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INTRODUCTION

The standards contained in this document are consistent with the general University guidelines for faculty advancement as outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and have been approved by the faculty of the School of Speech, Language, Hearing, and Occupational Sciences (SLHOS). The purpose of the Unit Standards is to provide a framework for the evaluation of faculty performance as it relates to specific University, College, and School responsibilities. In any evaluation for purposes of promotion, award of tenure, salary determination, or recommendation for retention, performance in teaching, service, and scholarship/creative works are each important and essential, as set forth in section 6.200 of the CBA. However, as the School of SLHOS is a multifaceted unit, the blend of academic responsibility may vary as the school has different expectations for each faculty position including an explicit difference between tenurable academic faculty and non-tenurable clinical faculty. For all, the character of the performance shall be such that there is a clear demonstration of professional development, and increasingly valuable contribution to the University, and a discernable commitment to furthering the mission of the school.

These Unit Standards and procedures are intended to be in addition to, and consistent with, those provided in the current CBA, and if University Standards and Unit Standards conflict with each other, or are otherwise inconsistent with each other, the University Standards shall control all interpretations and applications.

UNIT PHILOSOPHY AND MISSION

The mission of the School of SLHOS is to prepare students for progressive, collaborative, and research-minded careers in speech-language pathology, audiology, occupational therapy, and related fields through rigorous academic and clinical training. We strive to be innovative in the use of technology and program delivery to provide services to traditionally under-served regions and populations. Through our emphasis on typical and atypical speech, language, cognition, swallowing, and hearing, motoric and daily-living functioning, students gain knowledge and skills along with ethical and culturally competent values that foster a commitment to lifelong learning and civic engagement.

We meet our mission through a unique combination of course and clinical delivery models that impact our workload and evaluation process. The course delivery model in the School of SLHOS is unique in that it includes synchronous web-based live campus/broadcast distance, fully online, clinical education, and traditional face-to-face didactic courses. The course delivery is integrated into our undergraduate (e.g., bachelors degree, postbaccalaureate leveling, assistant-certificate) and graduate (master’s and
Ph.D.) programming. The School of SLHOS is also dedicated to community clinical outreach and houses the DeWit RiteCare Speech, Language, and Hearing Clinic to provide the community with clinical services across the lifespan while simultaneously engaging in the clinical education of our students. In addition, the School of SLHOS runs satellite clinics across the community in the public schools and medical settings.

PREAMBLE

To provide SLHOS students with the most favorable and productive educational environment, SLHOS faculty members are: (1) teachers and/or clinical educators, (2) scholars of teaching and/or research, and (3) active members of the University. In that capacity, all are expected to carry out the principal academic appointments and responsibilities of their positions that are aligned with the overall mission of the School, University, and College. Faculty members’ workload assignments (i.e., FTE allocations) vary across areas of teaching, scholarship, and service according to contractual roles. As such, faculty members are not expected to engage in equal amounts of teaching, scholarly activity, and service; it is recognized that the effectiveness of the School of SLHOS is dependent upon the collective contributions of the faculty in their respective areas of expertise and as elucidated in their contractual expectations. The School of SLHOS faculty believes that allowing for differences in workload assignment expectations in an equitable and transparent system provides the most appropriate framework for achieving the goals of the Faculty, Program, School, College, and University.

PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

The procedures for evaluating faculty performance are directed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) (section 10.200 – 10.260), which establishes specific expectations for faculty performance and the procedures and timeline for evaluating performance, as well as the Unit Standards. If the 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. Current standards must be used when requesting a merit award. Evidence of performance for each faculty member will be provided through an Individualized Performance Record (IPR) prepared by each faculty member. During each evaluation period faculty are required to state their request for a normal salary increment, promotion, tenure, or merit award and, as such, designate the applicable time period for the evaluation. Faculty are required to provide appropriate documentation in their IPR to ensure that the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), Chair, and Dean can accurately evaluate the requestor’s performance during the evaluation period. The IPR should not include evidence of performance outside of the applicable evaluation period. The FEC may request and consider any evidence from any source, including the faculty member to be evaluated, provided that any evidence relied upon for evaluation purposes shall be
incorporated into the record. The FEC may request additional information from the faculty member being evaluated during the evaluation period (October 15 to November 14). The faculty member shall have five working days to respond. No individual to be evaluated may be sanctioned, suspended, disciplined, or discharged for failure to comply with a request to provide additional information.

**FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

The articulated purpose of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) is to provide peer review and evaluation of the performance of each faculty member in the unit per the schedule as outlined in the CBA and specific to the period of evaluation. The FEC is responsible for evaluating the performance record of all faculty under the collective bargaining unit who have an FTE of ≥ 0.5. Please see section 10.240 of the CBA for specific details regarding the development and procedures of the FEC.

The FEC will consist of all SLHOS faculty members under the Collective Bargaining Unit, excluding the School Chair. An FEC sub-committee consisting of at least three tenured/tenurable faculty and two non-tenurable faculty will be elected by the SLHOS faculty to lead the evaluation process and ensure all deadlines are met. The FEC Chair will be elected by the members of the FEC sub-committee. An alternate will also be elected to the sub-committee, as needed, if any FEC sub-committee member is being evaluated in the review period. A faculty member requesting a merit or outstanding performance increase is not permitted to evaluate another faculty member also seeking merit or outstanding performance increase. An additional alternate will be selected in this circumstance. One student observer with all rights, save voting, shall be appointed by the FEC chairperson from among the students in the unit.

The FEC sub-committee will complete detailed evaluations and will provide a draft of the evaluation letter highlighting each faculty member’s relevant accomplishments in each applicable area of evaluation. Tenured and tenurable faculty will be evaluated in scholarship/creative works, teaching, and service. Non-tenurable faculty will be evaluated according to his/her appointed workload FTE (e.g., 80% teaching, 20% service). The entire FEC will then meet to discuss each faculty member under review and to vote. For each tenure-track faculty member under review, votes will be cast for **Less-Than-Normal,** **Normal,** **Above Normal,** or **Outstanding** for each faculty member in each applicable evaluation area. For each non-tenure-track faculty member under review, votes will be cast for **Unsatisfactory,** **Satisfactory,** or **Outstanding.** Voting will be anonymous. Only tenured or tenurable faculty will be allowed to vote for tenure-track faculty requesting tenure and promotion (CBA 10.240). In every other situation, all available members of the FEC will vote. The majority vote will hold. In the case of a tie or non-majority, the FEC sub-committee will decide.

Within ten (10) working days of receipt of the recommendation from the Faculty Evaluation Committee, the faculty member may submit a written appeal to the Faculty Evaluation Committee regarding any aspect of the Faculty Evaluation Committee’s recommendation or process (See Section 10.24 of the CBA for further detail).
RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNIT CHAIR

The faculty member’s FEC recommendation and SEC review will be submitted to the Unit Chair on or before November 15th. The Unit Chair will then review the faculty member’s IPR, FEC recommendation, SEC review, and complete the Chair’s recommendation on or before December 15th. On or before December 15th the faculty member will be given the opportunity to discuss the recommendation of the Unit Chair with the Unit Chair prior to the recommendation submitted to the Dean. Within ten (10) working days of receipt of the recommendation from the Unit Chair, the faculty member may submit a written appeal to the Chair regarding any aspect of the Chair’s recommendation or process (See Section 10.250 of the CBA for further details.).

STUDENT EVALUATION COMMITTEE

The purpose of the Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) is to provide student review of the teaching effectiveness of the faculty members in the bargaining unit who are in the academic unit for which the SEC is appointed. Each faculty member must have at least one course evaluated by the SEC for each semester he/she teaches. Please see section 10.230 of the CBA for specific details regarding the development and procedures of the SEC.

EXTERNAL REVIEW

For faculty applying for tenure, an external review process will be implemented. The faculty member under review for tenure will submit names and contact information of four to six (6) potential external reviewers from institutions with similar research and teaching loads to the FEC chair (i.e., FEC chair serving during the current academic year) for consideration by April 20th. The FEC subcommittee and School Chair will complete a review of the faculty member’s external reviewer list for final approval based on appropriateness of peer expertise and institution. The FEC sub-committee and/or School Chair may add additional potential reviewers to the list if deemed necessary. If additional reviewers were added for consideration, the faculty member will have the opportunity to respond to these additional potential reviewers within ten (10) days and may request, in writing, the removal of any names along with a rationale to the FEC subcommittee and Chair. The FEC subcommittee and Chair will determine if a sufficient rationale was provided to remove the name(s) from the list. The FEC subcommittee and School Chair will approve the final list of potential reviewers by May 1st.

The School Chair will secure commitments from three (3) reviewers no later than August 15th. The faculty member will submit external review materials (i.e., Curriculum Vitae, Summary of Achievement Letter that includes an overview of scholarship, teaching, service, and a description of role assignment/allocation of FTE for the review period) to the School Chair by August 20th. The School Chair will send the faculty member’s external review materials and the Unit Standards to the external reviewers by September 1st. The reviewers will be asked by the School Chair via formal letter or email to review the
candidate on teaching, scholarship, and service in accordance to the Unit Standards and the faculty member’s FTE allocation. Reviewer letters will be due to the School Chair by October 1 via email.

EVALUATION SCHEDULE FOR TENURED AND TENURE TRACK FACULTY

All evaluation schedules, timelines, and procedures will be in accordance with those outlined in the CBA. 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. See section 10.210 of the CBA for additional information regarding the evaluation schedule. This evaluation schedule is contingent upon the following conditions:

- The faculty member is seeking a normal increase;
- The faculty member has not received a less-than-normal recommendation in the past three (3) years; and
- The unit Faculty Evaluation Committee does not wish to initiate consideration for other than a normal recommendation.

GENERAL CRITERIA AND CONSIDERATIONS

The following criteria will be used to evaluate each faculty member and for making recommendations on retention, salary increments, promotion, and tenure. Both the quality and the quantity of the evidence provided will be used in decision-making. Each faculty member’s performance will be evaluated individually in relation to the role they play and the expectations delineated in their appointment and annually reviewed workload assignment.

Faculty Teamwork, Collaboration and Work Environment

The School of SLHOS provides a professionally oriented program of education that must meet the accreditation standards issued by the Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology (CAA). To meet the accrediting body’s standards and the mission of the School, faculty members are expected to actively engage in the work of the Unit in a professionally respectful, collaborative interaction with their colleagues (consistent with CBA 6.200).

Teaching

Assignments for all faculty may include teaching expectations for: traditional face-to-face courses, mixed synchronous web-delivered distance/local courses, fully online courses, and/or clinical education rotations in specialized clinics. Mentorship and supervision of students are considered critical components of teaching within the School of SLHOS. All faculty members are expected to be effective teachers who seek feedback and methods to become better educators throughout their career at the University of Montana.
The following provides a general guideline for normal and above normal/outstanding performance in teaching inclusive of academic as well as clinical education.

**Normal**

Evidence of effective teaching should include, but is not limited to the following:

- Teaches a minimum course load as determined by the Dean, including General Education Courses (as applicable);
- Creates course syllabi containing objectives, content, learning strategies, and evaluation procedures;
- Adheres to the timelines and procedures outlined in the course syllabi and notifies students of any changes to the syllabi;
- Achieves overall satisfactory student course evaluations;
- Grades and returns assignments in adherence with the guidelines set forth by the Registrar's Office;
- Consistently uses School, College, and University electronic data and/or course management systems when applicable (e.g., Moodle, Therabill, CORS);
- Engages in innovative course delivery models including: online, distance, traditional face-to-face, service learning, clinical education courses, and combinations thereof;
- Participates in continuing education and development of pedagogy consistent with faculty accreditation standards;
- Includes teaching philosophy and evidence of reflection on own teaching in IPR.

**Above Normal/Outstanding**

Evidence of *above normal* effective teaching should include, but is not limited to several additional artifacts, such as those listed below. Evidence of *outstanding* effective teaching should include but is not limited to several additional artifacts that are substantial in depth and/or breadth, such as those listed below.

- Use of evidence-based teaching strategies (e.g., active learning strategies, universal design, backwards design, problem-based learning strategies, reflective writing);
- Use of evidence-based models of clinical education;
- Mentoring a student in clinical practicum before the student has the typical prerequisite coursework;
- Substantial mentorship of students requiring remediation;
- Written peer evaluation of effective teaching (e.g., Pedagogy Project, Writing & Public Speaking Center, external evaluation of teaching, team-teaching associate, guest lecture in a colleague’s course);
- Mentorship of faculty, instructors, or graduate students in pedagogical methods;
- Evidence of writing-intensive assignments incorporated into courses;
- Providing guest lectures to other institutions and units;
• Teaching of a didactic course with a service learning designation that meets an identified need in the community;
• Evidence of students’ broadened understanding/heightened awareness of the importance of civic engagement and current social issues;
• Development of a new course to enhance the school’s mission
• Significant restructuring of a previously taught course in response to students’ needs;
• Inclusion of new instructional technology in courses or clinical education
• Supervision of undergraduate independent study/research credits
• Supervision of graduate independent studies/theses/dissertations
• Substantial collaboration with entities designed to promote student success and learning (e.g., American Indian Student Services, The Writing Center, TRIO, DSS);
• Integration of student success initiatives;
• Mentored-student recognition of performance (e.g., service learning community partner, award, accolade, acceptance into a competitive program)
• Teaching honors courses;
• Clinical expertise recognized and awarded locally or regionally (e.g., Board Recognized Specialist, special certifications);
• Application of principles and skills learned in continuing education programs specifically designed to enhance the faculty members’ teaching skills and/or pedagogical knowledge base;
• Demonstration of extensive mentored supervision of student learning/teaching/graduate assistants;
• Service on an advisory board or committee that emphasizes teaching effectiveness (academic or clinical) and/or innovation (e.g., Faculty Inquiry Project for Teaching, Teaching Excellence Initiative, Pedagogy Project);
• Honors, awards, and commendations for teaching excellence (including clinical education);
• Acquisition of grants to support course or instructional development
• Adoption or adaptation of Open Educational Resources (OER);
• Evidence of provision of interprofessional education opportunities (e.g., patient simulations, clinical observations, clinical rotations);
• Acquisition of a written evaluation of a live or recorded teaching session for the purpose of self-evaluation and improving teaching. The evaluation must be positive in nature to qualify for above normal designation.

Scholarly Activity/Creative Works

The School of SLHOS values the production and dissemination of scholarship as a key piece of integrating discovery and creative works beyond the local level. The complexity and depth of a faculty member’s scholarly activity may differ based on their specific contract and allocated load. Review and assessment of scholarly activity/creative works will be contextualized by faculty role and fraction of FTE dedicated to scholarship. Faculty members with a scholarship/research workload
appointment are expected to engage in scholarly and related research activity and to disseminate their findings in peer-reviewed contexts (e.g., journal publications, state/national presentations, published software applications). Furthermore, faculty are expected to characterize their contributions on scholarship/creative works and demonstrate growth over time (for example, a third author position on one manuscript may indicate a minor contribution, whereas a third author position on a collaborative study may indicate a major contribution). Equal value will be given to clinical research, laboratory research, translational research, implementation science, and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The following provides a general guideline for what is considered normal and above normal or outstanding accomplishments in Scholarly Activity/Creative Works.

**Normal**

In general, the minimum requirement for normal performance in Scholarship/Creative Works is one peer-reviewed research publication per year, on average, within a review period; however, other scholarship accomplishments will be considered as equivalent to a peer-reviewed publication provided they are similar (or higher) in impact. These works may include, but are not limited to:

- Publication of written work or other media (e.g., manuscript, book chapter, software application, non-refereed publication, abstracts, open educational resource);
- Supervision/mentoring of students in research;
- Publications in peer-reviewed journals;
- Evidence of works in progress (e.g., manuscript under review, book in preparation);
- Evidence of submission of grant proposals;
- Awarding of internal grants;
- Presentations (e.g., scholarly panels, symposia, seminars, workshops, posters, etc.) at university, local, regional, or national level;
- Professional society proposals, books, or presentations.

**Above Normal/Outstanding**

Evidence of above normal effective scholarship should include, but is not limited to several published works from the normal category and additional artifacts, such as those listed below. Evidence of outstanding effective scholarship should include but is not limited to several works in normal category and several additional artifacts that are substantial in quantity, influence, depth, breadth such as those listed below.

- Active editorial board member of scholarly journal;
- Authorship of published lab/clinical implementation manual;
- Editor or co-editor of a published book or journal;
- Obtained funding for collaborative or interprofessional efforts;
• PI co-PI, or significant investigator of awarded external funding;
• Expert consultant of research or project grants;
• Research awards, fellowships, and/or honors;
• Invited research presentations at national or international level;
• Established industry partnerships, patents, licenses with dissemination;
• Publication, dissemination, and evidence of field utilization of products/protocols from research;
• Production and publication of significant creative works, such as videos, software, or other technologically mastered productions.

Service

Service is reflected by participation in School, College, and University committees and task forces, initiatives, or working groups. Service may also include participation and active engagement in professional organizations and committees at regional, state, national, and international levels. Level, depth, and breadth of service is expected to grow with rank and align with School, College, and University mission and goals. Moreover, service expectations are to be considered in light of each faculty member’s position, FTE, and assigned workload. For example, for SLHOS, a typical full-time faculty member (1.0 FTE) is expected to dedicate approximately 4 hours on average weekly for every 10% service workload assignment.

As set forth in section 6.200 of the CBA, all faculty are expected to professionally participate in the work of the unit and of the institution. This normal increment expectation includes, but is not limited to, consistent, active, and informed participation in the School’s development, refinement, and implementation of programming, processes, and policies that support clinical and/or academic training. This expectation would be reflected in active and professional engagement in School and College meetings, and participation in School committees. In addition, depending on faculty rank, FTE, and assigned service load, the level, breadth, and depth of service may extend to also include participation in additional committees, working groups or task forces at the College, University, regional, national, and international levels.

Faculty service is considered to reflect that of an above normal or outstanding level when service activities 1) require commitments above and beyond position/rank expectations and assigned FTE dedicated to service, 2) require significant time and effort, 3) require effective faculty leadership responsibilities, and/or 4) result in relevant and significant impacts. Service would be considered to require extensive time and effort when follow up activities such as research, multiple meetings, and/or time-intensive reports are needed for successful service completion. Effective faculty leadership, such as that required of a committee chair, would be defined as taking the independent initiative to guide, organize, and coordinate relevant meetings, documents, and stakeholders to meet the committee/task force goals or charges. Finally, important and significant impacts would be demonstrated by
improved outcomes (e.g., streamlined processes, increased recruitment)
considered to have meaningful impacts that are aligned with the School, College,
and University mission.

Faculty with directorship roles have larger-than-average assigned service loads that
reflect specific positions (e.g., School Chair, Program Director, Coordinators). As
such, normal increment evaluation standards will reflect the expected effective
leadership roles and duties established as maintaining one’s role required in the
CBA (section 16.20 Chair only) or according to assigned duties. Like other faculty
peers, individuals in directorship duties would be considered to perform at levels
above normal or outstanding status when service activities 1) require commitments
above and beyond position/rank expectations relative to FTE dedicated to service,
2) require significant time and effort, 3) reflect effective faculty leadership
responsibilities in situations considered above and beyond role requirements;
and/or 4) result in important and significant impacts.

The following table provides a general guideline for normal and above normal or
outstanding performance in Service. All service will be considered in light of each
faculty member’s FTE allocation dedicated to service and assigned roles and
duties.

Normal

According to assigned role and FTE service allocation consistent, active, and
informed participation in:
- School’s development, refinement, and implementation of programming,
  processes and policies that support clinical and/or academic training;
- Participation in School, College, University, regional committees, tasks forces, or
  working groups.

Above Normal/Outstanding

Evidence of above normal/outstanding effective service should include multiple
additional artifacts that demonstrate the following expectations (meeting 1 to 2 of
the following expectations is considered above normal; meeting 3 to 4 of the
following expectations is considered outstanding):
- Commitments above and beyond position/rank expectations and FTE assigned
  service loads;
- Time and effort over a significant period of time;
- Effective leadership (described above); and/or
- Efforts that result in relevant and significant impacts.
Though not exhaustive, the following are examples of service across various levels:

- **SLHOS School Service Level**: SLHOS Committees, Subcommittees such as:
  - Faculty Evaluation, Admissions, Curriculum, Distance Education,
  - Undergraduate/Graduate Curriculum/Program, Technology; and additional
  - SLHOS Non-committee Service such as Policy and Procedural Development,
  - Accreditation Activities, Faculty Advisor for Student Organizations, Accreditation
  - and Administrative Reports;

- **College Service Level**: College Committees, Task Forces/Working Groups,
  - College Advisory Boards, Steering Committees, IPE Working Group, Research
  - Working Group, IT working Group, Teaching & Learning Working Group, Rural
  - Education Working Group;

- **University Service Level**: Faculty Senate, Executive Committee of the Faculty
  - Senate, ASCRC, IRB Board, Graduate Council, Research Council, Advisory
  - Boards, Steering Committees, Search Committees, Unit Standards, General
  - Education Committee, Graduation Committee, Service Learning Advisory Board;

- **State/Regional Professional Service Level**: State Professional
  - Organizations/Associations (include offices held, committees), State Governing
  - Boards, State Task Forces/Committees, State Legislative Involvement, State
  - Professional Conferences (in which you contributed service), State Level
  - Reports, Testimony, Interviews, Depositions, State Level Service-Related
  - Honors/Awards, State/Region Consulting, In-Services, Trainings;

- **National Professional Service Level**: National Professional Associations
  - (include offices held, committees), National Reports, Testimony, Interviews,
  - Depositions, National Professional Conferences (in which you contributed
  - service), Nationally Recognized Service-Related Honors/Awards, National
  - Consultation, In-Services, Trainings;

- **International Professional Service Level**: International Professional
  - Associations, International Reports, Testimony, Interviews, Depositions,
  - International Professional Conferences (in which you contributed service),
  - Internationally Recognized Service-Related Honors/Awards, Internationally
  - Recognized Consultation, In-Services, Trainings.
I. TENURE

Eligibility for Tenure Application

In accordance with section 9.310 of the CBA, eligibility for tenure in the School of Speech, Language, Hearing, and Occupational Sciences will be based on the following:

A probationary appointee shall be eligible to make an application for tenure:
1. after the appointee has completed five (5) years of credited service toward tenure, that is: during the sixth (6) year of credited employment.
2. the applicant must hold a doctoral degree, and
3. the applicant should hold the minimum academic rank of associate professor, although faculty may apply for tenure and promotion to associate professor simultaneously. If a faculty member seeking promotion to associate professor and tenure simultaneously is not promoted, tenure will be denied as well. Under no circumstances may tenure be granted to an assistant professor.

Tenure shall not be awarded in absence of application by the eligible faculty and approval of tenure by the employer. Application for tenure must be in accord with unit standards. No faculty member beginning employment at UM in fall 2019 or later may apply for tenure more than once, except in extraordinary circumstances, with the approval of the dean and the Provost. No faculty member hired before or after fall 2019 may apply for tenure more than twice under any circumstance.

In order to be awarded tenure, faculty must demonstrate Above Normal performance in at least one of the three evaluation areas (i.e., teaching, scholarship/creative works, and service) and at least Normal performance in the other two areas.

Tenure Application

Evaluation of tenure applications shall be conducted according to Article 10.000 of the CBA, SLHOS Unit Standards, and Faculty Evaluation Procedures. It shall be the responsibility of the eligible faculty member to initiate the application for tenure. The process will begin when the faculty member initiates the external review process during the spring prior to application (see External Review guidelines described above). The department chair will secure three external reviewers and forward the following materials for review by August 20th:
Curriculum Vitae, Summary of Achievement Letter that includes an overview of scholarship, teaching, service, and a description of role assignment/allocation of...
FTE for the review period. The reviewers will be asked to return reviews by October 1st.

The faculty member’s application will be submitted to the FEC by October 15th and will include the following:

- External reviews (submitted to the FEC by the School Chair).
- A statement of the teaching, scholarship/creative works, and public service performed by the applicant during the probationary period.
- A curriculum vitae of the applicant’s teaching, scholarship and/or creative works, and public service.
- Evidence that the applicant has achieved or is in the process of achieving recognition in his/her field of competence beyond the University of Montana.
- Evidence of at least Normal performance in teaching, scholarship/creative works, and service, with Above Normal performance in at least one of these categories.
- Any other information the applicant deems relevant to his/her professional development, competence, or performance.

Failure to Attain Tenure

If a probationary faculty member has not attained tenure at the University of Montana by the completion of his/her seventh (7th) year of credited employment, the conditions of 9.340 of the CBA will be enforced.

II. PROMOTION: Promotion in the School of Speech, Language, Hearing, and Occupational Sciences is based upon documentation of effectiveness and quality of work. In any evaluation for purposes of promotion, performance in teaching, community and university service, and scholarship/creative works are important and essential, as set forth in section 6.200 of the CBA. The blend of academic responsibility in these areas, however, may vary as the School may have different assignments for each faculty position. The character of performance shall be such that there is a clear demonstration of immersion and impact in his/her professional field, an increasingly valuable contribution to the University, and a discernable commitment to furthering the mission of the School and University. The evaluation process will consider all accomplishments in the present rank including work accomplished at other institutions in that rank consistent with CBA sections 9.240 and 9.310. In every case of promotion, the candidate will provide a curriculum vitae, a completed Individual Performance Review, and evidence of teaching, service, and scholarship.

- Specific Criteria for Promotion

In accordance with CBA 10.110, the following requirements must be met regarding each of the respective types of advancement:
• Promotion to Assistant Professor:
  Requires possession of a doctoral degree or its equivalent as
determined at the time of initial appointment by the Dean, in
consultation with the School.

• 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 a doctoral degree. The character of the
service in rank as assistant professor shall be such that there is a
clear demonstration of professional growth and an increasingly
valuable contribution to the University. Furthermore, in the School
of SLHOS, in order to be promoted to Associate professor the
faculty member must demonstrate Above Normal performance in
at least one of the three evaluation areas (i.e., teaching,
scholarship/creative works, and service) and at least Normal
performance in the other two areas.

• 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. 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. For promotion to full professor, a faculty member
must have the level necessary as defined in the CBA and unit
standards in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, scholarship of
teaching and learning, and service. However, no faculty member
may be promoted to full professor on the basis of teaching and
service alone. Scholarship shall be demonstrated by scholarly
publication or appropriate public recognition for creative works.
Furthermore, in the School of SLHOS, in order to be promoted to
Full Professor, the faculty member must demonstrate Above
Normal or Outstanding performance in at least two of the three
evaluation areas (i.e., teaching, scholarship/creative works, and
service) and at least Normal performance in the third area.

III. MERIT: According to Section 10.110 of the CBA, merit is defined as above normal
performance in at least two (2) of the three (3) areas of teaching,
scholarship/creative activity, or service; -OR- as outstanding performance or special
recognition in at least one (1) of these areas and normal performance in the
remaining area or areas of assigned duties. The IPR should present performance
of 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 (Article
10.22. No faculty member may earn a merit in the same year that a promotion is
granted (Article 13.240).

IV. NORMAL INCREMENT: The performance of a majority of faculty members will
generally be evaluated as "normal." They will be expected to grow in value to the
institution and will be rewarded with a "normal" increment to their salary (Article
10.110).

V. LESS-THAN-NORMAL INCREMENT: Either the absence of any performance or
poor performance of assigned responsibilities within the scope of employment may
constitute grounds for a less-than-normal evaluation. It is understood that the
absence of performance in any one or two of the areas of teaching,
research/creative activity, and public service does not justify a less-than-normal
evaluation if the quantity of performance in the remaining area or areas is
proportional to the FTE of the appointment, if the quality of performance in the
remaining area or areas is at least normal, and if the individual has assigned duties
solely in the remaining area or areas. Failure to submit an IPR for evaluation by a
faculty member, when required (see CBA 10.110, 10.210, 10.340), is grounds for a
less than-normal increment.

TENURE REVIEW

In accordance with article 17.000 of the CBA, tenure review will be initiated when a
tenured faculty member has received a less-than-normal salary increment for three (3)
successive years. The procedures for tenure review will be in accordance with article
17.100 of the CBA.

PROBATIONARY APPOINTMENTS AND NON-REAPPOINTMENTS

In accordance with Article 9.230 of the CBA, 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
NON-TENURABLE APPOINTMENTS

Non-tenurable appointments include five types: lecturers, adjunct faculty at any rank, research faculty at any rank, clinical faculty at any rank, and visiting faculty at any rank. Non-tenurable appointments must be recommended by the School faculty based upon Unit Standards and policies to ensure that the appointees have the requisite credentials to teach (inclusive of academic or clinical education) and/or conduct research in the unit. The evaluations of non-tenurable appointments must reflect assignments and expectations (e.g., non-tenurable faculty with no research and creative scholarship requirements will not be evaluated in this area), but the evaluations will acknowledge such professional activities when actually performed.

As outlined in Article 9.220 of the CBA, at the time of appointment or reappointment, each faculty member shall be provided by the employer with a written agreement which specifies rank, salary, and other terms and conditions of employment.

The rights of non-tenurable appointees in the School of Speech, Language, Hearing, and Occupational Sciences who are members of the bargaining unit, are the same as outlined in section 9.110 of the CBA:

In addition to all of the rights and privileges defined in this contract and UM Policy 350; revised 10/13/2017, members of the bargaining unit holding non-tenurable appointments shall:

1. hold an FTE assignment, which represents the actual proportion of full-time load as determined by the dean in consultation with the unit taking into consideration expectations of teaching, research, and service and their relationship to Unit Standards. In making workload assignments, deans may assign workload in the form of equivalent credit for duties beyond or in lieu of normal classroom teaching, including but not limited to advising, thesis direction, large classroom enrollment, writing-intensive courses, committee service, administrative duties, lab supervision, and research. A full-time semester assignment will be comprised of 15 credits and/or credit equivalencies as determined by the dean and approved by the Provost. In classes which are team taught, class credit will be prorated by degree of responsibility. Credit equivalencies are in addition to class credit.

2. be hired at no less than at the salary floors in the CBA (section 13.300) prorated by FTE.

3. Further, if members of the UFA bargaining unit holding non-tenurable appointments have been employed for the previous academic year at .50 FTE or greater, they shall receive a normal increase to their base salary, prorated by assigned FTE.

Consistent with BOR Policy 702.1, for non-tenurable faculty on a one year appointment there is no expectation of reappointment or renewal of any non-tenurable faculty appointment. Non-tenurable contracts are term contracts which automatically expire (without notice) at the end of the contract term unless renewed prior to expiration.

However, the Administration will attempt to inform non-tenurable faculty in a timely fashion if they are to be reappointed for the next semester. Non-tenurable faculty may be given a three (3) year contract at the discretion of the Administration in negotiation with the faculty.
member, the chair of the School and the dean of the College. The continuation of a multi-
year, non-tenurable contract is dependent on continued funding for the position and
satisfactory performance by the faculty member. Discharge for cause of all non-tenurable
faculty is governed by the procedures outlined in section 18.400. Non-tenurable faculty
who are bargaining unit members shall be encouraged to apply for non-tenurable
appointments comparable to those they have previously held and shall be guaranteed
reasonable consideration according to their teaching experience at UM. Service in non-
tenurable appointments does not count towards probationary service for tenure unless
otherwise agreed to in writing by the dean and approved by the Provost. Any non-
tenurable faculty member dismissed from a previous position for cause forfeits this
reasonable consideration at the time of dismissal.

Non-tenurable faculty will be evaluated by the FEC according to their appointed
duties and allocated FTE. Non-tenurable faculty will be evaluated on the same timeline as
tenurable faculty and with the same criteria used to evaluate tenurable faculty, except that
non-tenurable faculty will only be evaluated in the areas for which they hold an FTE
allocation.

Non-tenurable faculty are eligible for Outstanding Performance Awards (CBA
10.110section 3.a.). Outstanding Performance Awards are intended to reward excellence
in the performance of non-tenure track faculty. Award pay shall be in addition to other
salary increments provided in the contract. In the School of SLHOS, a non-tenurable
faculty member with FTE allocation in two areas (e.g., teaching and service), Outstanding
Performance is defined as at least above normal both areas, or outstanding in one area
and at least normal in the other area. If a non-tenurable faculty member’s FTE includes all
three areas (i.e., teaching, service, and scholarship), Outstanding Performance is defined
as above normal in at least two areas with normal in the third, or outstanding in one area
and at least normal in the other two. Performance in an area for which a non-tenurable
faculty member does not hold an FTE allocation (e.g., research activities when research is
not required) may also be considered when determining outstanding performance so long
as the areas within the FTE allocation are at least normal.