MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Role, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures

of the

Department of Health Development and Community Health

College of Education, Health and Human Development

Effective Date:
January 1, 2025

APPROVALS	SIGNATURE	DATE
Mary Miles Faculty	Signed by: Mary Miles 04239D7BE4BE46A... Chair, Primary Review Committee	9/11/2025 | 9:46 AM MDT
Michelle Grocke Primary Administrative Reviewer	DocuSigned by: Michelle Grocke 214EA7BACC7F4F9... Department Head/Director	9/14/2025 | 7:32 AM MDT
Carrie Myers Intermediate Review Committee	DocuSigned by: Carrie Myers 172574B504CA47B... Chair, Intermediate Review Committee	9/14/2025 | 12:28 PM MDT
Tricia Seifert Intermediate Administrative Reviewer	DocuSigned by: Tricia Seifert AFD631014495483... Executive Director	9/18/2025 | 10:26 AM MDT
Durward Sobek University Retention, Tenure and Promotion	Signed by: Durward K. Sobek II 012C669F1D9F4AD... Chair, University RTP Committee	10/6/2025 | 3:00 PM MDT
Robert Mokwa Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost	DocuSigned by: Robert Mokwa 313A38411AC04BD... 	10/6/2025 | 4:16 PM MDT

Role and Scope Document
for
The Department of Human Development and Community Health

Article I. Role and Scope of Unit

Mission of the Department of Human Development and Community Health

The mission of the Department of Human Development and Community Health (HDCH) is to enrich human well-being through teaching, research, and service.

Role and Scope of the Department

The Department of Human Development and Community Health serves the public by:

1. Educating and training professionals in various fields related to health and human well- being,
2. Conducting research and creative activities in areas related to health and human development, and
3. Conducting service/outreach activities that contribute to the general education and personal development of individuals, families, and systems within the university and community and at local, state, national, and international levels.

The Department of Human Development and Community Health offers a variety of undergraduate and graduate opportunities from which to choose. There are three areas of undergraduate study, four areas of graduate study, and two certificate options. Students may earn Bachelor of Science, Master of Science, or Doctor of Philosophy degrees.

Academic Programs are:

- Bachelor of Science
  - Community Health
  - Early Childhood Education: Preschool-Grade 3 (Teaching Endorsement)
  - Human Development & Family Science
    - Child Development
    - Family and Consumer Sciences Education (Teaching Endorsement)
    - Human Development and Family Science
- Master of Science
  - Community Health
  - Family and Consumer Sciences
  - Family Financial Planning
- Doctor of Philosophy
  - Indigenous and Rural Health
- Certificates
  - Gerontology Certificate (undergraduate)
  - Family and Consumer Sciences Education (graduate)

- Undergraduate Minors
  - Family & Consumer Sciences Teaching
  - Human Development
  - Personal & Consumer Finance

Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty
Not applicable

Article III. Annual Review Process

An annual review assesses a faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year and is based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, assigned percentages of effort, annual assignments, annual productivity report, and evaluations of teaching. The outcome of the annual review is independent from retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) reviews, and a positive result does not guarantee the faculty member will be eligible for retention, tenure, and/or promotion.

Faculty members in the Department of Human Development and Community Health will schedule a meeting with the Department Head and submit all annual review materials to the Department Head at least one week prior to their annual review meeting. These materials shall include a current curriculum vitae, personalized report from the university's reporting system for the past calendar year, and a brief self-reflective narrative outlining the candidate's annual progress and goals for the forthcoming year with respect to scholarship, teaching, service, and integration.

The Department Head will review each faculty member's materials prior to the annual review meeting and develop a draft of the annual evaluation. Corrections and clarifications will be discussed during the review meeting with pre-tenured faculty. Post-tenured faculty have a meeting, at their request or the Department Head's. The Department Head will sign the faculty member's annual review evaluation. The faculty member will also sign the evaluation and retain the right to attach a rebuttal to it. A signed copy will be given to the faculty member and a signed copy will also be retained in the Department file.

Section 3.01 Teaching Review
Candidates will receive a peer review by a colleague at least two times during the review period prior to the receipt of retention, at least one peer review prior to submitting materials for tenure and promotion to associate professor and at least one peer review prior to submitting materials to be reviewed for promotion to full professor. The review shall include three areas of teaching: knowledge, planning/organization, and instructional practices.

Procedures for conducting an internal peer review of teaching performance are:

1. The candidate can suggest potential, tenured, peer reviewers. Assignment of the peer reviewer is determined by the Department Head. The teaching observation cycle includes: a) pre-observation conference, b) classroom/community teaching observation, c) post-observation conference.
2. In the pre-observation, the peer reviewer and candidate meet to discuss any questions about the teaching portfolio and the goals/objectives of the classroom/community teaching

observation. The candidate and peer-reviewer will also discuss the candidate's approach to sustained effectiveness, as it relates to the Role and Scope document.

3. As part of drafting the written review letter, the peer-reviewer will consider all candidate-provided documents, information derived through teaching observation, and the pre-conference discussion to assess the following domains of teaching effectiveness: knowledge of content area, planning/organization, and instructional practices.
4. During the post-observation conference, the peer-reviewer must discuss the review with the candidate. Revisions to the written review letter may occur based on the post-conference discussion.
5. The peer-reviewer provides the department head and candidate the signed and finalized written review letter to include statements regarding candidate's effectiveness for knowledge, planning/organization, and instructional practices.

The candidate will provide the peer-reviewer with a teaching portfolio to include the following documents prior to the pre-conference of teaching performance:

- Statement of teaching philosophy.
- Course syllabus or other materials (as applicable) for teaching to be reviewed.
- Lesson plan/Agenda for the classroom/community teaching observation for one class or community teaching observation.

Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator

Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment

The Primary Review Committee (PRC) is an elected committee of 3 tenured faculty from the Departments of Counseling; Food Systems, Nutrition, & Kinesiology; and Human Development & Community Health. When possible, committee composition will be distributed across the three aforementioned departments. At least one committee member will be at the rank of full professor. During a year when at least one candidate is pursuing promotion to full professor at least two of the committee members will be full professor, if possible. Elected members serve one-year terms and can serve up to two consecutive years. Members serve during the academic year with terms of service beginning at the start of the fall semester.

Prior to election of members to serve on the committee for the next review cycle,
the current committee will select the chair for the next review cycle from among the currently serving committee members and notify the three department heads. The administrative assistant to the department heads then requests a vote of all eligible faculty. After the vote is back, the three department heads collectively determine the two elected committee members based upon the faculty who receive the most votes, taking the required composition into account, and appoint a one-year alternate who will serve if an elected member is unable to serve. A faculty member can serve no more than two consecutive years, including serving as chair.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

The primary review administrator for the Department of Human Development and Community Health is the Department Head of the Department of Human Development and Community Health.

Section 4.03 Identification of Responsible Entities

(a) Establish the Primary Review Committee either by facilitating the election or appointment of the members as described.
Primary Review Administrator

(b) A list of potential external reviewers of scholarship may be requested from the Primary Review Administrator
Primary Review Committee

(c) Select external reviewers of scholarship (from names provided by Primary Review Committee and candidate) and solicit review letters.
Primary Review Administrator

(d) If internal reviews are part of the unit's review process, select and solicit internal reviews.
Primary Review Administrator

(e) Assure the following materials are included in the Dossier:

(i) 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.
Primary Review Administrator

(ii) Applicable Role and Scope Document.
Primary Review Administrator

(iii) Letter of Hire, any Percentages of Effort changes, all annual reviews, and all Evaluation Letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.
Primary Review Administrator

(iv) Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period.
Primary Review Administrator

(f) Maintain copies of all review committee Evaluation Letters, and internal (if applicable) and external review letters after the review.
Primary Review Administrator

Section 4.04 Next Review Level

The next level of review after the Department of Human Development and Community Health is the review committee of the College of Education, Health and Human Development.

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator

Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee - Composition and Appointment
The College of Education, Health and Human Development Retention, Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. Refer to the College of Education, Health and Human Development Role and Scope document for composition and appointment.

Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator

Dean of the College of Education Health and Human Development. Refer to the College of Education, Health and Human Development Role and Scope document for requirements.

Section 5.03 Level of Review following Intermediate Review Administrator

The next level of review after the Intermediate Review Administrator is the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee. Refer to the College of Education, Health and Human Development' Role and Scope document for information regarding the selection of members for the University RTP Committee.

Article VI. Review Materials

Section 6.01 Materials submitted by Candidate

The Department of Human Development and Community Health requires the following in the dossier in reference to section 4 of the Faculty Handbook "Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights & Responsibilities Policy."

- The "Cover Sheet", obtained from the Provost's office.
- A comprehensive CV with Teaching, Scholarship, and Service activities of the candidate.
- Personal Statement: The personal statement is designed as the introduction to your dossier. In addition to information the candidate wishes to share, the following should be included: 1) a description of their current appointment (e.g., department, college, appointment percentages, etc.) and, if applicable, any changes during the review period; 2) a brief summary of teaching; 3) a brief summary of scholarship; 4) a brief summary of service; and, 5) a brief summary of integration.
- Self-evaluation of Teaching: 1) a teaching philosophy describing their approach to teaching and learning, including university and community teaching (if applicable), 2) a reflection about the interaction between the candidate's teaching philosophy and their student evaluations (qualitative and quantitative) from the departmentally approved form or community education programs, 3) a reflection on feedback from their internal review(s) of teaching, 4) curriculum design/development/innovation, and 5) description of graduate and/or undergraduate student mentorship and advising. The candidate should also include a description of teaching-related professional development efforts to stay current in their field.
- Self-evaluation of Scholarship: in-depth statement of research describing research program(s), scholarly outputs and the relationship between the candidate's research program and their research outputs, a comprehensive list of research products during the review period, and if involved in collaborative scholarly contributions, (see 6.02). Candidates will provide evidence of scholarship (as detailed in section 9.05.). In addition to published outputs, scholarship that was accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the Review Period may be considered. Candidates must provide evidence of acceptance in their materials. Scholarly products that have been accepted for publication but not yet published or published in a

journal not readily available through university databases must be included among the candidate's materials.

- Self-evaluation of Service: in-depth statement of service describing each level of service (i.e., department, college, university, professional, community) responsibilities, a table of service by level for the period of review.
- Integration statement: In-depth statement demonstrating integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service (see 9.02).

Each self-evaluation (Teaching, Scholarship, Service, and Integration) shall include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition itemized by year over the relevant Review Period.

The Department of Human Development and Community Health values Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI). Although not required, a candidate may include evidence of DEI in any part of the dossier. Further, to promote equity for the candidate and review committees, the department values succinctness in dossier presentation. The dossier should only include information relevant to the current review period. Recommended page length guidelines for major parts of the dossier are as follows:

Dossier Section and Description	**Page Length Recommendations (single spaced; 12 pt font; 1-inch margins)**	**For More Information, See:**
Curriculum Vitae (one document)		
Curriculum Vitae	No page recommendations	Section 6.01
Personal Statement		
Personal Statement (one document with table of contents, including:)		
In addition to information the candidate wishes to share, the following should be included: • Identification of the year of the Role and Scope Document being used for review (see section 7.02 and 7.03) • Appointment information (department, college, percentages, etc.; any changes in appointment over the review period) • Brief summary of teaching • Brief summary of scholarship • Brief summary of service • Brief summary of integration	2-3 pages	Section 6.01
Teaching Narrative		
Self-Evaluation of Teaching (one document with table of contents, including:)		
Teaching philosophy	1-2 pages	

Table and summary of student evaluation scores from departmentally approved form and, if applicable, other evaluation forms from community teaching, including: • Table with quantitative scores • Summary of representative student qualitative feedback	No overall page recommendations; summary of qualitative feedback likely only needs to be 1-2 pages	Sections 6.01 and 9.03
Reflection on the interaction between the candidate's teaching philosophy, including student evaluations, internal review(s), student mentorship and advising, curriculum design/development/innovation, and community teaching (if applicable)	1-2 pages	Sections 9.04 and 9.05
Statement of teaching-related professional development efforts	1/2-1 page	Section 6.01
Student Course Evaluations (one document with table of contents, including:)		
All student evaluations from departmentally approved form and, if applicable, other evaluation forms from community teaching; combined into one single document	No page recommendations	Section 6.01
Scholarship Narrative		
Self-Evaluation of Scholarship (one document with table of contents, including:)		
Description of primary research program(s), scholarly outputs, and the relationship between the candidate's research program and their research outputs	3-4 pages	Sections 6.01, 8.04, 9.03 and 9.04
Table that includes a comprehensive list of research products during the review period organized by level 1 and 2 indicators; an additional column is included to document individual contributions to collaborative scholarly products. Evidence must be provided for accepted (but not published) scholarly products.	No page recommendations	Sections 9.05 and 6.02
Self-Evaluation of Service (one document with table of contents)		
Self-Evaluation of Service (one document with table of contents, including:)		
In-depth statement of service (including describing each level of service [i.e., department, college, university, professional, community])	1-2 pages	Sections 6.01, 9.03 and 9.04
Table of service by level (department, college, university, professional, community)	No page recommendations	Sections 6.02 and 9.05
Integration Narrative (one document with table of contents)		
Self-Evaluation of Integration (one document with table of contents, including:)		
In-depth statement demonstrating integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service	1-2 pages	Sections 9.02 and 9.03
Professional Development (not required by department)		

Appendix (one document)			
	Inclusion of the Appendix is optional. This is a list of available materials only; no other documents are uploaded to this folder. The candidate provides this list for additional documentation purposes (i.e., materials that are not provided elsewhere in the dossier that may be of interest to reviewers). Materials listed need to be available to reviewers upon request.	No page recommendations	Section 6.03

Table 1. Dossier Components and Recommendations

Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

The candidate will include documentation of collaborative scholarly contributions in their in-depth statement of research. Documentation should include a table by scholarly contribution indicating what the candidate's responsibility (e.g., lead author, research design, writing, theory, data collection, data analysis, editing, etc.) was in terms of authorship.

Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure

Documentation. Candidates seeking promotion and tenure will follow the methods and procedures for external peer reviews established by the department and detailed below. The candidate will include items as appropriate to their letter of appointment which include the following:

1. Curriculum Vitae. The candidate will indicate publications, presentations, grant activity, scholarship, and other creative accomplishments.
2. Self-Evaluation of Scholarship. The candidate will describe: their scholarship responsibilities in relation to the curriculum vitae, scholarship program, the importance or significance of their research to the field.
3. Supporting Documents. The candidate will submit 3-4 electronic examples of their scholarship that best represent contributions to the field from the review period.

Procedures. External peer reviews of research are required for promotion and tenure reviews but not for retention reviews. A minimum of four external reviewers is required for promotion and tenure reviews. External reviewers are respected authorities appropriate to the candidate's area of Scholarship who will provide an independent and objective evaluation of the candidate's Scholarship using the criteria, indicators and standards outlines in this Role and Scope document. External reviewers independently assess the quality of the faculty member's scholarship and write letters of evaluation for inclusion in the dossier. According the MSU Faculty Handbook section "Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights & Responsibilities Policy" (3c) peer reviewers must comply to the conflict of interest statement as follows: "No person may participate in the review of any person with whom they have a personal, business, or professional relationship that could be perceived to preclude objective application of professional judgment. A conflict of interest occurs when the evaluating party could realize personal, financial, professional, or other gain or loss as a result of the outcome of the review process, or when the objectivity of the evaluating party could be impaired by virtue of the relationship. Examples of persons who may be excluded by professional relationship include undergraduate and/or graduate mentors, postdoctoral mentors, collaborators who are co-investigators on grants and/or co-authors on a

significant portion of scholarly products completed during the review period, colleagues who depend on instrumentation controlled or operated by the candidate, and/or co-inventor of a patent."

University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights & Responsibilities Policy," subsection "Primary Review Unit," (7b) states the following:

"Selecting external reviewers and soliciting review letters. External Reviews from at least four (4) respected authorities appropriate to the candidate's area of Scholarship are required by the university as part of review for tenure and promotion. The primary administrator or committee will identify external reviewers who will provide an independent and objective evaluation of the candidate's Scholarship. The soliciting entity may invite recommendations from the candidate, but at least one half of the external reviewers should be reviewers recommended by the primary administrator or committee."

The candidate will provide a copy of the review documentation to the department head prior to the applicable deadlines as set forth by the Office of the Provost.

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 Document 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 Document 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 – Candidates for promotion are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Document 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 candidate's Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 8.02 University Standards. 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 the tenure review are used in the retention review.

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Effectiveness in scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. *Effectiveness* includes, but is not limited to, establishing a research agenda that is in the candidate's discipline, evidenced by the creation of scholarly products (see Section 9.03) throughout the review period.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a record of scholarly products at the time of retention. These products shall represent both Level 1 and Level 2 indicators (see section 9.03), and publications may be submitted, accepted, in press, or published at the time of review. The record must be substantive enough that it is reasonable to expect the candidate to achieve the standards for tenure at the time of tenure review.

Collaborative work is highly valued in the department, and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across disciplines within the department. The candidate is expected to identify their individual contributions to each scholarly works (see Section 6.02).

Effectiveness in Teaching

Effectiveness in teaching is achieved through the candidate's positive contributions to the design, delivery, and instruction of courses and labs, both in the Department and in other venues. *Effectiveness* is judged primarily from the peer reviews conducted by tenured faculty who observe the candidate in the classroom or lab during the review period. Written reports from peer reviewers document the candidate's teaching performance and serve as evidence to evaluate effectiveness.

Undergraduate/Graduate advising is integral to the Department, and all faculty are expected to contribute to student education in the Department. At the time of the tenure review, a candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence of ability to mentor graduate students. Evidence may include providing career guidance, undergraduate or graduate mentorship. This list is representative, but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of mentoring and advising, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here.

Course evaluations serve to provide a measure of student perception of teaching. The Department expectation is that normally, for each course taught, the overall mean score from the university approved student evaluation instrument across all domains is equal to or greater than 70% of the maximum score. For the department this average is at or above 3.5 on a 5-point scale. Similarly, any issues related to teaching noted in the retention review should be addressed prior to tenure review.

Effectiveness in Service

Effectiveness in service will be achieved if the candidate demonstrates active participation and competent execution of tasks in any of the areas of service described by the performance indicators. Service is expected to include at least one assignment to a department, college, or university committee at MSU per year. Provide at least one professional service or outreach effort per year at the national level. Participation in other activities that contribute to the candidate's discipline or profession (e.g., task forces or special programs) is also valued, especially when such participation raises the stature and reputation of the Department or the University in the state, the nation, or internationally.

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Evidence of performance indicators are listed in Section 9.05. The same performance indicators and evidence that are used in tenure review are used in retention review, with the addition that *submitted* products are to be documented with a copy of the submitted work along with verification of submission.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

For retention review, scholarly products that are submitted, accepted, in press, or published at the time of review will be considered if they are included in the dossier and are appropriately documented according to Section 9.05.

Article IX. Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in the 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:

- sustained effectiveness in teaching and service
- sustained integration of no less than two of teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- accomplishment in scholarship
- as demonstrated by the candidate's performance during the review period.

University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Rights & Responsibilities Policy," subsection "Retention, Tenure & Promotion Review Definitions" states the following: "Accomplishment is sustained and commendable performance reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products. These activities and products include peer reviewed publications, formal peer-reviewed presentations, or comparable peer-evaluated works appropriate to the discipline. The activities and products must have impact and significance to the public, peers, or the discipline beyond the university."

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Performance indicators in scholarship
The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to scholarship. The indicators listed in Level 1 carry primary weight and are considered the primary activities by which performance in scholarship is evaluated. Those from Level 2 also contribute to performance but carry less weight. All items from Levels 1 and 2 are referred to as "scholarly products." Additional indicators will be considered if deemed appropriate and consistent with the definition of indicators stated in the Faculty Handbook.

Level 1

- Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and textbooks
- Edited Books (Candidate as editor)
- External grants funded as PI or Co-PI
- Invited Professional Presentations (i.e., plenary or keynote)

Level 2

- Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings
- Extension Publications (Montguides/Fact Sheets)
- Invited papers or presentations at professional meetings (international, national, regional, state)
- Refereed papers or presentations at professional meetings (international, national, regional, state)
- Grant proposals submitted (external and internal) as PI or Co-PI
- Internal grants funded as PI or Co-PI
- Non-refereed publications (e.g., non-refereed proceedings and technical reports; trade journals)
- Development and publication of scholarly products (e.g., 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.

Performance Indicators in Teaching
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 as assessed by faculty peer review of teaching
- Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/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 and advising of undergraduate students (e.g., supervising undergraduate research or independent study projects)
- Evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments

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 indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

Performance indicators in service

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

- Membership on committees and leadership roles held in the Department, College, or University
- Professional service in local, state, national, or international organizations in professional disciplines (e.g. conference abstract reviewer; accreditation; leadership roles)
- Outreach to local, state, national, or international communities
- Reviewer or editor for professional journals, monographs, books, or grant applications
- Professional consultations that may or may not result in a co-authored publication

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.

Performance Indicators in Integration

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

- 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 and/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 and/or delivering professional development for P-12 teachers or special programs for P-12 students.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Scholarship Expectations

Accomplishment in scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of published scholarly works, with refereed articles being the most commonly used performance indicator. With respect to publication quality, the Primary Review Committee will assess accomplishment based on the evidence provided by External Reviewers. *Accomplishment* includes, but is not limited to, an ongoing and sustained research agenda that has led to a regular record of publication in refereed journals.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the tenure review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of peer-reviewed products at the time of tenure review. The usual Departmental expectation for scholarly productivity is that tenure candidates average between 1 and 2 scholarly products per year in Level 1 and Level 2. At the time of tenure review it is expected that multiple items from Level 1 will appear in the candidate's body of work with the emphasis on peer reviewed publications. Typical of this department is an average of 1 peer reviewed publication per year. Publications may be accepted, in press, or published at the time of review.

Regardless of quantity of products, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as documented by External Reviewers is of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of journals and other scholarly venues, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process. It should be noted that publication impact factors or h-indices and the like are not typically an important measure of prestige or scholarly accomplishment within all the disciplines in the Department of Human Development and Community Health.

Collaborative work is highly valued in the department, and there is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship. Standards for determining author order vary within and across disciplines within the department. The candidate is expected to identify their individual contributions to each scholarly works (see Section 6.02).

Teaching Expectations

Sustained effectiveness in teaching is consistent successful performance over time and across course offerings and different student populations as appropriate to the faculty member's appointment. *Sustained Effectiveness* is judged primarily from the peer reviews conducted by Departmental faculty who observe the candidate in the classroom or lab during the review period. Written reports from peer reviewers document the candidate's teaching performance and serve as evidence to evaluate effectiveness.

Undergraduate/Graduate advising is integral to the Department, and all faculty are expected to contribute to student education in the Department. At the time of the tenure review, a candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence of ability to mentor graduate students. Evidence may include providing career guidance, undergraduate or graduate mentorship. This list is representative, but not exhaustive. As additional evidence of mentoring and advising, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here.

Course evaluations serve to provide a measure of student perception of teaching. The Department expectation is that normally, for each course taught, the overall mean score from the university approved

student evaluation instrument across all domains is equal to or greater than 70% of the maximum score. For the department this average is at or above 3.5 on a 5-point scale. Similarly, any issues related to teaching noted in the retention review should be addressed prior to tenure review.

Service Expectations

Sustained effectiveness in service is consistent successful performance over time and across a range of duties appropriate to the faculty member's appointment. Sustained effectiveness in service will be achieved if the candidate demonstrates active participation and competent execution of tasks in any of the areas of service described by the performance indicators. Service is expected to include at least one assignment to a department, college, or university committee at MSU per year. Provide at least one professional service or outreach effort per year at the national level. Participation in other activities that contribute to the candidate's discipline or profession (e.g., task forces or special programs) is also valued, especially when such participation raises the stature and reputation of the Department or the University in the state, the nation, or internationally.

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 scholarship
The list of evidence presented in Tables 2 and 3 is not exhaustive. Other evidence listed by the candidate that is related to the performance indicators for scholarship will be considered in the review.

Only scholarly products that have been accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the tenure review period will be considered. For works published in a journal not readily available through university databases, the candidate must include a digital copy of the accepted work in the dossier. For works accepted for publication but not yet published, the candidate must include a digital copy of the accepted work accompanied by an official letter or email indicating acceptance.

Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions (refer to section 6.02).

Level 1: Performance Indicator	**Typical Evidence**
Refereed journal articles, monographs, book chapters, and textbooks	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.
Edited Books (Candidate as editor)	Full citation of the book 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.
External grants funded as PI or Co-PI	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).
Invited professional presentations (e.g., plenary or keynote):	Letter of invitation, copy of program, or full citation.
Receptions of national competitive awards for scholarship	Letter of award

Table 2. Level 1 Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence

Level 2: Performance Indicator	**Typical Evidence**
Refereed proceedings published in connection with professional meetings:	Full citation for the proceedings, 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.
Extension Publications (Montguide/Fact Sheets)	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 papers or presentations at professional meetings (international, national, regional, state)	Full citation including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date.
Refereed papers or presentations at professional meetings (international, national, regional, state)	Full citation including the title, co-presenters, organization, location, and date.
Grant proposals submitted (external and internal) as PI or Co-PI	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).
Internal grants funded as PI or Co-PI	Brief description (title, source of funding, primary goals, length, collaborators if any).
Non-refereed publications (e.g., non-refereed proceedings and technical reports; trade journals)	Full citation for the publication or report, 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.
Development and publication of scholarly products (e.g., software or curriculum materials)	Brief description of the product including an overview of content and format, intended use, potential audience, and location where it is publicly available.
Receptions of regional, state, university-level, college-level, department-level competitive awards for scholarship	Letter of award

Table 3. Level 2 Performance Indicators in Scholarship and Typical Evidence

Evidence of performance indicators in teaching

The list of evidence presented in Table 4 is not exhaustive. Other evidence listed by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for teaching will be considered in the review.

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Delivering quality instruction as assessed by faculty peer review of teaching	Written report or letter from peer observer each year through the tenure review period, submitted directly by the observer to the Department Head and maintained in Department files.
Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum materials	Syllabus or other documentation of new methods or materials (including open educational resources) with evidence supporting innovation. Brief description of the implementation process, audience, and outcomes.
Mentorship of graduate students (e.g., supervising or substantially contributing to graduate student research)	Brief description including graduate student name, research question/focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Mentorship of undergraduate students (e.g., supervising undergraduate research or projects):	Brief description including undergraduate student name, research question/focus, funding (if any), and progress to date.
Evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments	Table of courses/workshops taught during the review period to include: number of credit and/or contact hours for each course, and number of students/learners per course, and semester or date of course/workshop. Evaluation scores for all courses/workshops taught during the review period. Scores from the departmentally approved form will display averaged scores for each domain for each course taught and a column documenting the accumulative average across all courses. Candidates will supply a table documenting a brief synopsis of student evaluation comments (positive and constructive) from the departmentally approved form for each course during the review period. If appropriate, include a broad description of changes made in response to student feedback.
Receptions of competitive awards for teaching	Letter of award

Table 4. Performance Indicators in Teaching and Typical Evidence

Evidence of performance indicators in service

The list of evidence in Table 5 is not exhaustive. Other evidence listed by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for service will be considered in the review.

Performance Indicator	Typical Evidence
Membership on committees and leadership roles held in the Department, College, or University	Name and level of each committee and dates of service.

Professional service in local, state, national, or international organizations in professional disciplines (e.g. conference abstract reviewer; accreditation; leadership roles)	Name of each organization (with description as needed), offices or roles held, dates of service, and notable accomplishments.
Outreach to local, state, national, or international communities	Brief description of outreach activities, audience, and outcomes.
Reviewer or editor for professional journals, monographs, books, or grant applications	Citations including name of journal, editorial role, dates of service, and workload.
Professional consultations that may or may not result in a co-authored publication	Brief description of consulting activities, audience, and outcomes.

Table 5. Performance Indicators in Service and Typical Evidence

Evidence of performance indicators for integration

Performance Indicator	**Typical Evidence**
Integration of at least two areas across scholarship, teaching, and service	Evidence may be unique to each program and/or discipline and can include, but not be limited to: student/community/constituent involvement in research, using personal research experiences in the classroom, textbook writing, P-12/community curriculum development, translating research for community members/constituents, or writing about teaching innovations.

Table 6. Performance Indicators for integration and typical evidence

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 at the rank of Associate Professor, 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 Standards

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

(a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service;

(b) sustained integration of no less than two of teaching, scholarship, and service; and following

areas during the review period, and
(c) excellence in scholarship

as demonstrated by the candidate's performance during the review period.

The review period for promotion to professor is the period of employment at MSU in the rank of Associate Professor plus the time that the candidate's MSU tenure dossier was under review until the deadline established by the provost for submission of the dossier for promotion to professor.

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 the following exception: candidates will receive at least one peer review of teaching between receiving tenure and submitting materials to be reviewed for promotion to full professor.

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. With respect to publication quality, the Primary Review Committee will assess excellence based on the evidence provided by External Reviewers. *Excellence* includes, but is not limited to, receiving national or international recognition from peers and colleagues as having made important scholarly contributions to the candidate's discipline. The Department expects that scholarly results will be disseminated through both publications and presentations.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of peer-reviewed scholarly products that impact the field. These products may represent both Level 1 and Level 2 indicators, and publications may be accepted, in press, or published at the time of review. At the time of promotion review it is expected that a substantial portion of the candidate's body of work will be comprised of Level 1 items. Due to the diverse nature of scholarship within the Department, expectations will vary across disciplines.

Regardless of quantity of products, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as documented by External Reviewers is of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of journals and other scholarly venues, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process. It should be noted that publication impact factors or h-indices and the like are not typically an important measure of prestige or scholarly productivity within all of our disciplines in the department of Human Development and Community Health.

Collaborative work and leadership in the scholarly process is highly valued. Standards for determining author order vary within and across disciplines within the department. The candidate is expected to identify their individual contribution to each scholarly work [see Section 6.02]. There is no expectation that single-authored publications are required to demonstrate accomplishment in scholarship.

Teaching Expectations
The expectation for this review is *sustained effectiveness* in teaching, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04.

Service Expectations
The expectation for this review is *sustained effectiveness* in service, 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
The Department of Human Development and Community Health will undertake a full review of our Role and Scope Document every three years. The Primary Review committee shall be responsible for revising and updating the document. Tenurable faculty within the department shall vote on proposed changes. The revised document will be submitted to the UPTC Chair after the review committee completes all reviews for that year.

Article XIII. Approval Process

Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document (a) tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit;

(a) Tenurable faculty and department head of the Department of Human Development and Community Health;
(b) College of Education, Health and Human Development Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee and dean;
(c) University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC); and
(d) Provost.