



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

Effective Date: 7-1-19

APPROVALS	SIGNATURE	DATE
<u>George Haynes</u> Department Faculty	<u>George Haynes</u> Chair, Primary Review Committee	<u>5-3-19</u>

<u>Gregory Gilpin</u> Primary Administrative Reviewer	<u>[Signature]</u> Department Head/Director	<u>5-3-19</u>
--	--	---------------

<u>[Signature]</u> Sneekala Bajwa (COA)	<u>[Signature]</u> Chairs (CLS and COA), Intermediate Review Committee	
--	---	--

<u>[Signature]</u> Robert Peterson	<u>[Signature]</u> College Deans (CLS and COA)	<u>5/8/19</u>
College Review Committee	Chair, College Review Committee	<u>5/3/2019</u>

<u>[Signature]</u>	Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	
--------------------	---	--

<u>Robert L. Mokwa</u> Provost	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>7-3-19</u>
-----------------------------------	--------------------	---------------

Role and Scope Document
for
Department of Agricultural Economics and Economics (DAEE)
Effective date: July 1, 2019¹

Overview

This document sets forth the standards, indicators, and procedures that govern the annual review process, retention, tenure, and promotion reviews of Department of Agricultural Economics and Economics (DAEE) faculty. This document aligns with university standards as outlined in the [MSU Faculty Handbook](#) (07/01/2017) and the College of Agriculture and the College of Letters and Science Role and Scope Documents. 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 apply. It is expected that all candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion have a Ph.D. in Economics, Agricultural Economics, or related field.

Article I. Role and Scope of Unit

The Department of Agricultural Economics and Economics at Montana State University–Bozeman (MSU) supports the fulfillment of the University’s teaching, scholarship, and service mission in the areas of agriculture business, general economics, and financial engineering, ascribes to the highest academic standards, and is dedicated to education which develops human capital. The DAEE is within both the College of Agriculture (COA) and the College of Letters and Science (CLS) and aims to meet the missions of both colleges. The DAEE supports the land-grant mission of MSU through the Montana Agricultural Experiment Station (MAES) and MSU Extension (MSUE). The DAEE has three undergraduate programs in agricultural economics, economics, and financial engineering, and a graduate program in applied economics. All faculty conduct high-quality scholarship in a wide variety of areas, deliver broad and thorough educational programming based on scholarly activities, and perform departmental, university, local, and national and international service. The DAEE adopted the AEA’s [Code of Professional Conduct](#) and [Policy on Harassment and Discrimination](#) and all faculty and staff follow MSU’s [workplace expectations and conduct](#) while executing their duties and responsibilities.

Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

Not applicable.

Article III. Annual Review Process

Overview: 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. Faculty members are reviewed annually by the Department Head and the DAEE Advisory Committee. The annual assessment is based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, the DAEE’s workload policy, assigned percentages of effort in teaching, scholarship, and service, annual assignments, faculty’s annual productivity report, and teaching evaluations. 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.

¹ Approved by the DAEE tenure-track faculty by supermajority (2/3) vote on June 14, 2019. Policies are effective on the date established by the Provost.

An annual review is an assessment of the faculty member's performance over a one-year period, except for accepted peer-reviewed journal articles as noted below. This contrasts with 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.

Procedure and Timing: In January, each faculty member inputs their previous calendar year's teaching, scholarship, and service activities and goals for the next 1-3 years in the Provost's designated reporting system and submits an up-to-date curriculum vitae. Faculty members may optionally provide a narrative with any additional pertinent performance information. Faculty members are evaluated based on the performance indicators as outlined in Section 9.03 below.

Appointment responsibilities and duties differ for faculty members with COA, MAES, and MSUE appointments. Performance is relative to the faculty member's assigned percentages of effort and current assigned responsibilities. The Department separately considers the annual review for those with COA appointments, those with MAES appointments, and those with Extension appointments. For Extension faculty, the Director of Extension's evaluations will be considered in the evaluation and rating of the faculty member's performance. If the faculty member has a split or joint appointment of 20% or more effort assigned to another unit, input from the other unit must be solicited and considered in the evaluation and rating of the faculty member.

The DAEE Advisory Committee and the Department Head review the submitted materials, consider any other relevant information, and rate the performance of each faculty member for each major area of responsibility (teaching, scholarship, and service). Peer-reviewed journal articles are evaluated using generally accepted journal rankings. Additionally, for MAES and MSUE faculty, scholarship is evaluated on whether it relates to the MAES and MSUE missions, respectively. The Committee and Department Head also calculate an overall rating for the faculty member's performance for the year, weighted by the assigned percentages of effort using the annual review form approved by the Provost. An explanation will be provided in cases where the overall score deviates from the weighted average, e.g., due to top-coding in the performance scale. Reviews will be completed by the date specified by the Provost.

The Department Head provides copies and justifies the faculty evaluations to the Deans of the COA and CLS for all faculty, and, additionally, to the Director of Extension for all Extension faculty. Copies of all annual reviews and the performance ratings of each faculty member are maintained in the faculty member's personnel file in the DAEE. These files shall be kept confidential and maintained as outlined in the [Faculty Personnel Files Policy](#). Faculty members will be provided a copy of their annual review and any revision of the assigned percentages of effort. The Department Head meets with each faculty member to discuss the review and assignments for the next academic year. The assignments for individual members of the faculty will reflect departmental needs and professional opportunities consistent with departmental strategic plans or articulated departmental priorities. The meeting may also include discussion of any other issues of concern raised by either the faculty member or the Department.

Scoring: Appointment responsibilities and duties differ for faculty members with COA, MAES, and MSUE appointments. The DAEE separately considers faculty members within these three groups. Scoring is based on the performance indicators and weighting as outlined in Section 9.03, and other factors may also be considered. Faculty members in their first year of a tenure-track appointment with the DAEE are automatically assigned an average overall evaluation score.

Across-year Averaging: Scholarly publications are often not perfectly correlated with the timing of efforts. In addition, funding for merit raises is not always available every year. To address these issues, the DAEE considers accepted publications in the most recent three-year period when evaluating scholarship.

Annual Evaluation During Sabbaticals and Leave: Faculty members on leave who submit their review materials by the stated due date are evaluated in the same manner as other faculty. Faculty members who do not submit their materials by the stated due date are automatically assigned the average evaluation score in the Department for that evaluation period. The Department does not reward leave activities directly in annual evaluations, but instead views leaves as an input to the department's teaching, scholarship, and service mission. The DAEE does, however, reward the "public good" aspects derived from faculty member leaves. To the extent that a faculty member's leave accomplishes the public good of increasing DAEE visibility and prestige within and beyond the University, it is recognized as service in the annual review process.

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. Percentage of effort reallocation policies are provided in the DAEE's workload plan. Either the faculty member or Department Head can propose changing the faculty member's percentages of effort, but there must be agreement. Changes to a faculty member's assigned percentages of effort must be approved by the faculty member, Department Head and Dean. 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 Committee and Administrator

Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment

Tenured members of the DAEE Advisory Committee serve as the Department's Primary Review Committee (PRC) and, normally, at least one-half of the members will be full professors. The chairperson of the PRC is appointed by the Department Head from among the full professor members of the DAEE Advisory Committee, typically the chair of the DAEE Advisory Committee. If a minimum of three DAEE Advisory Committee members do not meet the necessary requirements (e.g., diversity, tenure, lack of conflicts of interest, etc.), then a qualifying faculty member from among the immediate past DAEE Advisory Committee members is appointed by the Department Head to fill the vacancy. Faculty members from other departments can serve on the PRC, as long as the majority of members are from the DAEE. No faculty members shall serve on the PRC during the review year of their own dossiers.

The PRC shall review 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. To conduct a review, the PRC shall review the applicable articles in this document and the COA and CLS Role and Scope Documents 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. The committee shall prepare 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. The PRC is also responsible for reviewing and making suggestions for modification of the DAEE Role and Scope Document.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

The primary review administrator (PRA) is the Department Head. In cases where the PRA has a conflict of interest with a candidate or is a candidate, the immediate past DAEE Advisory Committee Chair is appointed as the PRA for those cases. The PRA shall determine, to the best of their ability, whether the candidate's preceding review was conducted in compliance with the procedures set forth by the DAEE, COA, and CLS Role and Scope Documents, 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, and/or promotion in a written Evaluation Letter. In cases of non-concurrence with a preceding review, the recommendation shall include a written rationale for non-concurrence.

The PRA is also responsible for:

1. Informing faculty members and the PRC of the applicable timelines for review.
2. Ensuring that the PRC is composed by September 15.
3. Assigning a senior faculty member to serve as a mentor to the candidate.
4. Forwarding the candidate's dossier with the PRC and PRA recommendations to the next level of review.
5. Sending copies of the PRC and PRA recommendations to the candidate.
6. Maintaining a copy of the dossier.

Section 4.03 Identification of Responsible Entities

The PRA establishes the PRC as described in Section 4.01. The PRC and PRA select external and internal reviewers and the PRA solicits review letters. The process by which reviewers are selected is outlined in the faculty handbook and Section 6.03. The PRC and PRA assure the following materials are included in the dossier:

1. Description of the process by which external reviewers were selected, external and internal reviewer letters of solicitation, letters from the reviewers and, in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch of each reviewer.
2. Applicable Role and Scope Documents.
3. Letter of hire, any percentages of effort changes, all annual reviews, and all evaluation letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.

The PRA maintains copies of all review committee evaluation letters and internal and external review letters after the review.

Section 4.04 Next Review Level

The next level of review is conducted by the COA and CLS RTP review committees.

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator

There are two intermediate review committees, the CLS RTP Committee and the COA RTP Committee, that conduct independent reviews of the dossier in accordance with the responsibilities delineated in Sections 2 through 6 of the University Faculty Handbook Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights and Responsibilities. See CLS' and COA's Role and Scope documents.

Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee - Composition and Appointment

See CLS' and COA's Role and Scope documents.

Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator

The intermediate review administrator (IRA) is the respective Dean of the COA and Dean of CLS. See CLS' and COA's Role and Scope documents.

Section 5.03 Level of Review Following Intermediate Review Administrator

The next level of review is conducted by the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Article VI. Retention, Tenure and Promotion Review Materials

Section 6.01 Materials Submitted by Candidate

Materials for External Review

- i. A comprehensive curriculum vitae (CV) including teaching, scholarship, and service activities.
- ii. A brief statement that identifies the candidate's area of scholarship.
- iii. Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represents their scholarship.

Materials for Dossier

- i. A completed "cover sheet" provided by the Provost's office.
- ii. A comprehensive curriculum vitae (CV) including teaching, scholarship, and service activities.
- iii. A personal statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of scholarship.
- iv. Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing 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, including accomplishments, and evidence of recognition itemized by year over the relevant review period.

The CV should separate the following categories:

- Refereed books or book chapters
- Refereed journal articles
- Invited book chapters or articles
- Invited conference presentations
- Contributed conference presentations
- Seminars and/or colloquia
- Funded grants
- Non-refereed publications
- Courses taught/workshop series

The candidate may choose to include other categories as appropriate.

Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

Candidates shall provide descriptions 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 cannot generally 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

The process and requirements for soliciting peer reviews are described in the Faculty Handbook RTP Rights and Responsibilities. At least five external review letters are solicited for the tenure and promotion reviews from recognized scholars to evaluate the candidate's scholarship. The candidate nominates five external reviewers and the PRC/PRA select seven. Any duplicates between lists are removed from the candidate's list. Three candidates are randomly drawn from the PRC/PRA list, while two are randomly drawn from the candidate's, so that the majority shall be reviewers recommended by the PRA and PRC. At least two in-depth teaching reviews are solicited for RTP cases from tenured MSU faculty to evaluate the candidate. At least two internal reviews are solicited for the tenure and promotion cases from tenured MSU faculty to evaluate the candidate's scholarship. Each reviewer shall provide an independent and objective evaluation. External reviewers will be provided with the DAEE Role and Scope document and materials for external review submitted by the candidate listed in Section 6.01.

The PRA and PRC meet by April 1 to identify internal reviewers. Internal reviewers cannot be members of MSU RTP committees and should be specialists in the candidate's field and familiar with the usual expectations for faculty performance. The internal scholarship reviewers will be provided the external review packet as described in Section 6.01 and may also review citations, individual contributions to co-authored work, and quality and economic relevance of interdisciplinary publications. The internal teaching reviewers will be provided with an internal teaching review packet that includes appropriate material to conduct an in-depth teaching assessment, e.g., syllabus, sample homework, sample exams, sample student works, course notes, presentation notes, presentation handouts.

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.

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.

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:

1. effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and
2. integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
3. satisfactory progress toward 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 review are used in retention review.

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

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

Expectations in Teaching are as described in Section 9.04, except that there is no requirement that teaching include undergraduate or graduate scholarly mentoring.

Expectations in Scholarship are as described in Section 9.04.

Expectations in Service are as described in Section 9.04, except that there is no requirement that service include assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at the time of retention review.

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Evidence of performance indicators are listed in Section 9.05, with the addition of the scholarly products listed in Section 8.06 and the exception of internal and external reviews of scholarship.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

The DAEE recognizes refereed journal article submissions, completed working papers (i.e., manuscripts that are actively receiving feedback from seminars and conferences), and professional research presentations, as defined in Section 9.03, as evidence of scholarly activity during retention.

Article IX. Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally 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. Due to MSU's mission as a land-grant institution, faculty perform diverse activities within these categories based on their letter of appointment and any amendments to their assigned percentages of effort (see Article III above). Weighting of performance indicators is dictated by percentages of effort of the candidate.

Teaching performance includes instruction and advising and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students. The instruction performance indicators are separated by resident instruction and non-resident instruction and outreach. Resident instruction is required by COA and MAES faculty. Non-resident instruction is required by MAES and Extension faculty.

The resident instruction performance indicators include:

- Instruction appropriate to the faculty's percentage of effort – primary weight on overall instruction load, quality, content, rigor, and effectiveness.

The non-resident instruction and outreach performance indicators include (excludes COA faculty):

- Instruction appropriate to the faculty's percentage of effort – primary weight on overall impact, quality, content, and effectiveness.
- Instruction by MAES faculty are weighted, in part, on their relevance and contribution to the MAES mission.
- Instruction by Extension faculty are weighted, in part, on their relevance and contribution to the Extension mission.

Undergraduate student advising and mentoring indicators include (excludes Extension faculty):

- Undergraduate student advising appropriate to appointment. Primary weight on overall advising load, and quality of advising as indicated by student and peer feedback.
- Undergraduate student scholarly mentoring. Weight less than undergraduate student advising.

Graduate student advising and mentoring performance indicators include:

- Serving as the chair/co-chair of a graduate student's committee – primary weight.
- Serving as a member of a graduate student's committee – weight less than chairing.

Scholarship performance indicators include:

- Refereed economics disciplinary journal articles (accepted, in press, or published). Primary weight on highly regarded economics disciplinary journals for which the candidate has been a primary contributor, i.e., idea generation, analyses, and authorship. Level of contribution, e.g., sole or multiple authorship, and quality of journal, e.g., journal ranking, are considered.
- Refereed interdisciplinary or outside of economics journal articles — weight according to quality of the journals and the degree to which the publications have economic content play central roles in evaluating this type of research.
- Additional publications — weight according to quality of the publications and the degree to which the publications have economic content play central roles in evaluating this type of research.
 - Books and book chapters.
 - Other publications.
- Published MontGuides and outreach bulletins (Extension faculty) - Primary weight on completed publications. Level of contribution, e.g., sole or multiple authorship, is a consideration.
- Program development (Extension faculty) - weight according to relevance and contribution to the MSUE mission.
- Ongoing scholarship activities may include:
 - Manuscripts in review – weight less than forthcoming or published research. Stage of review process is considered.
 - Manuscripts in process – weight less than manuscripts in review.
 - Research grants – weight based on leading to refereed-reviewed publication.
 - Research presentations – small weight.
 - MontGuides and other outreach publications in review (Extension faculty) – weight less than published MontGuides.
 - MontGuides and other outreach publications in process (Extension faculty) – weight less than publications in review.
- Scholarship by MAES faculty is weighted, in part, on their relevance and contribution to the MAES mission.
- Scholarship by Extension faculty is weighted, in part, on their relevance and contribution to the MSUE mission.

Service performance indicators include:

- Committee work (DAEE-, college-, university-, and Extension-level). Committee appointments with larger time or other resource commitments weighted more heavily than other types of committee work.
- Grants that increase departmental visibility and prestige both within and beyond the university, and/or reduce departmental budget pressures, e.g., financial support to the graduate program.
- Other public and professional service.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Teaching expectations: 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.

Scholarship expectations: 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.

Accomplishment requires a sustained record of scholarship. For COA and MAES faculty, accomplishment requires publication in high-quality general economics and field journals and evidence of a strong ongoing research pipeline. Additionally, MAES and MSUE faculty are required to produce scholarship related to the MAES and MSUE missions, respectively. The exact number of scholarly products depends on the mix of quantity and quality. Fewer scholarly products with high quality may be acceptable for satisfying scholarship expectations. At the same time, a large number of low-quality products may not be sufficient. Quality of the scholarly products is evaluated during annual reviews and by external reviewers. Regardless of quantity, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work is of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of journals and other scholarly venues is considered extremely important in the review process. The scholarly products and associated weighting are defined in Section 9.03.

For all faculty, the qualitative scholarship expectation is at least one published refereed article in a first/second tier general interest or top broad-field economics journal during the review period.

For COA and MAES faculty, the quantitative scholarship expectation is five and seven, respectively, refereed publications in well-regarded economics field journals during the review period or their quality-weighted equivalent. For example, the quantitative scholarship expectation could be met with fewer publications if they appear in the more selective first/second tier general interest or top broad-field economics journals. For MSUE faculty, the quantitative expectation is ten scholarly products related to the MSUE mission during the review period, with five being refereed articles in well-regarded journals.

There is no department-level extramural funds requirement for scholarship and grants are evaluated based on whether they lead to refereed publications or MAES/ MSUE scholarly 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 as outlined in this document. Service expectations must be commensurate with percentage of effort in faculty assignments and rank.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Teaching

- Teaching statement
- Course/instruction list
- Summary of instruction evaluations
- Peer evaluations of instruction, i.e., internal teaching evaluations (see Section 6.03 and the faculty handbook)
- Student evaluations (COA and MAES faculty)
- Participant evaluations (Extension faculty)
- Number of undergraduate students advised (excludes Extension faculty)
- Input from senior exit interviews
- List of graduate students mentored, the faculty member's role, and placement post-graduation (if available)
- Additional indicators may include:
 - Awards, nominations, and grants
 - Sample course materials
 - Examples of assessment of student performance
 - Examples of student work
 - Evidence of innovation
 - Subsequent performance of students in later DAEE courses
 - Publishing of graduate theses
 - Post-graduation outcome of advisees
 - Web analytics, e.g., webpage visit counts
 - Other relevant feedback in evaluating teaching and/or outreach activities. For example, for Extension faculty, this may include evaluations by county Extension agents, and other evidence of outreach quality and impact.
- Non-resident instruction may also include:
 - One-on-one consultations and presentations to clientele
 - Radio programs, television programs, websites, blog posts, webinars, podcasts
 - Educational programming for community-, education-, service-, or industry-based groups
 - In-service training programs for Extension agents, chambers of commerce, or governmental agencies or representatives.

Scholarship

- External reviews of scholarship (see Section 6.03 and the faculty handbook).
- Internal reviews of scholarship (see Section 6.03 and the faculty handbook)
- Scholarship Statement
 - Statement includes relevance and contribution to the MAES mission (MAES faculty)
 - Statement includes relevance and contribution to the MSUE mission (Extension faculty)
- Status of scholarly works, including refereed journal articles, reports, conference articles, monographs, etc.
- Evidence of an ongoing research agenda
- List of presentations
- Additional scholarship indicators may include:
 - Invited papers and presentations, books, book chapters, review articles
 - Professional assignments with technical committees, technical editing
 - Impact ratings for journals
 - Citation counts of publications

- Honors, grants, and awards
- Other research evaluations

Service

- Service Statement
- Service on department/college/university committees
- List of completed and ongoing public service activities related to the discipline and public engagement activities
- Additional service indicators may include:
 - Editorial duties
 - Reviews and panels to the profession
 - Meeting chairs/organizing committees

Integration

- Integration Statement
- An active individual Hatch project (MAES faculty)
- Examples of integration:
 - Mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students, such as co-authored papers, meeting presentations, student awards
 - Incorporation of research/research findings into instructional materials
 - Research presentations/workshops/classes to the public

Extension faculty are also evaluated by the Director of Extension. As additional evidence of performance, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The PRC will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

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

See Section 9.03. The Department also uses the following:

- (a) established national reputation in scholarship within their field.

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

See Section 9.04. The Department also uses the following:

- (a) a sustained record of scholarly publications within the review period.
- (b) a sustained record of mentoring graduate students to degree completion.

Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

See Section 9.05. The Department also uses the following:

- (a) recognition from former students/clientele as having made significant, positive contribution on teaching and advising roles. Evidence may include, but not limited to, senior exit interviews, letters of recommendations, meeting with prospective students, and program evaluations.

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

DAEE faculty members and university review committee members or administrators may propose changes to the DAEE Role and Scope Document. Proposals to amend the DAEE Role and Scope Document are submitted to the Department Head, who then reviews the proposals with the DAEE Advisory Committee. Upon approval by the Department Head and DAEE Advisory Committee, the proposals are provided to the DAEE TT faculty for discussion and vote. Supermajority approval of the change results in an update to the Role and Scope Document. Additionally, the faculty handbook outlines the procedure for university review committee members or administrators to submit changes. The DAEE will conduct a full review of the DAEE Role and Scope Document every three years.

Next review date: AY2023-24.

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) promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of the intermediate unit;
- (b) University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee; and
- (c) Provost.

Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document

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