<div align="center">

Baylor University
Robbins College of Health and Human Sciences
Department of Human Sciences and Design

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

</div>

Introduction

The Department of Human Sciences and Design (HSD) at Baylor University has as its mission to develop scholars and leaders who apply a Christian worldview to improve the quality of life and human experience for individuals, families, and communities by advancing education, scholarship, and service related to nutrition, apparel, the built environment, human development, and family relationships. To accomplish this mission, our work draws from many core disciplines in the sciences, social sciences, arts, and business, as well as from the specialized disciplines in Human Sciences that address human health, development, and endeavor. The interdisciplinary nature of human sciences complements the collaborative faculty members with diverse professional interests and creates varied teaching, research, and service outputs. These distinct differences are respected and valued by faculty and staff within the department, and create dynamic synergies and collaborations within missional frameworks.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion must provide evidence that their academic maturity, initiative, and leadership are adequate to sustain continued production of quality teaching, scholarly work, service, and student mentoring. Scholarship expectations for each candidate include consistent productivity within a focused area(s) within the discipline and aligned with his or her expertise, and regular engagement in rigorous scholarly collaboration with others building from their area of expertise.

Due to the diversity of disciplines in HSD at Baylor, typical scholarship expectations for the various candidates' specific disciplines at research universities have been noted and considered in creating the department's tenure and promotion guidelines. The HSD promotion and tenure guidelines provide minimum expectations for a candidate to be considered for tenure and/or promotion. These criteria are based on the mission and goals of Baylor University and the Robbins College of Health and Human Sciences and are in line with the Baylor University Tenure and Promotion Policies. Although numeric criteria are provided as a baseline, tenure and promotion reviews are equally dependent on the qualitative assessment of the candidate's body of work.

This document is intended to guide: (I) Assistant Professors in establishing themselves as emerging national/international scholars and dedicated teachers while attaining tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, and (II) Associate Professors in establishing themselves as national/international scholars, master educators, and leaders in their discipline aspiring to the rank of Professor.

Faculty workloads in HSD may vary and disciplinary differences are considered in the following guidelines when examining a faculty member's scholarly record for tenure and promotion; therefore, the proposed departmental tenure and promotion standards are flexible with regard to numeric and categorical expectations as indicated in the following Scholarship Expectations

section of this document. Faculty are expected to read and follow the criteria outlined in this document from the start of employment, to note expectations, and to document relevant achievements. It is expected that faculty in the Department of Human Sciences and Design produce excellence in their teaching, research, and service. The key to the success of a new faculty member is to build a research agenda that demonstrates evidence of scholarly productivity. As departmental and university-level research support for faculty increases and graduate programs are developed and strengthened, tenure and promotion expectations may also change. Consequently, the Department of Human Sciences and Design will re-evaluate departmental tenure and promotion criteria at least every five years.

I.   Tenure and Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor

A.   Teaching Effort (Teaching & Related Scholarly Work)

Faculty members are expected to document a consistent record of quality teaching and pedagogy development. Documentation must include peer and department chair evaluations, student course evaluations, artifacts of instruction (such as syllabi, class assignments, instructional development, student work), and evidence of reflection and growth in teaching through curriculum and instructional development. Evidence of teaching quality, as required by university policy, must include a systematic assessment of student opinion and peer teaching evaluations. The lists below are not intended to be exhaustive nor limiting to the faculty member; rather, they are examples of best practices in each aspect of teaching that they should continually strive to obtain and uphold.

1. Teaching Effectiveness

Indicators of teaching effectiveness, either in classes involving groups of students or in work with individual students include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Incorporate recent scholarship in content and innovative pedagogy.
- Apply appropriate information technology.
- Respond sensitively to student diversity and to the differing prior knowledge, needs, and interests of students.
- Impart to students critical and creative thinking skills consistent with the goals of the learning experience.
- Demonstrate expertise in subject matter through breadth and depth of courses taught
- Implement best instructional practices in the classroom as determined by the appropriate discipline's professional programs (e.g., following practices advocated by national accrediting bodies or other similar organizations).
- Receive recognition for teaching such as honors or awards from the university or a professional organization.
- Articulate personal teaching philosophy and demonstrate how this philosophy is applied in courses taught.
- Reflect annually on aspects of course pedagogy that are highly effective and those that may require improvement.

2. Development of Teaching

This area addresses course and curricula development. Course development refers to the the creation of new courses and improvement of existing courses, while curriculum development refers to cultivating the cohesiveness of knowledge among all course offerings within the program. Indicators of growth or development in teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Course Development
    - Create and refine student learning outcomes as identified by the program, the university and its accrediting bodies
    - Remain current on professional standards and accreditation requirements within their disciplines to best prepare students to meet requirements for licensure guidelines
    - Participate in teaching-related professional development and workshop opportunities offered by the university or their respective professional organizations
    - Expand teaching approaches through the adoption of innovative methods of instruction such as team teaching and engaging in scholarly strategies that involve innovative methods of teaching
    - Address and make concentrated efforts to improve any student course evaluation ratings that are lower than comparison groups to the mean in subsequent semesters
    - Respond appropriately to student comments in the qualitative portion of student course evaluations through improvements or adaptions to the course

- Curriculum Development
    - Participate in program decision-making processes about curricula, instruction, and assessment
    - Promote teaching development through revision and development of curricula, including preparation of new courses, active participation in professional development, revision of existing courses, and engagement in scholarly strategies such as action research, or publications and presentations about teaching practice
    - Submit teaching development grants

3. Participation in Student Mentoring and Graduate Education

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate evidence of providing guidance and leadership to undergraduate or graduate students through one or more of the following activities.

- Author joint creative design or joint presentations with students.
- Mentor students in student educational goals and career aspirations.
- Advise students' participation in competitions or receive honors or win awards for students' work completed in a faculty member's course.
- Mentor undergraduate research including honors theses and URSA grants.
- Serve on research or thesis committee(s) or comprehensive exam committee(s).
- Mentor graduate capstone projects.
- Supervise graduate student teachers.

- Receive awards or recognition for advising or mentorship.
- Be accessible to students outside of scheduled class times.

4. Department Peer Review Guidelines

In accordance with Baylor University tenure policy requiring submission of peer reviews of teaching as part of a candidate's tenure notebook/supporting materials, the HSD Department requires adherence to the following guidelines for the review process:

- Completion of at least 6 peer reviews, 3 of which must occur in the last 3 years of the pre-tenure period.
- The Chair will request a faculty peer to provide a peer review for the candidate.
- The peer review should be submitted to the Chair and the Chair will share the review with the candidate. The individual who writes the review also must meet with the candidate.
- Faculty peer teaching evaluations must be completed at least two weeks prior to the candidate's tenure review date.
- Peer reviews should be conducted using the HSD Peer Teaching Evaluation form (see Appendix B).
- Information from peer reviews should be shared with the HSD tenured faculty at each of the candidate's tenure review meetings. Copies of the Peer Teaching Evaluation forms should be kept in the candidate's tenure notebook and made available for review.

B. Scholarship Expectations

1. Types and Quality of Scholarship

Quality scholarship is required for promotion and tenure. The Human Sciences and Design (HSD) department recognizes two primary forms of scholarship: research and creative scholarship. Both forms incorporate innovative, systematic, rational inquiry into a topic and the application or exposition of conclusions drawn from that inquiry.

Candidates should provide evidence of the quantity and quality of scholarship accomplished during the pre-tenure period with a clear and focused scholarship agenda that demonstrates significant impact and promise of continuing success. Contributions will be assessed for their value in advancing HSD within the candidate's specific discipline.

"Research" refers to the discovery, development, and dissemination of new knowledge, technology, or scientific procedures resulting in innovative products, practices, and ideas of significance and value to society. Research is often made possible through the procurement of funds and is disseminated through publications and presentations. Candidates are responsible for providing information to demonstrate the quality of contributions including, but not limited to, impact factors, acceptance/rejection rates, rigor of the review process, citation scores, patents, and award/recognitions.

"Creative scholarship" refers to the discovery, development, and dissemination of original creative designs, products, or technology resulting in innovative products, practices, and ideas of significance and value to society. It may also consist of innovative conceptualizations or novel solutions to problems. Creative scholarship is disseminated through exhibition, competition, and commercialization, in addition to juried catalogs and publications. Candidates should provide the following types of information to demonstrate the quality of contribution to the field: credentials of reviewer(s)/juror(s), acceptance rates, size and professional reputation of venue, critical acclaim, patents, and award/recognitions. The terms "refereed" and "juried" are used synonymously to designate peer-reviewed work.

2. Evidence of Scholarship

Tenure considerations are based on a candidate's documented achievements while a faculty member at Baylor University. The evaluation, however, can include accomplishments prior to appointment to examine consistency of research agenda, as well as grant proposals submitted but not funded, creative works and papers accepted and awaiting exhibition or publication, co-authored graduate student research awaiting publication or presentation, and any other materials that may reflect on the candidate's potential for a long-term successful career. The tenure decision is based on quantitative and qualitative assessment of all of the evidence available to determine the candidate's potential to continue a productive career.

Faculty members are expected to produce scholarly outcomes as described in their position description, annual workload agreements, and start-up packages. It is expected that a recognizable pattern of high-performance levels in scholarship is evident for pre-tenure faculty. Quantity is of importance as a general indicator of regular activity. Of greater significance is the quality of the contribution to new knowledge in the field, as indicated through reviewer feedback, H or i-10 indices, or acceptance rates. Additionally, a candidate's honors, awards and other special recognition are important indicators of quality and dedication to research and scholarship; however, receipt of such awards is not necessary to achieve tenure or promotion.

A candidate for promotion and tenure must meet or exceed minimum levels of productivity (as defined in the HSD Contributions Table below), providing evidence of important scholarly contributions. If a faculty member is using research methods that are more time-consuming, starting a new project, or otherwise doing scholarly work that would explain a lower level of productivity, those issues need to be explained and justified by the candidate and will be taken into consideration in the evaluation with the understanding that over a two-to-three-year period the overall productivity will meet the expectation.

Following Baylor's Tenure Policy, samples of scholarship must be included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier. HSD promotes interdisciplinary and collaborative scholarship. In cases of collaborative contributions (e.g., multiple authors), the candidate should clearly describe her or his contribution.

3. Scholarship Quantity and Quality Expectations

Candidates for promotion in HSD must produce a minimum of ten Highly Significant scholarship contributions and a minimum of ten Important Contributions over their five pre-tenure service years to be considered for promotion and tenure. Additionally, of the ten Highly Significant contributions, the majority must be Level 1 contributions. These guidelines define a minimum quantity for scholarly output based on the typical assignment of 50% research. Quality assessments including scope and influence of the dissemination venue, acceptance rates, and H and i-10 values are noted and defined through categorical placement in the table. Additionally, external reviewers will contribute assessments of the quality and significance of the work. Given the diversity of the field and quality standards, this listing encompasses disciplines that emphasize peer-reviewed journal and juried exhibitions that are equivalent in quality for respective disciplines. The following table provides detailed information regarding scholarly quantity and quality; however, it is not intended to be an exhaustive list. The candidate may include additional items that are not listed in the table, but context must be provided demonstrating significance in contributing to the tenure and promotion decision. Additionally, a candidate may provide justification to have a nominally lower-level contribution be counted as a higher-level contribution. Examples of other contributions might include honors or recognitions from the University, organizations, journals, (for example, best paper awards, placement awards in juried competitions), faculty-mentored student success in discipline-related competitions, non-juried exhibitions or competitions (popular vote), professional research practice in one's field, or other scholarly works with students not otherwise accounted (e.g., student presentation, URSA abstract, direction of graduate work not yet disseminated, etc.).

Any modification in expectations of scholarship productivity from those described (to account for variations in disciplines, administrative duties, grant productivity and execution, and quality of publication) is to be determined by ongoing evaluation by the HSD tenured faculty, department Chair, and the Dean and documented in reports on tenure-track review meetings. Additionally, it is the responsibility of HSD tenured faculty within the candidate's discipline to provide guidance regarding the quality of publication/design outlets.

Highly Significant Contributions   *minimum of 10 (majority in Level 1)*
Level 1   • Principal Investigator, co-PI, co-Investigator or PI of substantial sub award of external funding from governmental, industry or foundation grants or contracts supporting the candidate's research and/or creative scholarship   • Refereed journal articles (e.g., original research, theory, review, creative design); Criteria*: Journal Impact Factor is median or higher of field's current impact factor OR the acceptance rate is less than median (or case made for high-quality)   • Juried exhibitions; Criteria*: national/international, jury of national/international credentials, acceptance rate is less than median for field, or under 50% acceptance rate

- Juried competitions; Criteria: national/international, jury of national/international credentials, placement in the top 3, honorable mention, or sponsor or academy recognition
- Invited exhibition; Criteria: national/international
- Patents or copyrights of original research or creative scholarship
- Development of a high-impact or high-demand digital tool, software, application, or product; Criteria: award/recognition for technical innovation, selection for inclusion in a digital repository, or justification based on number of unique users

Level 2

- Refereed publications (e.g., original research, theory, review articles) in peer-reviewed journals that do not meet the criteria for significant contribution based on Impact factor or acceptance rate
- Juried exhibitions; Criteria*: state/regional, jury of national/international credentials, acceptance rate is less than median for field
- Juried competitions; Criteria: state/regional; jury of national/international credentials; placement in the top 3, honorable mention, or similar recognition
- Invited exhibition; Criteria: state/regional

Important Contributions
Minimum of 10

Higher value may be attributed based on peer-review status and scope (e.g., international/national)

- Internal funding to serve as seed funding for external grant applications (Principal investigator or co-PI)
- Refereed presentation (e.g., oral, poster, panel, virtual, etc.)
- Refereed proceedings that include short manuscripts that describe the research beyond that of an abstract (this is separate from a presentation of the proceeding)
- Book chapters in edited texts
- Non-refereed articles published by recognized societies
- Juried exhibitions; Criteria*: state/regional, jury of national/international credentials, acceptance rate is higher than median for field, or over 50% acceptance rate
- Juried competitions; Criteria*: state/regional, jury of national/international credentials, acceptance rate is higher than median for field
- Development of digital tool, software, application, or product
- Invited publications, presentations, and/or dissemination of technical or creative work, eg. white papers, technical reports or industry standards and test methods
- Submission of external funding (e.g., unfunded grant submissions)

* Criteria for Impact Factor and Acceptance Rate should be discussed by the candidate's second-year Tenure Review and approved by the department's tenured faculty. The candidate should provide a list of journals/juried exhibitions/etc. in her or his field along with the impact factors and/or acceptance rates. The candidate should identify the median for impact factors and acceptance rates. These rates will be used as part of the evaluation criteria, unless other documentation is agreed upon by the tenured faculty of the department.

In summary of expectations for quality and quantity described above, each pre-tenure candidates is expected to:

- Have two peer-reviewed journal articles and/or juried creative scholarship contributions per year
- Have received at least one external grant contributing to her or his research agenda
- Have been the leading contributor (e.g., sole, first- or co-author, or principal investigator) on the majority of scholarship contributions

- Have a coherent research agenda
- Candidates with funded graduate research assistants are expected to achieve one additional *Important* or higher contribution per year (see chart examples.)

A candidate for tenure and/or promotion will include articles in press toward his or her total number of publications. Unless otherwise justified by the candidate and other faculty in the discipline, multiple publication, presentation, or exhibition of the same piece of scholarly work is not considered a separate outcome.

C. Service Expectation (Profession, Institution, Student, Community, and Church)

By nature of their rigorous preparation for and experience in university-level teaching and research, pre-tenure and tenured faculty have knowledge, skills, and competencies that can contribute to the furtherment of the profession, the university, and the community in a variety of ways as described below. Activities of this nature are categorized as "service." Faculty are encouraged to review the university policy document on faculty workload, BUPP 706, which explains how non-administrative service is included in workloads and annual evaluations.

Faculty members are expected to serve the Baylor community and the larger academic, civic, and religious communities with enthusiasm. Through service to the department/program, HSD faculty play a primary role in the success of the department/program; therefore, an important consideration in assessing service includes a clear commitment to advancing the HSD department and its programs. In reporting service, faculty will include reflection on how their service relates to their area of expertise and advances and supports the success of the department and their program. HSD faculty are also asked to provide evidence of active religious service and their support of the Christian mission of Baylor University.

Among all types of service, professional and community service enhance the visibility of the individual, department and discipline. Time committed to service activities will vary with rank, with a growing commitment to service as one progresses through the pre-tenure and tenured periods. Assistant Professors and pre-tenure Associate Professors in the first 2-3 years of appointment will have low service expectations to allow time for establishing the research agenda and developing their courses. After that time, service activities will be expected to increase but not to the point that they detract from research or teaching development.

Faculty members are expected to engage, at an appropriate level, in service activities in four areas: profession, institution, community, and a local congregation. The following sections provide examples of types of service in each area. The lists are not intended to be exhaustive. While it is expected that tenure and promotion candidates will show evidence of service in each area, it is acknowledged that various factors may lead a faculty member to have more activity in some areas than others. Reflection statements should explain the significance and impact of the service roles undertaken by the candidate.

1. Service to the Profession

HSD encourages professional service activities because they serve the interests of learning, are important forms of faculty development and scholarly participation in

their own right, and contribute to recognition and prestige for the faculty member and the University. Examples of service to the discipline or profession include, but are not limited to:

- Active membership and participation in national and regional professional organizations and meetings, with demonstration of leadership and service roles;
- Collaboration and/or consultation with private and public, profit and non-profit organizations directly related to the faculty member's academic expertise to create new organizations, or enhance the efficiency or effectiveness of the organizations served; and
- Membership on corporate, philanthropic, professional, or other academic boards or commissions.

2. Service to the Institution

Academic programs, departments, Robbins College, and the University expect faculty to participate in their administration and governance. HSD expects all faculty members to participate responsibly in the broader academic community.

During the first three years of the pre-tenure period, faculty are exempt from university committees. Pre-tenure faculty, after their third year, are expected to serve on at least one and no more than three University committees. After the first pre-tenure year, faculty are expected to serve on one or two departmental committees. Service beyond committees is also expected after the first pre-tenure year. Faculty members are expected to serve consistently at the departmental, college, and university levels, contributing to the vision and goals of the program, department, college, and university. Promotion and tenure decisions require evidence of departmental service participation, possible committee leadership roles, and committee involvement. Examples of institutional service include, but are not limited to:

- Faculty governance activities, including providing meaningful contributions toward meeting the goals and objectives of program, department, college, or university committees, task forces, or governance bodies as an appointed or elected member; serving as a committee or task force chair; serving as a program coordinator;
- Service collaboration with colleagues across the program, department, university, and/or broader scholarly community;
- Participation in securing and maintaining relevant program and institutional accreditations;
- Program, department, and college support activities, including personnel search activities, strategic planning, participation at advisory board meetings, and other similar activities demonstrating commitment to goals of the program and the department; and
- Participation in student recruiting activities, commencement ceremonies, faculty meetings, and workshops/seminars.

3. Service to the Student

Student service involves assistance to individual students and groups of students that goes beyond the normal teaching/mentoring obligations of every faculty member. It may involve support for both academic and social activities and organizations. Examples of student service include, but are not limited to:

- Assisting students in the transition from school to professional life through formal and informal career counseling, job-seeking assistance, and providing letters of recommendation and referral;
- Serving as a faculty advisor for a student chapter of a professional organization; and
- Serving as a faculty mentor for a student, student club, or other non-professional activity which may have both academic and social components.

4. Service to the Community

Faculty serve the community in a variety of ways, including developing relationships with schools, organizations, businesses, and public agencies; developing and participating in outreach programs that apply and disseminate knowledge and creative work beyond the confines of the university; and developing and participating in partnerships (such as discipline-specific agencies and internship programs) between academic programs and external agencies. Activities such as these are legitimate extensions of scholarship and teaching, because they enrich academic programs, and because they help to prepare students for lives of service and leadership. Examples of community service include, but are not limited to:

- Providing services to the public through involvement in discipline-specific agencies, clinics, hospitals, laboratories, etc.;
- Making research understandable and useable in specific professional and applied settings, including technology-transfer activities;
- Engaging in activities that address public-interest problems, issues, and concerns, aimed at either general or specialized audiences;
- Direction of class projects that benefit communities while demonstrating a faculty member's expertise in his or her discipline;
- Involvement in communications directed toward popular and non-academic publications including newsletter, radio, television, and magazines; and
- Community service unrelated to the discipline but reflective of Baylor's Christian mission (i.e., serving in civic groups, soup kitchens, scouting activities, mission outreach).

5. Service to the Local Congregation

Finally, as part of the tenure evaluation, faculty members are asked to provide information about active religious service as part of a local congregation and evidence of one's commitment to Baylor's distinctive Christian mission.

D. Collegiality

Collegiality refers to cooperative interaction with members of Baylor University and other universities, as well as good working relations with departmental colleagues and professionals

outside the department at the University. Collegiality refers to the commitment and ability of a faculty member to work effectively and cooperatively with others in achieving the goals of the program, department, college, university, and profession. In HSD, strong collegiality is desirable, such that a faculty member fosters goodwill and harmony within the department, mentors colleagues and students, and generally contributes to the pursuit of common goals.

Collegiality is especially related to ethical issues that enable university colleagues to work together with mutual respect, trust, and cooperation. HSD faculty members are expected to treat their colleagues and students with respect. In their personal activities and relationships, faculty members should maintain a level of ethical and moral behavior that is supportive of and consistent with the Christian mission of Baylor University. Civil resolution of disagreements is expected. Faculty members must adhere to high standards of conduct in their work with students, peers, and the general public.

II.   Promotion to the rank of Professor

Standards related to attainment of tenure/promotion to the rank of Associate Professor generally apply also to promotion to the rank of Professor. Additionally, the candidate's work should show outstanding evidence of achievement in scholarship and research, teaching, and service (and administration, if applicable to a particular candidate) and exhibit national leadership, and, in most cases, international professional recognition as evidenced by external peer reviews of scholarship in the faculty member's specific discipline. Faculty members in Human Sciences and Design realize that as support for faculty increases and programs are developed, expectations for promotion to the rank of Professor may also change. Consequently, a departmental committee will re-evaluate the promotion criteria every 5-7 years.

The timing for applying for promotion to the rank of Professor is individual and may vary by discipline. It is unlikely that an Associate Professor will achieve the level of prominence and leadership expected of the rank of Professor earlier than six years past the receipt of tenure. University policy does not allow an Associate Professor to be promoted to the rank of Professor sooner than four years after the granting of tenure. In some cases, an Associate Professor may pursue promotion before the sixth year after tenure was granted: however, such an action must be approved by the majority of departmental Professors, the Dean, and the Provost. Regardless of the number of years that the candidate has been at the Associate level, an application put forward for promotion should reflect achievement of the expectations described here.

A.   Scholarship Expectations (Research & Scholarly/Creative Contributions)

Associate Professors pursuing promotion to the rank of Professor must sustain or exceed the level of productivity demonstrated in their pre-tenure period and demonstrate scholarly excellence reflective of a national and/or international reputation.

1. Promotion to the rank of Professor requires both evidence of advanced and focused scholarly activity and recognition of the work nationally and internationally through peer review and impact. By this point in their careers, candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor would have established national and international reputations for quality scholarship and writing in their respective disciplines with external

funding. An important indication of such reputation is the opinion of external reviewers from the candidate's specialty/expertise area.

    a. At least three letters assessing the candidate's scholarly/creative achievements will be acquired. These evaluators should have significant levels of achievement in their fields, and these levels of achievement should be clearly equivalent at least to the level of achievement expected by the University of a Professor in the discipline. HSD will adhere to the university policies outlined for obtaining external reviewers.

    b. Information about the candidate's research contributions to the field will be requested from external reviewers and evaluated as supporting evidence in decision-making.

2. Successful candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor must have obtained external funding to support their research/scholarly activity. Successful candidates must show a consistent record of seeking and securing funding from available sources within their respective scholarship field. Given the diversity of disciplines within HSD, funding sources may vary. Expectations for promotion to Professor will take into account available grant resources within the field in making final assessments. Each external reviewer will be requested to provide an assessment of available external funding, and whether the candidate has achieved levels of funding that would be expected in the discipline. Faculty within the department will be able to ascertain acceptable funding levels through Academic Analytics and other available databases.

3. Recognizing the University's support of interdisciplinary and collaborative scholarship, Associate Professors are encouraged to take advantage of the freedom afforded by tenure to pursue their scholarly interests whether they fall within or across traditional disciplinary boundaries. An Associate Professor may also have more opportunities for productive collaboration than would a candidate for tenure; this might be demonstrated through lead and joint authorship on publications and grant submissions.

4. The quantity of research and scholarly contributions may vary among candidates due to faculty members' dates of hire, resultant workload/expectations (teaching, research, administration), and length of years between promotional stages. Research and scholarly output may also fluctuate due to the candidate's ability to access graduate students in their discipline. Expectations relating to quantity of scholarly outputs are noted as following:

    a. Quantity of publications and scholarly products should reflect a growth from expectations prior to tenure, not a decline.

    b. Status of scholarship venues should reflect movement toward top tier and esteemed journals, exhibition venues, or funding agencies.

    c. Expectations should parallel the performance of successful peers in the discipline with equivalent resources and programming support.

    d. Administrative responsibilities do not alter productivity expectations, but may impact judgments about the pace at which these expectations are met.

Additional success indicators for the Department of HSD are expected as a faculty member moves toward the status of full Professor. Examples of additional success indicators nclude but are not limited to a) ongoing pursuit of external funding, b.) citation frequency of publication above the median for the field, as reflected in Acadmenic Analytics, Google Scholar, or other appropriate review system, c.) honorary recognition by national/international organizations (e.g., best researcher of the year) or high-quality journals (e.g., best paper of the year), and/or d.) invitation as keynote speaker or presenter for national/international organization.

To ensure success in the promotion process, potential candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor should regularly invite input from the department's current Professors, Department Chair, and the College's Dean regarding progress toward scholarship, publication, and grant achievement and readiness for potentially successful promotion.

B. Teaching Expectations (Teaching & Related Scholarly Work)

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires continued evidence of growth in teaching and attention to provision of high-quality instruction. Evidence of teaching effectiveness and growth may be demonstrated through student evaluations, peer evaluations, teaching artifacts (e.g., syllabi, class assignments, video teaching logs, graded student work, other evidence of teaching/professional development, etc.), and awards or honors for teaching excellence. Supporting evidence may also include development of new courses, teaching and/or mentoring graduate students (e.g., serving on graduate student committees), and supporting letters from alumni who are professionally employed within their respective disciplines. As senior departmental faculty, candidates for promotion are expected to mentor junior faculty in successful approaches to teaching.

C. Service Expectations (University, Profession, Community, and Church)

Service to department, college, university, community, and a local congregation is a highly important consideration for promotion to the rank of Professor. Candidates for this promotion (and tenured faculty members as a group) also have special responsibilities for mentoring junior faculty and for leadership in service and governance on the departmental, college, and university levels. Through service to the department, HSD faculty have a primary role in the success of the department; therefore, an important consideration in assessing service includes a clear commitment to advancing the HSD department. Additionally, however, it is important for candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor to have exhibited service efforts that receive attention across the College or University, in national/international professional organizations, and/or in the broader community. Such noteworthy service could include, but is not limited to: serving as an elected/appointed officer for national/international professional organizations, departmental and/or college leadership roles, leading and/or initiating committees or task forces for professional organizations, or taking a major role in community projects or organizations at the local, state, regional, or national level.

III. Department External Peer Review Guideline

In accordance with Baylor University Tenure and Promotion Procedures as outlined in the Baylor University Faculty Handbook, the HSD department uses the following policy for

selecting external reviewers for tenure and/or promotion:

Process for External Review for Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion:

A.   The Candidate shall submit a letter to the Department Chair along with a current curriculum vitae, representative publications, and a list of three names (including telephone numbers, addresses, nature of professional relationship, and brief professional profile) of potential external reviewers by June 1st prior to the academic year in which he or she will be reviewed for promotion. Outside evaluators must hold a rank at least equal to the rank that the candidate is seeking or have comparable professional standing in a non-academic setting. The ideal evaluators should come from highly reputable programs at respected peer and/or aspirant universities. In addition, except in rare cases, external evaluators should not include individuals for whom a close academic or personal connection with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisors, former Professors, graduate school colleagues, co-authors, fellow faculty, friends, former students of the candidate, etc.) might compromise their ability to evaluate the candidate's work objectively. Finally, it should be noted that letters from co-authors regarding the contributions of a candidate to co-authored work could in some circumstances provide useful information regarding the record of a tenure or promotion candidate, so departments may choose to submit letters of this nature as an additional part of the tenure review process. In no circumstance, however, shall a letter from a co-author be considered an "external review letter" (see Tenure Procedures at Baylor University, p. 13).

B.   The Chair and departmental faculty holding the rank being pursued by the Candidate will add 5-6 additional names to the Candidate's list. The Chair will rank order potential reviewers based on national and international recognition in the Candidate's field, recognition of scholarly contribution to the field, academic position, tenure and longevity, and employment status in a higher education setting at a peer or aspirant university. Every effort will be made to minimize biases for or against the candidate when selecting qualified reviewers.

C.   The Chair will subsequently write to each of the top five reviewers (with the remaining reviewers serving as ranked alternates), requesting a confidential, written assessment of the Candidate's scholarly activity. The university has provided a sample letter in Appendix 1 of the Baylor University Tenure Procedures document, and in the Appendix to the Promotion Procedures document. These requests will be sent by July 1st prior to the academic year in which the Candidate will be reviewed for promotion. A copy of the Candidate's curriculum vitae, representative publications, and Baylor University's guidelines for tenure and/or promotion will be included. The external reviewers' letters of assessment will be included as part of the Candidate's professional portfolio at all levels of university consideration.

At a minimum, the letter of invitation to review should request that the reviewer:

1.   Detail his or her acquaintance or familiarity with the candidate and the candidate's scholarly work.
2.   Review and critique of the candidate's scholarly activity on the basis of standards in the specific discipline or sub-discipline.

3. Provide an assessment of the candidate's recognition and standing among his or her peers.
4. Indicate whether his or her scholarship has had an impact on the discipline or advanced the discipline in meaningful ways, and, if it has done so, describe how it has affected the discipline.
5. Indicate whether it has earned for the candidate a national reputation.
6. Indicate whether the candidate's collective work/program of research is likely to yield further significant advances in knowledge and innovation.

The letter of invitation should provide a statement addressing confidentiality such as:
"Your letter will be provided to departmental, college, and University review committees and appropriate administrators. Candidates will not be told the identity of the reviewers who are chosen, or be allowed to read the original reviews. The letters will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by Texas law, although a candidate who successfully obtains tenure may request and obtain a general written summary of the reviews from the departmental chair or dean."

D. Candidates will not be told the identity of the reviewers who are chosen, or be allowed to read the original reviews. If tenure or promotion is granted, the candidate may request a written summary of the reviews from the department chair or dean. Confidentiality is granted to the external reviewers by the department, college, or school through the tenure or promotion process. The external reviews, however, may be discoverable if legal action is taken by a candidate who is unsuccessful in the tenure or promotion process.

E. The Chair is responsible for ensuring the following are completed:
1. Securing names of potential reviewers by the annually published University deadline.
2. Contacting external reviewers and securing their agreement to participate by University deadline.
3. Securing reviews by University deadline.
4. Placing reviews in the candidate's file.
5. Summarizing the qualifications of the external reviewers and placing this summary in the candidate's file.
6. If needed, placing in the file any justification for why the external review process was not conducted in accordance with the stated criteria.

APPENDIX A

HSD Peer Evaluation of Teaching Policy and Procedures

How frequently are peer evaluations of teaching done?
Peer evaluation of teaching is critical for pre-tenure faculty, lecturers (who are working toward senior lecturer status), clinical faculty, and Associate Professors who are working toward Professor status. Peer evaluations of teaching are an expected part of assessing teaching performance. Even tenured Professors or Clinical Professors should have peer evaluations at least every few years to help inform the merit process and any teaching or professional awards for which they might apply. It is also expected that adjunct faculty are peer-reviewed, especially new adjuncts or adjuncts teaching new classes. Here are the expectations by rank.
- Adjunct faculty - at least one evaluation each of first two semesters teaching and each time they teach a new course, then less frequently for subsequent teaching unless concerns arise.
- Lecturers - at least two each year until they are promoted to Senior Lecturer.
- Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor - at least two per year.
- Pre-tenure faculty at any rank - a minimum of one peer evaluation each semester before each tenure review.
- Tenured Associate Professors working toward promotion to the rank of Professor and/or merit - need representative peer evaluations every year.
- Professor, Clinical Professor, Senior Lecturer - need one or two every few years.
- For all faculty, additional peer evaluations may be needed if concerns arise.

What does a peer evaluation involve?
- Peer evaluations are more meaningful if they involve a review of the syllabus prior to the class session(s) being observed, potential for attending more than one class session if needed to see the full scope of the teaching activities, and a follow-up session with the instructor to go over the suggestions of the peer reviewer.
- If multiple peer evaluators are observing in the same semester, they should not attend the same class sessions. This maximizes the assistance that can be provided.
- Peer reviews (over the various years) should cover all the different courses or course types that are taught if possible.
- The completed peer evaluation of teaching form (typed) should be provided to the department chair after it has been discussed with the instructor, who should also receive a copy. Hard copies are needed for promotion and tenure binders.

Who should conduct the evaluations?
- Peer evaluations by any colleagues are valuable and can be included.
- For pre-tenure faculty and tenured Associate Professors, peer evaluations by tenured faculty are recommended for at least half of the peer evaluations as these are the colleagues who vote on the instructor's tenure and/or promotion, and it gives them first-hand experience with her or his teaching abilities. For the same reason, Clinical faculty and Lecturers should have peer evaluations by tenured faculty, Senior Lecturers, and/or Clinical Associate or full Professors.

- Division leaders should be involved in the peer evaluations of adjunct faculty teaching in their divisions as they make recommendations regarding which adjuncts to hire for future assignments. Likewise, it is helpful for division leaders to be aware of the teaching skills of all faculty in their programs, making it wise to conduct at least one peer evaluation for each at some point in the term as division leader.
- Ideally, the Department Chair will conduct a peer review of pre-tenure faculty, clinical faculty, and lecturers at least once before the second- or third-year review and again before the sixth-year tenure year or the promotion year. The department chair will also conduct a peer evaluation of teaching for Associate Professors approaching promotion to the rank of Professor.
- It is valuable to have faculty within the division, particularly those familiar with the content of a course, involved in peer evaluation, but there is also merit in including faculty from outside the division and sometimes outside the department. Peer reviews from the Academy for Teaching and Learning are particularly helpful in some cases.

APPENDIX B – HSD Peer Evaluation of Teaching

HSD PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING
Instructional Assessment Form

Date:_____Presentation:_____

Instructor:_____Rater:_____

Directions: This instrument consists of seven sections and twenty-four statements intended to serve as a guide for assessing instruction in lecture and lab settings. After attending an instructional period, please respond to each statement by circling the number that best corresponds to your observations. The scale is as follows: **(1) Poor; (2) Fair; (3) Average; (4) Good; (5) Excellent: and NA (Not Applicable)**

A.   DEMONSTRATES EXPERTISE IN SUBJECT AREA AND SKILL IN KNOWLEDGE TRANSFERENCE
1. Specifies purpose of the instructional period   1 2 3 4 5   NA
2. Sets general ground rules for audience participation and evaluation   1 2 3 4 5   NA
3. Relates the main body of information to the introductory purpose   1 2 3 4 5   NA
4. Makes transitions between different segments of the instructional   1 2 3 4 5   NA
    content
5. Uses clear, relevant examples to demonstrate ideas   1 2 3 4 5   NA
6. Clarifies technical terminology   1 2 3 4 5   NA
7. Summarizes most important points of ideas of the instructional   1 2 3 4 5   NA
    period
8. Develops a conclusion related to the purpose and body of the   1 2 3 4 5   NA
    instructional period
9. Cites appropriate authorities to support statements   1 2 3 4 5   NA
10. Presents divergent viewpoints for contrast and comparison   1 2 3 4 5   NA
11. Separates fact from opinion   1 2 3 4 5   NA
12. Can illustrate theory through practice models   1 2 3 4 5   NA
13. Provides resources for further investigation of subject   1 2 3 4 5   NA

B.   DEMONSTRATES SKILL IN USE OF VOICE AND BODY MOVEMENTS DURING INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS
1. Speaks at a volume suitable for audience   1 2 3 4 5   NA
2. Speaks at a suitable pace for presentation   1 2 3 4 5   NA
3. Varies rate, pitch, and force of voice for emphasis   1 2 3 4 5   NA
4. Speaks in a conversational manner   1 2 3 4 5   NA
5. Uses eye contact with entire audience   1 2 3 4 5   NA
6. Moves purposefully within the classroom   1 2 3 4 5   NA

C.   DEMONSTRATES SKILL IN THE USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT MEDIA (ie. over-heads, PowerPoint, dry erase board, slides, videos, demonstration, etc.)
1. Coordinates support media with verbal presentation   1 2 3 4 5   NA
2. Uses support media to enhance understanding of subject matter   1 2 3 4 5   NA
3. Uses support media which are easily visible and audible to all   1 2 3 4 5   NA
    students

D.   **GENERAL COMMENTS (Any score below a rating of "3", requires a comment)**

E.   **STRENGTHS**

F.   **AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

G.   **STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT**