



Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures  
of the  
Department of Agricultural Education

Effective Date: July 1, 2019

APPROVALS

SIGNATURE

DATE

Carl G. Igo  
Department Faculty

Carl G. Igo  
Chair, Primary Review Committee

5/13/2019

George W. Haynes  
Primary Administrative Reviewer

George W. Haynes  
Department Head/Director

5/13/2019

Intermediate Review Committee

Chair, Intermediate Review Committee

Shreekala Bajwa  
Intermediate Administrative Reviewer

Shreekala Bajwa  
College Dean

5/17/2019

Robert K. D. Peterson  
College Review Committee

Robert K. D. Peterson  
Chair, College Review Committee

5/17/2019

DAVID J. SINGEL  
University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

David J. Singel  
Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

7/3/2019

Robert L. Mokwa  
Provost

Robert L. Mokwa

7-3-19

**Role and Scope Document  
for  
Department of Agricultural Education  
Effective Date: July 1, 2019**

**Overview**

This document sets forth the standards, indicators, and procedures that govern the annual review process, retention, tenure, and promotion reviews of tenure-track faculty of the Department of Agricultural Education. This document aligns with university standards as outlined in the MSU Faculty Handbook (07/01/2017) and the College of Agriculture Role and Scope Document. This document does not supersede these other documents. In cases of conflict between the information contained herein and these other documents, the information provided in the other documents applies. It is expected that all candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion have a Ph.D or Ed.D in Agriculture or Technology Education, or related field.

**Article I. Role and Scope of Unit**

The mission of the Department of Agricultural Education is to be the leader in developing quality students to communicate and educate the value of agriculture to communities through innovative teaching, scholarship, and outreach.

The Department of Agricultural Education strives to be Montana's center of excellence and expertise for the preparation of agricultural education professionals at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The Department's mission includes the preparation of both formal and non-formal educators in the areas of agricultural education, communication, leadership, and extension. Collaborative relationships are maintained with Montana's Office of Public Instruction, public junior high and high schools, area vocational schools, community colleges, agricultural industry organizations, youth development organizations, MSU Extension Service and other institutions of higher education in Montana, the region, the nation, and foreign countries. Montana State University is the only university with academic training and Agricultural Education degree programs for Montana.

The Department's scholarly programs are grounded in basic and applied research aimed at improving professional and technical skills in Montana agricultural education. Faculty and graduate student scholarship focuses on contributing to the agricultural education knowledge-base by conducting research that: (a) addresses issues relative to formal and non-formal education; (b) evaluates pedagogical constructs in agricultural education; and (c) serves Montana communities by integrating learning, discovery, and engagement. In addition, the Department meets the needs of formal and non-formal educators by: (a) offering credit and non-credit courses and workshops both on- and off-campus; (b) designing, conducting and evaluating educational programs; and (c) assisting state education officials, local school administrators and boards of education in ensuring quality educational programming for students in public and private schools as well as two-year post-secondary institutions.

The Department seeks to improve education practices through integrated teaching, research and

## Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document

service activities of use to the general public; the agricultural and natural resources community; federal, state, and local agencies; professional organizations; and institutions of secondary and higher education. The primary goal of the Department is the preparation of public and private sector personnel to work in formal and non-formal education as agricultural education instructors, agricultural communicators and leaders, and extension professionals. The primary emphasis of the Department is to serve, develop, and enrich the educational capacities of agriculturalists in Montana, the region, and the nation.

### **Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty**

Not applicable

### **Article III. Annual Review Process**

Annual review assesses the faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year and is based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, annual assignments, annual productivity report, self-assessment, and teaching evaluations. The annual review policies and procedures listed within this document are applicable to tenure-track (TT) and non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty who are not subject to the NTT Collective Bargaining Agreement. Reviews must be completed by the date specified by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. These reviews are used to encourage productivity, to determine annual merit raises (when available), and to provide faculty signals regarding their progress toward tenure, promotion, and professional development.

An annual review is an assessment of the faculty member's performance over a one-year period. This is in contrast to retention, tenure, and promotion reviews, which are based upon the cumulative performance of the faculty member in each area (teaching, scholarship, and service) over the review period appropriate to the review. Annual reviews may not accurately predict the outcomes of much more demanding reviews that accompany retention, tenure, and promotion.

Each year by January 31, faculty are expected to prepare a) a complete listing of annual productivity for the previous year in the prescribed format and digital system, b) an up-to-date curriculum vitae generated from the digital system, and c) a cover letter with any additional pertinent performance information for the last year and goals related to teaching, scholarship, and service activities for the next 1 to 3 calendar years. Faculty are responsible for ensuring that all documents are complete and accurate. All documents are reviewed by the Department Head and the faculty member in an oral review session and an evaluation is made by the Department Head. This evaluation is checked on the prescribed form and signed by the Department Head and the faculty member. The faculty member's signature signifies that they have seen the evaluation, but does not necessarily signify agreement with it.

The Department Head provides copies and justifies the evaluations to the Dean of the College of Agriculture (COA). Copies of all annual reviews and the performance ratings of each faculty member are maintained in the faculty member's personnel file in the Department. These files shall be kept confidential and maintained as outlined in the Faculty Personnel Files Policy.

Change in Assigned Percentages of Effort: If the assigned percentages of effort are inconsistent with the faculty member's current activities and levels of performance, a revision of the assigned

percentages of effort should be discussed. If a modification of the assigned percentages of effort is made as outlined in Section 4 of the faculty handbook, it will be documented using the Faculty Assigned Percentages of Effort Update Form.

Appeal of Review to Dean: A faculty member who disagrees with an annual review or individual rating may appeal by submitting a rationale for their disagreement and forwarding it to their respective Dean. The rationale must be filed within ten (10) days of the receipt of the annual review in Section 2e of the faculty handbook. The Dean shall consider the appeal and may support or assign a different performance rating in any area of responsibility. The Dean shall notify the faculty member and Department head, in writing, of the decision regarding the appeal within ten (10) days of receipt of the request.

#### **Article IV. Primary Review Administrator and Committee**

##### **Section 4.01 Primary Review Administrator**

The primary review administrator (PRA) is the Department Head for Agricultural Education. The PRA shall determine, to the best of their ability, whether the candidate's preceding review was conducted in substantial compliance with the procedures set forth by the Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document as well as the Faculty Handbook. The PRA shall also conduct an independent and substantive review of the candidate's dossier and make recommendations regarding retention, tenure, or promotion. In cases of non-concurrence with a preceding review, the recommendation shall include a written rationale for non-concurrence. Should a PRA have a conflict of interest with a candidate under review, the College of Agriculture Dean will identify an individual to serve as PRA for the case under review.

##### **Section 4.02 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment**

The primary review committee (PRC) is ad hoc and will be formed as needed for retention, tenure, and promotion review of Department faculty. For decisions of retention, tenure, and promotion, the primary review administrator (PRA) will consult with all Department faculty and select five tenured faculty composed of eligible Department faculty and faculty external to the Department for the PRC. At least 50 percent of the PRC will have a majority teaching appointment. The PRC shall be composed solely of tenured faculty with at least three members holding the rank of Professor; and the PRC must be comprised of faculty members satisfying the Non-Discrimination Policy. The PRA will appoint the committee in the spring semester prior to review. PRC members must attend the retention, tenure, and promotion orientation mandated by the Provost's Office for the review cycle.

##### **Section 4.03 Identification of responsible entities**

The PRA is responsible for:

1. Establishing the Primary Review Committee either by facilitating the election or appointment of the members as described.
2. Selecting external reviewers and solicit review letters.
3. If internal reviews are part of the unit's review process, selecting and soliciting Internal Reviews.
4. Assuring the following materials are included in the Dossier:

## **Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document**

- a. Internal and external reviewer letters of solicitation, letters from the reviewers and, in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch of the reviewer should be included in the Dossier.
  - b. Applicable Role and Scope Document.
  - c. Letter of hire, any Percentages of Effort changes, all annual reviews, and all Evaluation Letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.
  - d. Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period. If the evaluations are not in electronic format, the unit will provide evaluation summaries. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the unit will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review.
5. Maintaining copies of all review committee Evaluation Letters and internal, (if applicable), and external review letters after the review.

The PRC is responsible for:

1. Reviewing all submitted materials contained within the dossier, provide any required materials, and solicit and obtain additional materials from the candidate as the committee deems necessary to make a fair, objective, independent, thorough, and substantive review of the candidate's qualifications commensurate with the candidate's appointment.
2. Reviewing the applicable articles in this document and the COA Role and Scope Document as well as the Faculty Handbook, Definitions, Standards and Timelines, and Rights and Responsibilities. Following detailed discussion of the merits of the case, each member indicates their vote. For cases in which the committee is divided, additional deliberations may be scheduled. After additional discussions on the case in dispute, the PRC takes a final vote.
3. Preparing its written Evaluation Letter and include a rationale explaining the reasons for the decision and vote tally, and provide this recommendation to the primary review administrator with a copy sent to the candidate. The recommendation becomes a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel files maintained in the department, division, and college offices. These files shall be kept confidential and maintained as outlined in the Faculty Personnel Files Policy.
4. Reviewing and making suggestions for modification of the Department's Role and Scope Document.

### **Section 4.04 Next Review Level**

The College of Agriculture Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee shall conduct the next level of review.

## **Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator**

### **Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee - Composition and Appointment**

See College of Agriculture's Role and Scope document

### **Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator**



## Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document

The intermediate review administrator (IRA) is the Dean of the College of Agriculture.

### **Section 5.03 Level of Review following Intermediate Review Administrator**

The level of review following the intermediate review administrator is the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC).

## **Article VI. Review Materials**

### **Section 6.01 Materials submitted by Candidate**

Review materials submitted by the candidate shall comply with the University Faculty Handbook document entitled “Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion,” subsection “RTP: Rights and Responsibilities,” and the College of Agriculture Role and Scope document. Additionally, candidates in the Department of Agricultural Education must follow the requirements below:

Materials for External Review:

1. Comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate;
2. Brief statement that identifies the candidate’s area of scholarship;
3. Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate’s judgment, best represents their scholarship.
4. Brief statement of the candidate’s integration for teaching, scholarship, and service.

Materials for Internal In-Depth Teaching Review (required at retention and tenure only):

1. Materials appropriate to conduct an in-depth teaching review, including syllabi, sample homework assignments, sample examinations, samples of student work, course notes, presentation notes, and other materials.

Materials for the Dossier:

1. “Cover Sheet” provided by the Provost’s office;
2. Comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate. If included in the CV, the candidate should separate the following categories and provide evidence of contributions:
  - Teaching responsibilities
  - Refereed books or books chapters
  - Refereed journal articles
  - Invited books chapters or articles
  - Non-refereed publications
  - Invited conference presentations
  - Contributed conference paper, abstract, and poster presentations
  - Seminars, workshops, or colloquia

- Grant proposals submitted and grants funded
  - Service responsibilities
3. “Personal Statement” that includes a description of the candidate’s scholarship;
  4. Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation shall include a summary of activities, selected outputs, accomplishments, and evidence of recognition itemized by year over the relevant review period.

### **Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions**

Candidates shall provide description of their roles in collaborative scholarly contributions, e.g., publications, creative works, and grant proposals. Full authorship listing must match that of the scholarly contribution and it is noted that author order on published works can generally not be used to infer any information about the nature, quantity, or quality of the contribution of any particular author.

### **Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure**

#### External Peer Review of Scholarship

The process and requirements for soliciting peer reviews are described in the Faculty Handbook, Rights, and Responsibilities. At least 6 weeks prior to the deadline for submission of the review packet to the Department, the candidate must submit a list of four external references, including telephone numbers, physical addresses, and email addresses, to the PRA. In addition, the PRC will provide names of four external references with contact information. The PRA, in consultation with the PRC, shall select five external reviewers. The majority shall be reviewers recommended by the PRA and PRC. Candidates should not be informed of the identity of external reviewers in order to protect the confidentiality of the review process.

The PRA shall send the five selected external reviewers the following materials:

- i. Letter soliciting the external reviewer;
- ii. Comprehensive CV with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate;
- iii. Brief statement that identifies the candidate’s area of scholarship;
- iv. Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors or other evidence that best represents their scholarship; and
- v. Department Role and Scope

A name-redacted copy of the letter soliciting external reviewers must be included in the candidate’s file. Reviewers should state their relationship to and knowledge of the candidate. Letters of review will address the candidate’s scholarly potential and accomplishments. The written reviews shall be addressed and mailed to the PRA who will see that they are inserted into the review dossier prior to transmitting the dossier to the PRC chair.

## Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document

### Internal In-Depth Assessment of Teaching

An internal assessment of teaching performance must be included for review of retention and tenure. Assessors must be tenured members of the MSU faculty whose primary area of appointment is outside the Department of Agricultural Education. The candidate for retention or tenure will submit the names of at least four faculty members who meet these criteria to the PRA by December 1. The PRA, in consultation with the PRC, shall select two in-depth assessors; at least one from the list provided by the candidate.

The PRA shall send the two selected reviewers the following materials:

- i. Comprehensive CV with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate;
- ii. Statement describing the candidate's philosophy and practice of teaching, including evidence of innovations and contributions to teaching beyond the classroom (e.g. textbook writing, curriculum and program development, involvement in professional societies, writing about teaching innovation, etc.);
- iii. List of courses taught during the review period, number of credit or contact hours for each course, the number of students per course, and information regarding the course contexts (on-line, required/elective, graduate/undergraduate, first offering, etc.)
- iv. Potential dates for observation as provided by the candidate;
- v. Summary of student course evaluations with a brief synopsis of the written comments offering the candidate's interpretation of the results;
- vi. Copies of internal annual peer reviews which may include classroom observations, comprehensive classroom peer evaluation, focus groups, interviews, and surveys; and
- vii. Evidence reflecting supervision/advising responsibilities which may include advisor evaluations, a statement of workload relating to masters and doctoral committees, and any other information reflecting these responsibilities.

The internal reviews will be submitted to the PRA by start of Fall Semester in which the dossier is due.

The internal and external reviews are not made available to the candidate.

## **Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents**

### **Section 7.01 Retention Review**

Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.



**Section 7.02** Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review

Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

**Section 7.03** Promotion to Professor Review

The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

**Article VIII. Retention Reviews**

**Section 8.01** Timing of Retention Review.

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

**Section 8.02** University Standard

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

- (a) Effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and
- (b) Integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) Satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

**Section 8.03** Performance Indicators and Weighting

Performance indicators and weighting are defined in Section 9.03. The same indicators and weights that are used in tenure reviews are used in retention reviews.

**Section 8.04** Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

The Department emphasizes and focuses on quality, rather than setting targeted quantitative expectations. However, evidence of teaching and scholarship performance must be demonstrated.

Teaching: Faculty performance in teaching will be judged effective if it is consistent over time and of high quality and meets or exceeds the standards as outlined in this document. Effectiveness in teaching is described Section 9.04.

Scholarship: Faculty performance in scholarship will be judged effective if it is consistent over time and of high quality and meets or exceeds the standards as outlined in this document.

## Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document

Effectiveness in scholarship is described Section 9.04.

Service: Faculty performance in service will be judged effective if it furthers the mission of the department, college, university, or profession, is of high quality, and if it meets or exceeds the standards as outlined in this document. Effectiveness in service is described Section 9.04, except that there is no requirement that service include assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at the time of the retention review.

Integration: Faculty performance integration will be judged effective if they demonstrate the integration of a least two of the three academic areas: scholarship, teaching, or service. Effectiveness in integration is described Section 9.04.

### **Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators**

Evidence of performance indicators are listed in Section 9.05 with the exception of external reviews of scholarship.

### **Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products**

The Department of Agricultural Education has a standard of publication in peer reviewed agricultural education journals and recognizes that publishing in quality disciplinary journals often involves time lags. The Department recognizes refereed journal submissions, completed working papers (i.e., manuscripts that are actively receiving feedback from seminars and conferences), and professional research presentations, as defined in Section 9.05, as evidence of scholarly activity during retention.

## **Article IX. Tenure Review**

### **Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review**

Faculty are reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

### **Section 9.02 University Standard**

The University standards for the award of tenure are:

- (a) Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period.
- (b) Integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) Accomplishment in scholarship.

### **Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting**

The following performance indicators are considered in the review to determine if the university standards are satisfied. Performance indicators are the categories of products and activities used to evaluate performance. Weighting of performance indicators is dictated by percentages of assigned effort of the candidate. Due to MSU mission as a land grant institution, faculty perform diverse activities within these categories based on their letter of appointment and any amendments to their percentage of effort assignment (see Article III above). Weight of performance indicators is dictated by percentages of effort of the candidate.

### **Teaching Performance Indicators and Weighting**

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to teaching. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in teaching is evaluated.

- Delivering quality instruction in support of the Department's teaching mission (as documented by faculty peer review of teaching)
- Delivering quality supervision of student teachers or internships (as documented by surveys of student teachers or interns)
- Delivering quality undergraduate and graduate student advising (as documented by student advising surveys)
- Serving as the chair or co-chair of a graduate student's committee or serving as a member of a graduate student's committee. Being a chair or co-chair carries a higher weight than serving as a committee member.
- Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods or curriculum materials (note that publications resulting from such activities are performance indicators of scholarship)
- Mentorship of graduate students (e.g., supervising or substantially contributing to graduate student research)
- Mentorship of undergraduate students (e.g., supervising undergraduate research or independent study projects)
- Student evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments
- Receipt of national, regional, state, or local teaching awards

Student evaluations are vulnerable to various forms of bias (e.g., evaluations may be based on criteria other than quality of instruction). Therefore, evaluation scores and averages should be applied with caution as a measure of teaching effectiveness and supplemented by other evidence. In particular, written student comments may be viewed as formative feedback to be used for instructor improvement, but are not considered a form of evaluation.

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in teaching, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Primary Review Committee will determine the weight of such teaching indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

### **Scholarship Performance Indicators and Weighting**

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to scholarship. The indicators listed in Group I are considered the primary activities by which performance in scholarship is evaluated. Those from Group II also contribute to performance but carry less weight. All items from Groups I and II are referred to as "scholarly products."

#### **Group I**

- Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and textbooks in the discipline. Primary weight on refereed journals within the discipline for which the candidate has been a primary contributor. Level of contribution (e.g., sole or

## Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document

- multiple authorship) and quality of journal (e.g., journal ranking), are considered
- Refereed journal articles, monographs, books chapters, and textbooks in disciplines outside of candidate's primary discipline. Level of contribution (e.g., sole or multiple authorship) and quality of journal (e.g., journal ranking), are considered
- Publications resulting from the development and implementation of new pedagogical methods or curriculum materials
- Invited major talks, such as plenary or keynote addresses
- Invited high-profile seminars, workshops, or colloquia
- External grants funded

### Group II

- Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings
- Invited papers or presentations given at professional meetings
- Contributed papers or presentations given at professional meetings
- Non-refereed publications (e.g., non-refereed proceedings or reports)
- Grant proposals submitted (internal or external)
- Internal grants funded
- Development and publication of scholarly products (software or curriculum materials)

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in scholarship, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Primary Review Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

### **Service Performance and Weighting**

The following list a list of performance indicators for service. All indicators are considered the primary activities for evaluating service performance.

- Membership and offices held on Department, College, or University committees
- Professional service in international, national, state, or local organizations in the discipline
- Outreach in discipline topics to international, national, state, or local schools and communities
- Service as a reviewer or editor for a professional journal, monograph, conference proceedings, or book
- Other professional service

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in service, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Primary Review Committee will determine the weight of such indicators.

### **Integration Performance Indicators and Weighting**

As indicated in Section 9.02, candidates are expected to demonstrate integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service. The nature and extent of integrated

## Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document

activities will vary depending on the candidate's discipline and areas of specialization. The candidate must clearly define and describe how integration is achieved in the dossier. The following list offers examples of potential indicators of integration, with the understanding that integration can take many forms:

- Integration of teaching and service: designing or delivering professional development for K-16 teachers or special programs for K-16 students.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: implementing a research activity within a course.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: offering seminars to introduce students to the process of conducting research.
- Integration of scholarship and teaching: collaborating in research or publication with a student.
- Integrating of scholarship and service: lending research expertise through consulting.
- Integration of scholarship and service: implementing research results in a community setting.
- Integration of teaching and service: designing or delivering professional development for industry

This list is representative but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of performance in integration, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Primary Review Committee will determine the weight of such indicators.

### Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

#### Teaching Expectations

Faculty performance in teaching will be judged effective if it is sustained over time, high quality, and meets or exceeds the standards as outlined in this document. Sustained effectiveness is demonstrated by the following:

- (1) Evidence provided by peer evaluations, conducted by at least two faculty members who observe the candidate in the classroom or lab at least once per year during the review period. The department will supply a standardized review form to the reviewer to document the candidate's teaching performance and serve as evidence to evaluate effectiveness.
- (2) Evidence provided by student course evaluations, which provide a measure of student satisfaction. The Department expectation is that normally, for each course taught, the overall mean score from the student evaluation instrument is not less than the indicator for "average." It's expected that any overall mean score below "average" will be addressed by the candidate.
- (3) Evidence provided by undergraduate advising evaluations showing that the faculty member promotes student or constituent academic progress.
- (4) Evidence provided by evaluation completed by student teachers or interns, which show that the candidate can assist the student in successfully completing the student teaching or internship experience.
- (5) Evidence provided by graduate student exit evaluations, which show that the candidate is able to successfully mentor graduate students, which includes



## Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document

chairing or serving on a graduate committee. The exit evaluation will be conducted by the PRA.

- (6) Evidence of a record of seeking extramural funding to support teaching activities.

### **Scholarship Expectations**

Faculty performance in scholarship will be judged effective if it is consistent over time, high quality, and meets or exceeds the standards as outline in this document. Sustained effectiveness is demonstrated by the following:

- (1) Evidence provided by external peer evaluators, who will assess publication quality and quantity.
- (2) Evidence of sustained output of peer-reviewed scholarly publications, which may include peer-reviewed publications, invited presentation, trade journals, conference abstracts and presentations, and grants. The usual Departmental expectation for scholar productivity is that tenure candidates will average between 1 and 2 scholarly products per year during the review period. These products may represent both Group I and Group II indicators, and publications may be accepted, in press, or published at the time of review. Scholarly products from Group I are weighted more than scholarly products from Group II. For instance, two scholarly products from Group II would equal one scholarly product from Group I.
- (3) Evidence of seeking extramural funding to support research activities. A candidate who is active as a PI, co-PI, or collaborator on an awarded external grant during the review period may not be expected to produce as many Group I or Group II products.

### **Service Expectations**

Faculty performance in service will be judged effective if it furthers the mission of the department, college, university, or profession, is of high quality, and if it meets or exceeds the standards outlined in this document. Service expectations must be commensurate with percentage of effort in faculty assignments and rank.

### **Integration Expectations**

Faculty performance in integration will be judged effective if the candidate demonstrates integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.

### **Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators**

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier.

#### **Evidence of performance indicators in teaching**

The list of evidence presented in the table below is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for teaching will be considered in the review.

Table 1 Performance Indicators in Teaching and Typical Evidence

**Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document**

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Typical Evidence</b>
Delivering quality instruction in support of the Department's teaching mission	Written report from peer reviewer, submitted to the Department Head and maintained in Department files. In addition, the candidate must provide a teaching statement and list of courses taught during the review period.
Delivering quality supervision of student teacher or internships	Written report from the Department Head, summarizing the results of internship surveys of students supervised by the candidate.
Delivering quality undergraduate and graduate student advising	Written report from the Department Head, summarizing the results of a student advising survey of students advised by the candidate.
Effectively serving as the chair or co-chair of a graduate student's committee or serving as a member of a graduate student's committee.	Written report from the Department Head, summarizing the results of a graduate student survey having the candidate as their committee chair or member of their committee.
Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods or curriculum materials	Syllabus or other documentation of new methods or materials with evidence supporting innovation provided by candidate. Brief description of the implementation process, audience, and outcomes.
Mentorship of graduate students	Brief description, provided by candidate, including graduate student name, research question/focus, funding (if any), and progress to date. Publishing of graduate theses
Mentorship of undergraduate students	Brief description, provided by candidate, including undergraduate student name, research question/focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Student evaluations of instruction using University-approved instruments	Student evaluation scores for all courses taught during the review period. Brief, overarching analysis of student comments (summary, selected quotes, or full list of comments) provided by the candidate. If appropriate, include a broad description of changes made in response to student feedback.
Receipt of national, regional, state, or local teaching awards	Brief description of the award, including the date received, purpose of the award, and organization presenting the award provided by the candidate.

**Evidence of performance indicators in scholarship**

The list of evidence presented in the Table 2 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to the performance indicators for scholarship will be considered in the review.

**Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document**

Table 2 Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence, Groups I and II

<b>Group I: Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Typical Evidence</b>
Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and textbooks in the discipline.	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance. In addition, the candidate will supply a scholarship statement and evidence of an ongoing research agenda. The RTP Committee will assess scholarship quality based on evidence supplied by external reviewers of scholarship.
Refereed journal articles, monographs, books chapters, and textbooks outside of discipline.	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Publications resulting from the development and implementation of new pedagogical methods or curriculum materials	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Invited major talks, such plenary or keynote address	Letter of invitation, copy of program, or full citation
Invited high-profile seminars, workshops, or colloquia	Full citation, including title, venue, date, and level (Department, University, community, etc.)
External grants funded	Grant number or code with URL or other contact where more information can be found. Brief description (title, funding agency and level, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
<b>Group II: Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Typical Evidence</b>
Refereed proceeding published in connection with professional meetings	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published

## Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document

	form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Invited abstracts, papers, posters or presentations given at professional meetings	Full citation, including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date
Contributed abstracts, papers, posters or presentations given at professional meetings	Full citation, including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date
Non-refereed publications (e.g., non-refereed proceedings or reports)	Full citation for the scholarly work, and either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance.
Grant proposals submitted (internal or external)	Brief description (title, funding agency, primary goals, length, and collaborators)
Internal grants funded	Grant number or code, and brief description (title, funding agency, primary goals, length, and collaborators)
Development and publication of scholarly products (software and curriculum materials)	Briefly describe the product, including an overview of the content, intended use, audience, and location where it's publicly available

### **Evidence of performance indicators in service**

The list of evidence presented in the Table 3 is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to the performance indicators for service will be considered in the review.

Table 3 Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence in Service

<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>Typical Evidence</b>
Membership and offices held on Department, College, or University committees	Name and level of each committee and dates of service. In addition, the candidate will supply a service statement
Professional service in international, national, state, or local organizations in the discipline	Name of each organization, offices or roles held, dates of service, and accomplishments
Outreach in the discipline topics to international, national, state, or local schools, communities, and industries	Brief description of the outreach activities, audience, and outcomes
Service as a reviewer or editor for a professional journal, monograph, or book	Citations including the name of the journal, role (editor, associate editor, or reviewer), and dates of service
Other professional service	Brief description of any other professional service, dates of service, roles, and

accomplishments
-----------------

**Evidence of performance indicators in integration**

The candidate will supply an integration statement. The integration statement shall discuss evidence of integration between at least two of the three areas of academic assignment. See Section 9.03 (Integration Performance Indicators and Weighting) for examples.

**Article X. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor**

**Section 10.01 University Standards**

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

**Article XI. Promotion to Rank of Professor**

**Section 11.01 Timing of Review.**

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service in the current rank, however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they “meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.”

**Section 11.02 University Standard**

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

- (a) Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period,
- (b) Sustained integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) Excellence in scholarship.

**Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting**

The performance indicators and weighting used for this review are the same as those defined in Section 9.03 of this document, with three exceptions. In teaching expectations, more weight is placed on the mentorship of undergraduate and graduate students. In scholarship expectations, more weight is placed on a sustained record of scholarly publications and grants. In service expectations, more weight is placed on active contributions to Department, University, and professional committees and programs.

**Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations**

**Scholarship expectations**

Excellence in scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. Excellence in scholarship requires a sustained record of scholarly publications and mentoring graduate students that leads to an established national reputation within their field. The RTP Committee will assess



## Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document

excellence based on the evidence supplied by external reviewers. The Department expects that scholarly results will be disseminated through both publications and presentations.

### **Teaching expectations**

The expectation for this review is effectiveness in teaching, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that at the time of promotion review an additional weight is placed on mentorship of graduate students to degree completion.

### **Service expectations**

The expectation for this review is effectiveness in service, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that at the time of promotion review an additional weight is placed on active contributions to Department committees and programs.

### **Integration expectations**

The expectation for this review is effectiveness in integration, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04.

### **Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators**

Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier. The description of evidence of performance indicators is found in Section 9.05 of this document.

## **Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document**

Proposals to amend the Department Role and Scope Document are submitted to the Department Head, who then reviews the proposals with the Department faculty and Dean of COA. Upon approval by the Department head, Department faculty and Dean of COA, the Role and Scope Document is revised. Department faculty members and university review committee members or administrators may propose changes to the Department Role and Scope Document. Additionally, the faculty handbook outlines the procedure for university review committee members or administrators to submit changes. The Department will conduct a full review of the Department Role and Scope every three years.

## **Article XIII. Approval Process**

### **Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document**

- (a) Tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit;
- (b) Promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (usually colleges);
- (c) University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC); and
- (d) Provost.

### **Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document**

- (a) Retention, Tenure and Promotion review committee and administrator of the intermediate unit;
- (b) University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC); and

## Montana State University Agricultural Education Role and Scope Document

(c) Provost.

### **Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document**

- (a) University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC);
- (b) Faculty Senate;
- (c) Deans' Council; and
- (d) Provost.