are expected to demonstrate a commitment to excellence in teaching, advising, and preparing students for professional practice. Similarly, faculty members are expected to contribute to the generation of knowledge that furthers the purpose of the profession. The school values diverse modes of scholarship and the active engagement of relevant stakeholders in the research process. As with scholarship, excellence in service furthers the purpose of the profession and the mission of the school. The faculty recognizes that the effectiveness of the school is dependent on the collective contributions of faculty and that the division of responsibilities for teaching, service, and research may vary among faculty members over time. In the spirit of cooperation and collegiality, the faculty is committed to equitable distribution of these responsibilities.

PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

The procedures for evaluating faculty performance are directed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), which establishes specific expectations for faculty performance and the procedures and timeline for evaluating performance. If Unit Standards are changed during an evaluation period for any faculty member, such faculty member will have the choice of using

either the Unit Standards effective at the time of hire, or those currently effective, when applying for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. However, after faculty members are tenured, only the Unit Standards in effect at the time of evaluation will be used. Faculty will follow the most recent unit standards for annual evaluations once those standards are approved. Current standards must be used by untenured faculty when requesting a merit award unless a portion of the evaluation period occurred when an older set of standards was in place. During each evaluation period faculty are required to state their request for a normal salary increment, promotion, tenure, or merit award and designate the time period for the evaluation. Faculty are required to provide appropriate documentation to ensure that the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), Chair, and Dean can accurately evaluate the requestor's performance during the evaluation period. If the request, documentation, or time period is unclear to the evaluators, additional documentation can be requested in writing via email during the FEC evaluation process; faculty members will then have five working days to provide the information.

#### Individual Performance Record – October 15

Faculty members are required to submit a written record of performance to the FEC on or before October 15. Faculty rank and the CBA FEC protocol will determine whether or not submissions are made annually, every other year, or once every three years. Per the CBA, members of the bargaining unit who are in their first year of service at The University of Montana or who are on a terminal year contract do not need to be evaluated. Also in accordance with the CBA, the Individual Performance Record (IPR) shall be sequentially page-numbered, provide references to exhibits, and signed on the final page by the author.

Documentation will be submitted based on the following evaluation periods:

- Promotion to Associate Professor: all service in the current rank including prior service, if applicable, or the most recent seven (7) sequential years, whichever is less.
- Promotion to Full Professor: all service since documentation was prepared for the last promotion, or the most recent seven (7) years, whichever is less.
- Tenure: entire probationary period including credited prior service.
- Merit: time since the documentation was prepared for the last granted merit or promotion, or the most recent seven (7) sequential years, whichever is less.
- Normal and Less-than-Normal: the previous year, or since last evaluation for Associate Professors and Professors evaluated in alternate or every third year.

#### Student Evaluation Committee – October 15

The Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) must be appointed by the School Chair by September 15 and shall consist of at least three but not more than seven currently enrolled social work students from the undergraduate and graduate programs. At the direction of the Chair, the SEC will prepare a written evaluation in the area of teaching of each faculty member who is scheduled for review or who has indicated intent to apply for merit or promotion. Each faculty member must have at least one course evaluated each semester they teach but faculty are encouraged to

evaluate all of their courses. The results of all courses evaluated will be provided to the Student Evaluation Committee. The report will be informed by numerical course rankings and major written comments included in faculty course evaluations. The written summaries shall be submitted to the School's Administrative Assistant by October 15. The absence of Student Evaluation Committee participation shall not be regarded as a defect in the evaluation process.

#### Faculty Evaluation Committee – November 15

The faculty will elect a Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) prior to the end of spring semester each year to serve for the following academic year. Both tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to serve on the FEC. The FEC will consist of three eligible SSW faculty members, voted upon by the faculty, one outside member from another unit of the College of Health appointed by the Dean, and one non-voting student member appointed by the FEC. Faculty selected for the FEC will elect a committee chair. If the FEC cannot select a Chair by majority vote, one will be appointed by the school's Chair. The faculty will elect a substitute if a person elected to the FEC cannot serve on the committee. In the case of a tie vote, this will be indicated in the FEC recommendations (See CBA 10.240 for more detail).

The FEC will review the performance of each faculty member as documented in their IPR in accordance with the School of Social Work Unit Standards and the CBA. Discussions that occur during the FEC evaluation process shall remain confidential and limited to members of the committee in accordance with the CBA. Upon completion of the review, a summative report will be written and approved by the FEC and signed by the FEC chair to endorse the committee's recommendation. The FEC shall attempt to reach a consensus in reaching a final decision. In the event that a consensus cannot be reached, a majority vote will determine the final outcome and an explanation will be provided to describe any dissenting opinions in the FEC report. Whenever a merit award is requested, the FEC will indicate whether the faculty member seeking a merit award has performed at the level of: outstanding, above normal, normal, or less-than-normal in teaching, research, and service.

FEC deliberations are closed to the member being reviewed. However, faculty members can address the FEC in person regarding their evaluations and appeal a finding while following the procedures outlined in the CBA. In accordance with CBA 10.240, the faculty member may submit within ten (10) days a written appeal to the FEC regarding any aspect of the recommendation or process stating any concerns that the FEC is asked to review and stating the remedial action desired.

The majority of the work of the FEC is carried out between Oct. 15, the deadline for faculty submission of IPRs, and Nov. 15, the deadline for submission of FEC evaluations as outlined in the CBA. However, in cases of tenure review, an external review process is also required. The steps and timelines for external review are outlined below:

- Faculty member informs School of Social Work (SSW) Chair of intent to apply for tenure by May 15 of the academic year prior to application.
- The SSW Chair asks candidate to submit five names of potential external reviewers by May 31 of academic year prior to application. Reviewers should be "arm's length" from

the candidate – familiar with candidate’s scholarship or areas of expertise but should not be in the role of mentor, co-author or collaborator.

- SSW Chair provides FEC Chair with candidate’s list of names, and FEC Chair, in consultation with FEC members, identifies an additional five external reviewers. FEC Chair consults with candidate regarding the list to ensure that all potential reviewers meet “arm’s length” criteria.
- FEC Chair sends out the requests for review to potential reviewers by June 15.
- The goal is to secure commitment for a minimum of four reviews and a maximum of six reviews evenly distributed between the faculty’s list and the FEC Chair’s list. If the FEC Chair is not able to secure commitment from four potential reviewers, the FEC Chair requests additional names from the candidate and the FEC and makes additional requests.
- FEC Chair sends the reviewers copies of the candidate’s CV, personal statement on teaching, research, and service, and sample of published research by September 1. The sample consists of three published works (articles or books) selected by the candidate. All reviewers receive the same packet of materials.
- The FEC Chair provides the reviewers with a copy of the SSW Unit Standards and instructs reviewers to assessment the candidate’s material based on the SSW standards for tenure.
- The FEC Chair requests reviewers to submit written reviews according to the process outlined below:
  - Reviewers are asked to submit two letters by October 15: one is the review letter with no identifying information regarding the reviewer. The second is the accompanying cover letter in which the reviewer verifies that s/he is author of the anonymous review.
  - The review letter goes to the SSW Chair, who keeps the identifying cover letter and review letter.
  - SSW Chair provides the FEC the review letters and a key code to letters and reviewers
  - Key code is destroyed at end of review process.
  - The letters, without identifying information, become part of the IPR record and are available to the candidate.
  - CBA 10.240: Any material solicited at this, or subsequent steps, must be made available to the individual being evaluated within five (5) working days of its inclusion.

### Chair Evaluation – December 15

The Chair is required to prepare a written evaluation for faculty required to participate in a performance review. The evaluation includes evidence submitted by the faculty member, the recommendations of the SEC and FEC, and additional evidence deemed relevant to the evaluation of performance or advancement. The evaluation should specify areas that apply for faculty retention, salary increment, promotion, or tenure. Merit awards shall include a summary of performance and an indication of whether the criteria were met for outstanding, above normal, normal, or less-than-normal as defined in this document. The Chair will rank faculty who have applied for merit awards and prepare a written memo to the Dean specifying all recommendations. In accordance with CBA 10.250, the faculty member may submit within ten

(10) days a written appeal to the chairperson regarding any aspect of the recommendation or process stating any concerns that the Chair is asked to review and stating the remedial action desired.

### Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service:

Teaching, scholarship, and service within the School of Social Work are informed by and reflective of our anti-racist principles. The School of Social Work prepares students at both the bachelor's and master's levels who will promote social work's commitment to social justice, diversity, critical thinking, and research-informed best practices through integration of direct practice, community building, advocacy, and scholarship that disrupt systems of oppression, promote the well-being of people, and contribute to a more humane society.

The School is committed to fostering collaborative partnerships with tribal, state, and community-based organizations; supporting initiatives addressing social service and social change; and meeting the needs of rural, tribal, and developing communities. The School values diversity in modes of inquiry, research methodologies, areas of expertise, and scholarly products among its faculty. The School also recognizes the value of inter- and transdisciplinary scholarship, and the effective integration of teaching, research, and service. Faculty are expected to possess the requisite knowledge and skills to teach in two or more curricular areas at both the MSW and BSW levels (direct practice with individuals, families, groups, and communities; research; social policy; social welfare history; human behavior and the social environment; difference and diversity; organization leadership and development). Faculty are also expected to have at least one area of emphasis or expertise from which they can draw in developing elective courses, supervising independent studies, directing graduate student research, and advancing knowledge in the profession. In addition, faculty are expected to bring their knowledge and skills to bear in service to the School, the University, the social work profession, and broader publics including tribal, state, and federal social services organizations, community-based organizations, and other social work or social change initiatives.

### Teaching:

Faculty are expected to demonstrate a commitment to rigorous, high-quality teaching and to foster a collaborative teaching-learning environment that reflects and promotes social work knowledge, skills, and values.

Faculty are expected to create classroom environments where white supremacy, white privilege, and other forms of hierarchy can be identified and challenged while maintaining a classroom environment where BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) students feel safe and academically challenged.

Faculty are expected to provide students the opportunity to evaluate each course using standardized evaluation procedures.

Full-time faculty teaching loads are 14-16 credits per academic year and shall be equitably distributed by the Chair and Dean based on course type (research, practice, seminar, portfolio, chairing dissertation committees), academic level (BSW, MSW), course size, and whether or not

the course fulfills a UM general education requirement. Faculty who secure external funds or participate in activities that support the school's mission can request to reduce their credit load with approval from the Chair and Dean.

All faculty are expected to teach at least one core or elective course per year regardless of buyout or salary replacement. All faculty are expected to participate in service to the School (as evidenced in participation in faculty meetings, service on School committees, and membership on MSW portfolio committees) regardless of buyout or salary replacement.

Each of the following positions receives a credit load reduction in teaching in order to meet CSWE accreditation release policy. The requirement for teaching for Directors and Chair is as follows:

Chair: 3-4 credits per year (one of which may include portfolio)

MSW Program Director: 6 -7 credits per year (one of which may include portfolio)

BSW Program Director: 6 - 7 credits per year (one of which may include portfolio)

\*\*\*Faculty must chair at least four portfolio committees to receive one credit towards total teaching load.

\*\*\*Faculty who chair dissertation committees may receive one credit for one semester per dissertation, one time only per dissertation.

**Evidence** of teaching effectiveness involves multiple components and may include, but is not limited to:

- Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness as measured through standardized course evaluations. Note: All student course evaluations must be submitted with the IPR.
- Evidence of course relevance and rigor as demonstrated through course syllabi and assignments.
- Evidence in course syllabi of content on historic and contemporary racism and decolonizing, anti-racist and anti-oppressive practices as relevant to the course.
- Evidence of student mentoring as demonstrated through a combination of measures including BSW and MSW mentoring/advising load, chairing MSW portfolio committees, and supervision of independent studies and research projects.
- Chairing dissertation committees.
- Students' narrative comments regarding teaching effectiveness written on standardized course evaluations (if narrative comments are included, all comments for a given course must be presented as evidence).
- Reports from faculty observation and peer review of teaching. If this occurs, it would be at the discretion and request of the member being reviewed as to when and how this occurs.
- Participation in pedagogy projects.

- Participation in professional development opportunities to build knowledge base of anti-racist pedagogy and skills for addressing microaggressions and other manifestations of racism and other forms of oppression in the classroom.
- Completion of significant course or curriculum redevelopment.
- Teaching that includes significant community engagement such as a University-designated service learning course.
- Development of an online version of a new or existing course.
- Receipt of teaching awards.
- Provision of outside supervision to MSW and BSW practicum students.
- Conference presentations or publications by students as a result of faculty instructional activity.
- Instruction of University-designated writing courses or other General Education courses.
- Reasonable availability to students via office hours, email, etc.

### **Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness:**

The SSW faculty recognizes that student evaluations provide only one measure of teaching performance. Furthermore, the faculty recognizes that some course content is particularly challenging to teach, that faculty may face unique challenges in teaching a course for the first time, that positionality of the instructor may affect teaching evaluations, and that faculty in leadership roles may face particular challenges in balancing teaching and service obligations. The faculty also recognizes that the evaluation of an individual course may be an outlier in terms of the overall performance of a faculty member. Likewise, the school values innovation in teaching and does not want to penalize faculty if experimental efforts fall short of potential. Therefore, the School values a teaching evaluation process that is holistic in nature. Standards for evaluation of teaching effectiveness are as follows.

**“Normal:”** For teaching effectiveness to be evaluated as “normal” faculty must demonstrate, at minimum, that they have fulfilled assigned teaching load expectations and that courses are rigorous, up-to-date, and satisfactorily received by students per student course evaluations. Faculty must also competently perform a reasonable share of student advising and mentoring. In considering student teaching evaluations, “Normal” effectiveness for a given course is operationally defined as greater than 75% of student evaluations of overall effectiveness for a given course at the level of “Good” or above. Note: “overall teaching effectiveness” is a measure provided based on the median of items 1-4 on the paper form of the standardized course evaluations. For electronic evaluation forms used in online courses, this average of overall effectiveness must be calculated by averaging scores for items 1-4.

**“Above Normal:”** For teaching effectiveness to be evaluated as “above normal” faculty must demonstrate a consistent pattern of teaching excellence as demonstrated through course evaluations. Above normal teaching may also be evidenced through teaching more than the required number of courses; mentoring more than the average number of students; effective assessment of student learning outcomes; or otherwise showing through additional evidence (as listed above) that the faculty member has exceeded expectations of normal performance. “Above

normal” effectiveness for a given course is operationally defined as receiving 75 to 89% of student evaluations of overall effectiveness for a given course at the level of “Very Good” or above.

**“Outstanding:”** For teaching effectiveness to be evaluated as “outstanding” faculty must demonstrate a consistent pattern of excellence in student evaluations of teaching *and* additional evidence of teaching excellence. “Outstanding” effectiveness for a given course is operationally defined as receiving 90% or greater of student evaluations of overall effectiveness for a given course at the level of “Very Good” or above. Additional evidence may include but is not limited to the above list.

#### Scholarship and Creative Activity:

The School of Social Work values diverse forms of scholarship and recognizes that scholarly inquiry may be conceptual or empirical, employ diverse modes of inquiry and methodologies, and have relevance for diverse communities. In keeping with the values and mission of the profession, the School values scholarship that contributes to the theoretical or practice-knowledge base of the profession, scholarship that furthers transdisciplinary and interprofessional theory and practice, decolonizing scholarship that challenges histories and practices of oppression, and community-engaged scholarship that informs and improves the practices of tribal, state, federal, international or community-based social service and social change efforts.

#### **Essential Evidence of Research Effectiveness may include:**

- Publication of a peer-reviewed journal article
- Publication of a peer-reviewed book, an edited volume, a book by an academic press, or a book that receives regional or national acclaim
- Publication of a chapter in a peer-reviewed book
- Receipt of major grant for scholarly work (the major grant may be evidenced by dollar amount or scholarly/community impact)
- Receipt of award for scholarly work from a leading professional organization or national institution
- Formal recognition of scholarly impact of research by BIPOC organization.

Note: For cases involving tenure, essential evidence includes written reviews of the candidate’s body of scholarly work by faculty external to UM who have relevant expertise.

#### **Additional Evidence for Research Effectiveness includes but is not limited to:**

- Publication of research in non-peer reviewed journal or book
- Conference papers, both invited and competitive
- Collaborative presentation of research with members of communities affected by historical and contemporary racism or other forms of oppression.
- Invited presentations, public addresses, or colloquia



- Conference papers or posters, both invited and competitive with evidence of acceptance or invitation even if the event is canceled or postponed due to factors beyond the control of the faculty member
- Invited presentations, public addresses, or colloquia with evidence of invitation even if the event is canceled or postponed due to factors beyond the control of the faculty member
- Receipt of minor awards or grants for research (such as University small grants or recognition of research by a campus or community group)
- Recognition of research contribution to anti-oppressive social work knowledge and practice.
- Completion of professional reports for agency, organizational, or public use
- Production of non-print media for professional use relevant to the field (e.g. websites, podcasts, documentary videos)
- Evidence of conducting successful organizational or community-based research, program evaluations, or policy analyses
- Evidence of significant research in progress
- Other evidence of civically-engaged research that contributes to the well-being of society
- Published reviews of research-based materials

### **Evaluation of Effectiveness in Research and Scholarship.**

**“Normal:”** For research effectiveness to be evaluated as “normal” the faculty member must provide:

- documentation of at least one research product from “essential evidence” list per year on average for the years under review *or*
- documentation of at least two research products from “additional evidence” list per year on average for the years under review.

**“Above Normal:”** For research effectiveness to be evaluated as “above normal” the faculty member must provide:

- Documentation of two or more research products from “essential evidence” list per year on average for the years under review *or*
- documentation of at least one research product from “essential evidence” list per year on average for the years under review *and* documentation of at least two research products from “additional evidence” list per year on average for the years under review

**“Outstanding:”** For research effectiveness to be evaluated as “outstanding” the faculty member must provide:

- documentation of one research product from “essential evidence” list that is recognized as “outstanding” in the field via awards, reviews, citations, etc., *and* one or more research product from “additional evidence” list on average for the years under review *or*

- documentation of two research products from “essential” evidence list *and* one or more research products from “additional evidence” list on average for the years under review *or*
- documentation of three or more research products from “essential” evidence list per year on average for the years under review.

**Note:** For promotion to associate professor the faculty member must provide documentation of at least 3 peer-reviewed publications. For tenure the faculty member must provide documentation of at least 4 peer-reviewed publications (articles, books, or book chapters), including those produced at the level of assistant professor. For promotion to full professor the faculty member must provide documentation of at least 5 peer-reviewed publications (articles, books, or book chapters) published after promotion to Associate Professor along with evidence of a nationally recognized program of research as evidenced by letters solicited by the member being reviewed from faculty external to UM who have relevant expertise or from other experts in the field who can speak to all scholarship or receipt of significant award or recognition of scholarship by relevant communities.

Service:

Service is a core value of the social work profession. Meaningful service to the School of Social Work, the University, the profession, and broader publics is expected of faculty over the course of their careers. The School relies on the full participation of the faculty for program governance and fulfillment of mission. Service to the School includes attendance at and participation on faculty and committee meetings, participation in curriculum review and accreditation review requirements, and participation in student-related activities such as organizing social events, reviewing scholarship and award applications, and the like. The School specifically recognizes the significant service obligations of School leadership roles, such as Chair, MSW Program Director, BSW Program Director, and 2 + 2 Program Director, the labor-intensive commitment required to effectively fulfill these roles, and the challenges the roles pose to maintaining an active research agenda. Effectiveness in School leadership roles is a highly valued form of service. All service since documentation was prepared for the last promotion, or the most recent seven (7) years, whichever is less, must be documented. (CBA 10.220).

**Evidence of Service to the School of Social Work includes but is not limited to:**

- Service on key committees such as the MSW, BSW, FEC, or Assessment committee
- Service through School leadership roles as Chair or Program Director
- Active engagement in professional leadership development to strengthen leadership capacity
- Active engagement in School initiatives to promote program integrity, program development, diversity, or pedagogical innovation
- Active engagement in School initiatives in support of anti-racist principles and practices.
- Service through leadership on accreditation self-study
- Service on essential work groups such as search committees, Unit Standards review committee, and committee engaged in program planning and innovation

- Activities related to promotion and development of the 2+2, BSW, or MSW programs that go beyond the work of the standing committees
- Service as social work representative to UFA, faculty senate, ASCRC, or Graduate Council
- Active engagement in planning of social events and community-building activities in support of BSW and MSW students

**Evidence of Service to the University includes but is not limited to:**

- Service on UM committees or in faculty senate leadership
- Liaison with other units of campus or within MUS
- Service as UFA Officer
- Active engagement in University initiatives to promote anti-racist principles and practices
- Service on committees for the College of Health
- Demonstrated leadership in program development, pedagogical development, curriculum review, etc. in conjunction with other units of campus
- Receipt of honors or awards related to university service
- Active participation in leadership roles in campus initiatives

**Evidence of Service to the Profession includes but is not limited to:**

- Active involvement in professional organizations, such as leadership roles, serving on executive committees, chairing subcommittees, etc.
- Active engagement in professional initiatives to promote anti-racist principles and practices.
- Providing peer review of abstracts or papers for professional conferences
- Review of grant proposals
- Chairing conference panels
- Editorship or membership on editorial review boards
- Service on professional boards
- Providing continuing education to professional organizations
- Receipt of honors or awards related to professional activities

**Evidence of Service to the Community includes but is not limited to:**

- Membership on boards, commissions, or committees
- Leadership in executive committees, subcommittees, or working groups
- Involvement with community organizations in acquiring grants to enhance public services
- Active engagement in community initiatives to promote anti-racist principles and practices
- Partnership with community organizations to promote community engagement for students and faculty
- Public presentations related to professional expertise
- Consulting or training for community groups
- Receipt of awards or honors for community service activities

**“Normal:”** For service-related activities to be evaluated as “normal” the faculty member must provide documentation of:

1. Service on at least two school committees *and*
2. Service in at least one other arena (campus, profession, community)

**“Above Normal:”** For service-related activities to be evaluated as “above normal” the faculty member must provide documentation of

1. Service on at least two school committees *and*
2. Service in at least two other arenas
3. At least one of these demonstrates a significant service contribution

**“Outstanding:”** For service-related activities to be evaluated as “outstanding” the faculty member must provide documentation of:

1. Service on at least two school committees *and*
2. Significant service in at least two arenas (school, university, community, profession) *and*
3. At least one of these demonstrates outstanding service contribution as recognized by a relevant community.

### **Less-than-Normal Performance**

The CBA indicates that a less-than-normal increment may be recommended for either the absence of any performance or poor performance of assigned responsibilities within the scope of employment. Tenure review shall be initiated when a tenured faculty member has received a less-than-normal salary increment for three successive years. A tenured faculty member shall undergo a performance review each year for three successive years following a less-than-normal recommendation.

Per CBA 10.110: Failure to submit an IPR for evaluation by a faculty member, when required (see CBA 10.210, 10.220), is grounds for a less-than-normal increment.

Documentation and evidence submitted by the faculty member will conform to the CBA and this document will also be used by the FEC in consideration of retention and non-reappointment. Probationary tenure-track faculty should meet the standard for normal to be recommended for retention. The procedure used for making a recommendation concerning retention and non-reappointment will be the same as that provided in the CBA and this document for making recommendations concerning tenure, salary, and promotion.

Non-reappointment of a probationary faculty member shall be recommended when the FEC makes a judgment that the performance of the faculty member is less than normal with respect to the standards applicable to his or her rank. Faculty members should consult the CBA for procedures relative to the evaluation process beyond the scope of this document and to determine the procedural requirements for appeals.

**Promotion**

Promotion to any rank depends on securing the academic qualifications and record appropriate to that rank. Criteria listed in the CBA (10.110.1) must have been successfully met along with the following:

Assistant Professor

Assistant Professor: Requires possession of a Ph.D or JD.

Associate Professor

To be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor a faculty member shall demonstrate:

1. Competence in teaching, research, and service as evidenced by ratings of at least normal performance for all years, or evidence of professional development and growth immediately following any year(s) when normal expectations for performance in teaching, research, or service were not met as determined by the FEC.
2. Increasing professional recognition in the area of scholarship as evidenced by meeting the annual expectations for “normal” performance delineated above *and* at least three (3) peer-reviewed publications (articles, books or book chapters).
3. Professional growth and an increasingly valuable service contribution at the School, University, community, state, regional, national and/or international level.

Professor

To be promoted to the rank of Professor a faculty member must demonstrate:

1. Progressively valuable contributions as evidenced by annual ratings that demonstrate normal performance for all years, or evidence of professional development and growth immediately following any year(s) when normal expectations for performance in teaching, research, or service were not met as determined by the FEC. Note that consistent, normal performance during the evaluation period in teaching, research, and service is insufficient for promotion to full professor.
2. Professional recognition in the area of scholarship as evidenced by:
  - Meeting “normal” expectations for scholarship each year as delineated above, *and*
  - At least five (5) peer-reviewed publications (articles, books, or book chapters) since promotion to Associate Professor; *and*
  - A nationally recognized program of research as evidenced by:
    - letters from faculty external to UM, solicited by the member applying for promotion, who have relevant expertise or from other experts in the field who can speak to community-engaged scholarship *or*

- Receipt of significant award or recognition of scholarship by relevant communities.
3. Professional growth and increasingly valuable contributions in leadership to the school through administrative assignments, committee chair representation and leadership in service at the local, state, regional, and/or national levels. A diverse array of scholarly and professional service activities is expected, with some areas of national recognition in evidence.

#### D. Tenure

Applications for tenure must be in accordance with the University of Montana Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA 9.310 and 9.320; 10.110.2 a & b) in effect at the time of application. To be considered for tenure the faculty member must demonstrate professional growth since the time of hire and continuous normal ratings or evidence of professional development and growth immediately following any year(s) when normal expectations for performance in teaching, research, or service were not met by the FEC in the three areas of teaching/advising/supervision, research and scholarship, and service. In the event that normal performance was not obtained any time during the evaluation period, clear evidence must be provided to indicate professional development and growth immediately following any year(s) when normal expectations for performance in teaching, research, or service were not met. Granting of tenure will also reflect the progress expected for being promoted to Professor and a judgment by the FEC that a faculty member has made significant contributions to the School of Social Work and will continue to do so. Note that consistent, normal performance as reported in the member's IPR during the evaluation period in teaching, research, and service is insufficient for tenure.

A faculty member must meet the criteria listed in the CBA and each of the following:

1. Overall "Normal" performance in teaching, research, and service for each year of service, as delineated above *including*;
2. Evidence of at least four (4) peer-reviewed publications (articles, books, or book chapters chapters) during previously credited time periods and time at UM towards tenure.

Consistent with the CBA, consideration for tenure will also be based on professional behavior and equitable participation in the unit's and institution's workload. The applicant for tenure must demonstrate a pattern of professional behavior that is consistent with the values and principles in the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) Code of Ethics.

Documentation of these accomplishments will include: 1) the Individual Performance Record (IPR) and 2) external review letters that support the candidate's viability for tenure.

The steps and timelines for external review are outlined below:

- Faculty member informs School of Social Work (SSW) Chair of intent to apply for tenure by May 15 of the academic year prior to application.

- The SSW Chair asks candidate to submit 5 names of potential external reviewers by May 31 of academic year prior to application. Reviewers should be “arm’s length” from the candidate – familiar with candidate’s scholarship or areas of expertise but should not be in role of mentor, co-author or collaborator.
- SSW Chair provides FEC Chair with candidate’s list of names, and FEC Chair, in consultation with FEC members, identifies an additional five external reviewers. FEC Chair consults with candidate regarding the list to ensure that all potential reviewers meet “arm’s length” criteria.
- FEC Chair sends out the requests for review to potential reviewers by June 15.
- The goal is to secure commitment for a minimum of 4 reviews and a maximum of 6 reviews evenly distributed between the candidate’s list and the FEC Chair’s list. If the FEC Chair is not able to secure commitment from 4 potential reviewers, the FEC Chair requests additional names from the candidate and the FEC Chair and makes additional requests.
- FEC Chair sends the reviewers copies of the candidate’s CV; personal statement on teaching, research, and service; and sample of published research by September 1. The sample consists of 3 published works (articles or books) selected by the candidate. All reviewers receive the same packet of materials.
- The FEC Chair provides the reviewers with a copy of the SSW Unit Standards and instructs reviewers to assess the candidate’s material based on the SSW standards for tenure.
- The FEC Chair requests reviewers to submit written reviews according to the process outlined below:
  - Reviewers are asked to submit 2 letters by October 15: one is the review letter with no identifying information regarding the reviewer. The second is the accompanying cover letter in which the reviewer verifies that s/he is author of the anonymous review.
  - The review letter goes to the SSW Chair, who keeps the identifying cover letter and review letter.
  - SSW Chair provides the FEC the review letters and a key code to letters and reviewers
  - Key code is destroyed at end of review process.
  - The letters, without identifying information, become part of the IPR record and they are available to the candidate.

Finally, a faculty member considering application for tenure should consult the current CBA regarding “Eligibility for Tenure Application (9.310),” “The Tenure Application (9.320),” “Limitations on Tenure Awards (9.330),” Rights of Tenured Appointees (9.300),” “Failure to Attain Tenure (9.340),” and the sections that cover criteria, documentation, and procedure.

#### E. Merit Awards

Faculty members are eligible for a merit award by demonstrating outstanding performance in one or more of the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service, and normal performance in the other two areas or above normal performance in two of the areas and at least normal performance in the third. Faculty seeking merit awards must meet the criteria outlined in the

CBA (10.110.3) and those specified within these unit standards for performance that is considered above normal or outstanding. The applicant seeking a merit award should clearly document accomplishments that exceed the benchmarks outlined for normal and describe how the accomplishments meet the criteria for above normal or outstanding.

Merit materials shall be submitted based on the time since the documentation was prepared for the last granted merit or promotion, or the most recent seven (7) sequential years, whichever is less (CBA 10.220).

Receipt of a merit award does not imply that the requirements of promotion and tenure have been successfully met.

See CBA 10:110 for Outstanding Performance Awards for non-tenure track faculty.

### **Merit Award Criteria for Above Normal or Outstanding Performance:**

Eligible faculty members may apply for a merit award whenever they deem their performance meets the following criteria:

- Above normal performance in at least two of the three areas subject to evaluation *and* normal or above performance in the third area (teaching, research, service) *or*
- Normal or above normal performance in at least two areas and outstanding performance in at least one of these areas.

The criteria for evaluating performance as normal, above normal, or outstanding in these three areas is delineated earlier in this document.

### **III. NON-TENURABLE APPOINTMENTS**

The performance of Faculty Affiliates, Lecturers, Adjunct Faculty, Clinical Faculty, and Visiting Faculty shall be evaluated annually by the FEC and Chair and be based on criteria in Section A. Normal Performance: Teaching, Advising, and Supervision. Annual evaluations for Research Faculty will be based on criteria in Section A. Normal Performance: Research and Scholarship.

The specific assignments for persons with non-tenurable appointments shall be recommended by the Chair and approved by the Dean. Such assignments shall be consistent with the mission and needs of the school. Assignments might include teaching, practicum supervision, advising, special projects, research, and service.

Those with non-tenurable appointments who are teaching a regular course shall comply with the University of Montana's personnel policy by filing their class syllabi with the designated office.

#### Faculty Affiliates

Faculty affiliates are those individuals the school recognizes for contributions to either the instructional, research and creative works, or service components of the school.



Faculty affiliates may contribute to the school through practicum supervision, membership on the advisory committee, guest lecturing in classes, teaching occasional off-campus courses approved by and under the auspices of the School of Social Work and participation with faculty members who are conducting research and/or demonstration projects.

#### Adjunct Faculty (annually appointed)

A University of Montana employee may receive an appointment as an adjunct faculty within the School of Social Work if that individual is actively involved in providing ongoing and substantial instruction or ongoing significant involvement in teaching, supervising, advising, research, creative activity, or service activities within the school. Contributions may include responsibilities for instruction in at least one course per year, participation in research and demonstration projects, and service of central importance to the mission of the school.

Appointment shall be in accordance with The University of Montana personnel policy.

The Chair using course evaluations shall evaluate those holding an adjunct appointment annually.

#### Probationary appointment and non-reappointments

The CBA (9.230) indicates that a probationary appointee has no right to reappointment, and a probationary appointment shall automatically expire at the end of the specified term in the absence of a written reappointment signed by the President. The President may request and review, but shall not be obligated to adhere to, recommendations from the unit, Dean, and the Provost regarding questions of renewal of probationary appointments.

In cases of non-reappointment for financial or programmatic considerations the probationary appointee will be so notified in writing. Written notice of non-renewal of a probationary appointment shall be mailed or given by the President or his/her designee at least four (4) months prior to the expiration of the first appointment, seven (7) months prior to the expiration of the second appointment, and twelve (12) months prior to the expirations of the third or later appointment.

#### Reference:

National Association of Social Workers [NASW] (2017). *NASW Code of Ethics* [rev. 2017]. Washington, DC: NASW.