



















## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

Faculty units are encouraged to have a faculty committee assist in conducting the annual performance reviews. In the annual interview the dean and the faculty member will review performance and develop goals and strategies for development and improvement. A written summary of the dean's evaluations will be given to the faculty member and a copy placed in his or her personnel file. In addition to serving as a regular, systematic process for reviewing faculty members' past performance, the annual stewardship interview process should also contain a prospective, developmental component. It is the primary opportunity for deans to monitor and help encourage continuous faculty development. Faculty development needs and opportunities should be discussed in each annual interview, regardless of a faculty member's past performance. Faculty should include in the materials submitted for the annual review a statement of plans for faculty development. The interview should include discussion of time and other resource implications of the development plans. All faculty members are expected to engage in continuous development and improvement in scholarship and teaching. Deans should encourage efforts and support opportunities for faculty development.

### **3.1.5 Rank and Status Standards vs. Disciplinary Standards**

Occasionally, evaluation of faculty for rank and status may involve issues of questionable faculty conduct or expression. In such cases, the Church Educational System [Honor Code](#) and principles of academic freedom should be respected (see [Academic Freedom Statement](#)). Nevertheless, evaluation of these issues under the faculty rank and status process will differ from evaluation under University procedures governing faculty discipline or academic freedom grievances since the rank and status process considers faculty conduct and academic freedom issues under a different standard than would apply in a disciplinary or academic freedom grievance proceeding. This is because disciplinary and academic freedom grievance proceedings are concerned primarily with whether a faculty member has engaged in conduct that violates University standards or expression that seriously and adversely affects the University mission or the Church. A faculty rank and status review, on the other hand, focuses not merely on the presence or absence of harm, but on the quality of the faculty member's overall affirmative contribution to the University. Thus, the faculty rank and status process applies a higher standard for teaching, scholarship, and citizenship than would apply in a disciplinary or academic freedom grievance proceeding. For instance, a faculty member may decide to implement a questionable teaching method which they believe is acceptable based on their academic freedom. Even though assessment data may demonstrate that the practice is not harmful, if it fails to demonstrably add value to the education or improve student performance, it is

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

reasonable for the dean or other administrators to ask and expect the faculty member to make changes or improvements. The same approach applies to issues of scholarship and citizenship.

### **3.1.6 Annual Performance and Behavior Reviews for Faculty with CFS**

All faculty are expected to perform at acceptable levels in all areas of their responsibility: teaching, scholarship, and citizenship (see Sections 3.1.3 and 3.1.4). The standard for judging acceptable performance will depend in part on particular assignments and expectations formulated during the annual review process. Such assignments and expectations may vary over the course of a faculty member's career. If, such as in the annual performance interview, a faculty member's performance is evaluated and determined to be below acceptable levels, it is the faculty member who bears the responsibility for achieving and maintaining acceptable performance. The dean or designee should take steps to see that reasonable efforts or resources are expended to assist the faculty member's efforts toward development and maintenance of acceptable levels of performance. These efforts, along with the dean's evaluations, should be documented on an ongoing basis. Development opportunities and activities should also be discussed in each annual interview. Generally, three consecutive annual reviews in which the faculty member's performance is judged to be below acceptable standards constitute adequate cause for termination of the faculty member's employment. Furthermore, a recurrent pattern of negative performance reviews over a period of years, even if they do not occur in consecutive years, may also constitute adequate cause for termination. These provisions do not mean that the University must wait three years or more before terminating a faculty member's employment. In some situations, immediate termination may be appropriate. In other situations, termination may be appropriate if the faculty member does not correct the problem within a reasonable period of time (see Section 2.1).

## **3.2 Teaching**

### **3.2.1 The Teaching Standards**

Teaching that results in significant student learning is, and should be, the most important activity of BYU–Hawaii faculty. Effective university teachers are themselves eager learners who imbue their teaching with the excitement of learning. They care about their students. They are enthusiastic about sharing their knowledge with students and helping them learn. They have high standards, set clear expectations, and hold students to high levels of academic performance. They are well prepared and well organized, and they make good use of class time. They prepare well-designed syllabi, course materials, assignments, and examinations. They provide helpful evaluations of student work in a timely manner. They are consistently available to help students at least during reasonable designated consultation hours outside class. They are engaged in the process of improving their teaching. They master the content of their courses and stay current with the literature and techniques of their disciplines. They are mentors and role models to students. They provide an education that is spiritually strengthening, intellectually enlarging, character building, and leading to lifelong learning and service.

### **3.2.2 Assessment of Teaching**

In assessing a faculty member's overall performance, evaluators should be sensitive to teaching loads, the number of preparations required, extra time spent working with students individually, and similar factors. Although faculty may participate in only a portion of these and other teaching activities, evaluation of teaching should consider evidence such as:

- A. Description of teaching activities and quality, including:
  - 1. List of courses taught by semester, with enrollment numbers.
  - 2. New courses developed.
  - 3. Student mentoring (including mentored scholarship).
  - 4. Supervision of academic internships and service-learning experiences.
  
- B. Products of high-quality teaching and mentoring, including:
  - 1. Evidence of student achievement.
  - 2. Student scores on standardized test when appropriate.
  - 3. Student papers and examinations that evidence learning.
  - 4. Student scholarly or creative works.
  - 5. Successful academic internship and service-learning programs.

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

6. Student placement in graduate school or meaningful employment.
- C. Peer evaluations: The faculty review committee (Section 7.5.1) will obtain at least two substantive confidential peer evaluations of teaching from University faculty members (in addition to the dean) qualified to make evaluations of the faculty member's approach to pedagogy, teaching activities, and materials. The faculty member will assemble a teaching portfolio containing syllabi, textbooks, handouts, multimedia materials, assignments, learning exercises, examinations, and other course materials. The peer evaluations should concentrate on a review of the teaching portfolio, but should also include classroom visits.

Peer evaluations might best assess such areas as:

1. Whether the course reflects the current state of the discipline.
  2. The faculty member's mastery of the course content.
  3. The course objectives, including whether the course meets the objectives of the curriculum of which it is a part.
  4. The course organization.
  5. The methods used to foster and measure learning.
  6. The materials in the teaching portfolio (syllabi, textbooks, readings, handouts, multimedia materials, assignments, learning exercises, examinations, and other course materials).
  7. The faculty member's general concern for and interest in teaching.
  8. The overall quality of teaching.
- D. Description of steps taken to evaluate and improve teaching, such as:
1. Staying current in one's discipline.
  2. Performing self-evaluations of teaching.
  3. Studying teaching techniques.
  4. Obtaining assistance from the CLT.
  5. Presenting at, or attending seminars, workshops, and conferences on teaching.
  6. Involving students or peers in improvement efforts.
  7. Appropriately implementing instructional innovations, including technology.
  8. Participating in course or curriculum development.
  9. Writing textbooks, supplements, or other instructional materials.
  10. Taking professional development leaves to improve teaching.
  11. Engaging in the scholarship of learning and teaching.

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

- E. Other evidence of quality teaching, such as:
  1. Teaching awards and honors received.
  2. The quality of text materials used.
  3. Information about the faculty member’s availability to students.
  4. Effectiveness in implementing innovative teaching methods, including technology.
  5. Effectiveness in mentoring students.
  6. Other evidence of positive impact on students, including working with students in mentored learning environments.
  
- F. Student feedback and evaluations, including:
  1. University student evaluation forms and students written comments.
  2. Written or oral comments solicited by the faculty review committee from a representative sample of students.
  3. Independent communications from students to directors, deans or the AVP concerning faculty performance, with validated evidence/documentation, including faculty response.
  
- G. Dean’s observations of classroom teaching summarized in the Dean’s letter.

### 3.3 Scholarship

#### 3.3.1 Purpose of Scholarship

The faculty member’s scholarship and/or creative endeavors constitute a measure of a university’s quality, although scholarship and creative endeavor may take different forms. While quantity is one measure of productive effort, it is less important than the quality—no mere quantity of work can compensate for lack of quality. Although the amount, type, or scope of scholarship/creative endeavor may be different at the University than at other institutions that require less teaching, the quality should not (see Section 3.3.3). Likewise, the quantity may be affected by other University assignments, but again, the quality should not. When faculty members work in areas where progress is exceptionally difficult and where results submitted for review are necessarily few and infrequent, an exceptional scholarly or creative product may be more important than several less significant activities.

Particular approaches and assignments will vary among individuals and faculty units as circumstances, needs, and interests require, but all faculty members should engage in scholarship/creative endeavor to some meaningful degree over their entire careers,

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

often through creations with artistic merit, instructional improvements, publications, professional discourse, and/or attendance and presentations at conferences. The scholarly and creative work should not interfere with nor detract from teaching, but should support and strengthen it. University faculty members must be learners in order to be teachers worthy of the name. They must be intellectually alive and current, not only in the substantive developments of their disciplines, but also in the skills and tools of scholarship and creative endeavor used in these disciplines. In general, faculty members enrich themselves by producing academic work, subjecting that work to the review of their peers, and sharing their insights with colleagues and students. The faculty member in this sense is characterized by devotion to discovering and to learning, by quality and thoroughness in that learning, and by the determination to profess that which is learned.

### **3.3.2 The Scholarship Standards**

For a faculty member's research or creative work to satisfy University expectations and faculty standards, his or her work should:

- develop the faculty member as a scholar and an educator;
- be consistent with the advancement of their discipline and the University mission, contributing positively to the University reputation;
- be scholarly in nature—containing some elements of originality, in the form of new knowledge, new understanding, fresh insight, or unique interpretation;
- be subjected to peer review for the purpose of verifying the nature and quality of the contribution by those competent to judge it (see Section 3.3.3);
- be disseminated or shared in venues beyond BYU–Hawaii; and
- meet additional applicable, published faculty standards, if any.

### **3.3.3 Assessment of Scholarship and Peer Evaluation**

The expression of the faculty member's work can take a variety of acceptable forms. Each discipline has its own scholarly and creative traditions and its own channels for communication within the discipline. With approval from the dean and the Academic Vice President, each faculty unit and/or program may therefore establish specific standards for defining and measuring the quality of scholarly and creative work within its own discipline and then assess its faculty endeavors against those standards. These discipline-specific standards must satisfy the criteria listed in Section 3.3.2. These scholarship standards and progress toward meeting them should be addressed in annual interviews and in the dean's recommendation during reviews for CFS and rank advancement.

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

The mechanism of peer evaluation of scholarship varies among disciplines. For publication in scholarly journals, peer review is a natural part of the process. For other products of scholarship such as books, creative works, performances, and professional consulting, the dean should arrange with faculty members during annual interviews for comparable peer evaluation. These arrangements may involve sending copies, images, or recordings of the work to independent external experts. They may also include other forms of evidence when standard for the discipline such as successful outcomes in competitions, auditions, commissions, or hiring. In all cases, peer evaluations should meet the following standards: they should be independent (unaffiliated with the University or with the candidate), objective (optimally anonymous to the candidate), and expert (*i.e.*, beyond administrative reviews, copy editing, or decisions by the publishing staff) (see Section 7.5.6). These peer evaluations should also be separate from and in addition to the general external reviews solicited at the time of application for rank advancement.

Review of conference proceedings, presentations, posters, and abstracts is often only at the editorial level, with most contributions being accepted. This type of review with limited rigor, expertise, or attention usually does not match the level of scrutiny involved with peer review of manuscripts submitted to scholarly journals and would typically be inadequate as the only source of peer review in a candidate's file. If the candidate has participated in a conference for which peer review of submitted contributions is more rigorous, it is the candidate's responsibility to provide convincing evidence that such is the case.

Although the completion of a terminal degree is a commendable scholarly effort and activity, to meet standards for CFS or promotion, a faculty member must provide evidence of additional peer-reviewed work beyond the completion of a terminal degree.

### **3.4 Citizenship**

#### **3.4.1 The Citizenship Standard**

As a University sponsored by and affiliated with the Church, BYU–Hawaii expects all faculty to adhere to the highest standards of personal behavior and to exemplify honor and integrity. Faculty who are members of the Church should be loyal to the Church, and all faculty should support and work to further the principles stated in the University mission and vision. Faculty should observe University policies. They should willingly serve on committees and in other faculty and University assignments. They should mentor, encourage, advise, and collaborate with colleagues. Although

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

professionalism requires rigorous review and critique, faculty should always interact with colleagues, students, and others with civility and respect. They should promote collegiality and harmony in their faculty units. They should not denigrate other faculty or students or engage in disruption, manipulation, or contention. They should not abuse the moral climate of discourse on the campus. They are encouraged to use their professional expertise to give service to the community and the Church. They should actively participate in the life of the University community by attending University devotionals, faculty, and other University meetings.

### 3.4.2 Assessment of Citizenship

The following citizenship criteria are critical and will be used in the assessment of all faculty members:

- A. For faculty who are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, loyalty to the Church.
- B. Support for and affirmative contributions to the University mission.
- C. Behavior reflecting honor, integrity, collegiality, civility, respect, concern for others, adherence to the Church Educational System Honor Code, and observance of University policies.
- D. Engagement with faculty meetings and attendance at campus devotionals, forums, convocations, commencements, etc.

Although a faculty member may participate in only a portion of the following and other citizenship activities, evaluation of citizenship should consider the following evidence:

- A. Meaningful contribution to activities that strengthen the University, including administrative and committee service.
- B. Collaboration with colleagues in teaching, scholarship, or citizenship.
- C. Mentoring colleagues.
- D. Service to the profession, such as holding offices and committee assignments in professional associations, organizing professional meetings and panels, editing journals and newsletters, serving on editorial boards, and serving as referees of scholarship.
- E. Sharing of professional expertise in service to the community and the Church.
- F. Collaborative participation in international and service-learning activities and other activities that enhance BYU–Hawaii's approved outreach efforts.



### **3.4.3 Review Letters of Citizenship Activities**

Deans and review committees may solicit review letters evaluating a faculty member's citizenship activities from those who have closely observed these activities. Review letters should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the service.

## **4. CFS REVIEWS**

### **4.1 Outline of Process**

Obtaining CFS is generally a six-year process with a first complete review at three years, unless the hiring offer letter dictates otherwise or the CFS clock is extended for approved personal or parental leaves or other extenuating circumstances. The salient features are summarized below:

1. Faculty members are provided with a copy of this policy and any specific program expectations when they first begin their appointment. This includes an interview with the dean or designee to make plans for the faculty member's development.
2. The dean meets with the faculty member annually to assess and update the plan and to provide written feedback on the faculty member's progress.
3. A mandatory review is conducted during the third year of regular full-time faculty employment that includes evaluation of the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship (including library duties for librarians). This review begins with an evaluation by a faculty committee consisting of at least three members who have CFS. The committee makes recommendations to the faculty unit, and members of that faculty unit with CFS vote on the recommendation from the review committee. The dean writes a letter commenting on the faculty-level review and recommendation and also providing an independent review of the candidate. The University Promotion Review Committee reviews the recommendations and the process to determine whether appropriate procedures have been followed and that the evaluation has been fair to both the University and the candidate. They then forward their recommendation with the other materials to the Academic Vice President. The outcome from this third-year review includes a final decision of the Academic Vice President that will generally be either advancement to candidacy for CFS or non-renewal of the employment contract.
4. Those individuals advanced to candidacy after the third-year review will continue to meet annually with the dean to receive feedback and to respond to concerns and suggestions raised during the third-year review.

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

5. A final review is conducted during the sixth year of regular full time faculty employment. External letters of evaluation are included with this review.
6. The Academic Vice President makes a recommendation to the University President based on the outcomes of the sixth-year review.
7. The University President makes a final decision to grant CFS or to not renew the faculty member's employment contract.
8. Negative recommendations at each level of the review process are timely communicated to the faculty member, and the recommendation of the Academic Vice President may be appealed only through an independent evaluation of the file.

### 4.2 Mandatory Initial and Final Reviews

A faculty member's years of service prior to being granted CFS are probationary. New faculty members should counsel with wise and experienced colleagues or mentors during this period. To receive CFS, faculty members must pass two formal University reviews. During the winter semester of a faculty member's third year, an initial review will assess his or her progress and determine whether he or she will advance to CFS candidacy. If the faculty member continues to meet expectations after passing the initial review, he or she will undergo a final CFS review, typically beginning fall semester of the sixth year. Except as provided otherwise by this policy, the initial and final reviews to determine whether CFS will be granted, and their timing, are mandatory.

Requests to delay a scheduled review or to review a faculty member early for either CFS or rank advancement must be made in writing by the faculty member and approved by the dean and the Academic Vice President. A faculty member may also withdraw from the CFS process at any stage, but withdrawal constitutes a resignation from the University at the end of the contract year. Moreover, a faculty member who does not submit a timely application for the initial or final CFS reviews or who does not pass either of these reviews will not receive another contract after the existing contract year ends. The University, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

### 4.3 Purpose of the Reviews

CFS reviews ensure that a faculty member's present qualifications and future promise justify the University's ongoing commitment to that faculty member. Granting CFS creates a long-term relationship that significantly affects the University's ability to fulfill its mission and influence the lives of its students. CFS reviews help provide the best

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

education for BYU–Hawaii students by promoting faculty development and establishing ongoing performance expectations.

Assessments and recommendations by reviewers at all levels should be candid, thorough, and fair. Reviewers should fully discuss the faculty member’s strengths and weaknesses and clearly explain their recommendations.

### 4.4 Initial (Third-Year) Review

The initial (third-year) review will include an assessment of the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship. Essentially the same procedures apply to initial and final CFS reviews, except that external reviews of scholarship are not required in initial reviews. Faculty who are progressing satisfactorily will be granted candidacy for CFS. The Promotion Review Committee will send commendations and recommendations regarding the faculty member in a report to the AAVP-Faculty, who will forward the report to the Academic Vice President for final decision. The AAVP-Faculty will draft a letter to the faculty member, notifying the faculty member of the Academic Vice President’s decision whether to grant CFS candidacy. If granting CFS candidacy, the letter will also indicate areas for commendation and concern to help the faculty member prepare for the final review. The letter will be distributed to the faculty member and the dean. Deans or designees will review progress with the faculty member in their annual interviews. This letter will be included in the final review file. If the Academic Vice President’s decision is to not grant CFS candidacy, a letter to the faculty member will explain the reasons for not granting CFS candidacy.

The normal calendar for initial reviews is:

- Faculty member submits portfolio to Dean: no later than February 28
- Faculty Review Committee and faculty unit recommendations 'to Dean: March 31
- Dean’s recommendation to Promotion Review Committee: April 30
- Promotion Review Committee’s report to AAVP-Faculty: May 31
- Academic Vice President’s decision to faculty member: June 15

### 4.5 Final (Sixth-Year) Review

The final (sixth-year) CFS review will include an assessment of the faculty member's performance and promise in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship. To receive CFS, faculty members must clearly demonstrate in their final review that they have met program, faculty unit, and University standards in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship. The normal calendar for final reviews is:

- Faculty member submits portfolio to Dean: no later than October 15

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

Dean solicits external reviews: October 15-December 1

Faculty Review Committee and faculty unit recommendations 'to Dean :  
December 15

Dean's recommendation to Promotion Review Committee: January 15

Promotion Review Committee's recommendation to Academic Vice President:  
February 28

Academic Vice President's recommendation to President: March 31

President's decision to faculty member: April 15

### 4.6 Changes in Timing of CFS Reviews

The timing for the initial and final CFS reviews is mandatory, except as provided in this policy. Professional development leaves taken during the first six years count as part of the six-year probationary period. By contrast, personal leaves (including leaves for illness or other significant extenuating circumstances) generally do not count as part of the six-year probationary period and therefore delay the CFS reviews. Extenuating personal or family circumstances may also justify postponing a review. During the probationary period, a faculty member may also request a one-time, one-year delay in the schedule of rank and status reviews because of specific extenuating personal or family situations, such as pregnancy, childbirth, special parenting needs, personal or family illness, or other similar personal or family circumstances without taking a personal leave if they are able to meet their normal full-time teaching or other professional assignments. Faculty-member-requested delays of CFS reviews are exceptional and must be approved in writing by the dean and the Academic Vice President before the rank and status review process begins (that is, before the portfolio submission deadline).

## 5. RANK ADVANCEMENT

The three academic ranks are assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. The minimum University requirements for these ranks are:

### 5.1 Assistant Professor

- A. Understanding of the importance of citizenship and willingness to engage in high-quality citizenship.
- B. Definite promise of high-quality teaching.
- C. Interest in and evidence of ability to produce high-quality peer-reviewed scholarship or creative work.
- D. Generally, a doctoral degree or other appropriate terminal degree, such as Master of Fine Arts or Master of Library Science is expected. In some disciplines,

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

a non-terminal master's degree may suffice, especially if coupled with subsequent relevant experience that is also considered sufficient by similar institutions in higher education.

- E. For library faculty, promise of high-quality librarianship.

## 5.2 Associate Professor

- A. A demonstrated record of high-quality teaching.
- B. A demonstrated record of high-quality scholarship since appointment as an assistant professor.
- C. A demonstrated record of high-quality University citizenship.
- D. A minimum of six years in service as an assistant professor to demonstrate over time the faculty member's proficiency in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship. Therefore, the review for rank advancement will normally occur during the faculty member's sixth year of service as an assistant professor, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the six-year minimum.)
- E. A terminal degree relative to the person's field of expertise or master's degree with appropriate experience as described in Section 5.1.D.
- F. For library faculty, a demonstrated record of high-quality librarianship.

## 5.3 Professor

Philosophically, there is an important difference between advancement from associate professor to professor compared to advancement from assistant to associate concurrent with the granting of CFS. The former reflects the University's academic standing and stature in the broader academy more than the latter. The latter is more of an internal question of fit and willingness to retain the faculty member, an indication of a university's investment in a faculty member's potential. The granting of the rank of professor has traction beyond the University. The logical extension of this thinking is that advancement to associate professor carries high personal stakes for the candidate, and fairness in the process should be of paramount consideration. Although a false positive (retaining someone who is not a good fit) would be frustrating for the University, a false negative (releasing someone who should be retained) would be devastating for the candidate. Fairness is also an important consideration for the advancement to professor, but the stakes are different because the person's employment is not in question. A compelling case for advancement to professor, then, ought to be the prime consideration for the institution because false negatives can be corrected in a subsequent review cycle whereas false positives characterize the University in

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

perpetuity. Accordingly, great attention needs to be paid by both candidates and reviewers to the concept of an established pattern of high quality as follows:

- A. An established pattern and record of high-quality scholarship since becoming an associate professor.
- B. An established pattern and record of improvement in high-quality teaching.
- C. An established pattern and record of high-quality university citizenship.
- D. For library faculty, an established pattern and record of high-quality librarianship.
- E. At least five years in service as an associate professor to demonstrate over time the faculty member's proficiency in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship. Therefore, the earliest that a review for rank advancement could occur is during the faculty member's fifth year of service as an associate professor, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the five-year minimum.)
- F. A terminal degree relative to the person's field of expertise.

### 5.4 Calendar for Rank Advancement Reviews.

The normal calendar for rank advancement reviews is the same as for final CFS reviews (see Section 4.5). The application for advancement to associate professor is concurrent with the final review of CFS.

## 6. Librarians

### 6.1 Standards for Librarians

Librarians are faculty members. As such, they are held to the same standards of teaching (Section 3.2), scholarship (Section 3.3), and citizenship (Section 3.4) as other faculty members, although the proportions of assignments are different because of their specific role in the library. Those proportions are determined by the director of the library in collaboration with the Academic Vice President.

The BYU–Hawaii Library's mission is to gather and preserve collections of recorded information, literary arts, and certain cultural artifacts and to provide the means to access these collections. The library also makes information and collections accessible and facilitates scholarship activities and professional development. Librarians' accomplishments must be judged according to their contributions to that mission. Librarians participate in a wide variety of assigned activities throughout their careers. Certain activities in every position involve the day-to-day provision of library services.

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

The diligent fulfillment of such responsibilities is essential but not sufficient for effectiveness. True professionals possess a vision that enables them not only to adapt to changing circumstances, but also to foresee change and prepare for it. They are able to look critically at their own work and creatively expand and enhance library services.

They accept responsibility for resolving problems and overcoming obstacles. Commitment, leadership, innovation, and creativity characterize the effective librarian. The skills needed for librarianship are constantly changing as the means of collecting and disseminating information change. Beyond formal training, every librarian needs to have a broad range of professional experiences in order to develop the necessary competency, commitment, vision, and creativity.

### 6.2 Assessment of Librarians

Evaluation of librarianship should consider the following evidence (in addition to teaching, scholarship, and citizenship):

- A. The faculty development plan, which includes a statement of goals, description of past activities and accomplishments, and a plan for future professional development.
- B. A summary of accomplishments that addresses areas of library assignment such as:
  1. Setting and accomplishing significant goals.
  2. Achieving a satisfactory quantity and quality of work in each major responsibility.
  3. Using sound judgment in decision-making.
  4. Managing personnel and budgetary resources effectively.
  5. Participating on library committees that are directly related to assigned responsibilities.
  6. Cooperating with librarians, other faculty, and patrons to accomplish library and University goals.
  7. Demonstrating effectiveness in studying, evaluating, and building collections, and in selecting, acquiring, and providing access to materials.
  8. Demonstrating effectiveness in developing and maintaining bibliographic control by verifying, ordering, and processing materials; by classifying and cataloging materials; or by utilizing other bibliographic processes, resources, or systems.
  9. Demonstrating effectiveness in guiding and assisting students and faculty by satisfying reference needs, developing subject bibliographies,

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

- teaching research strategies both formally and informally, and promoting the effective use of the library.
  - 10. Demonstrating effectiveness in preserving or conserving the physical integrity and intellectual content of materials and in educating patrons in their careful use.
  - 11. Demonstrating effectiveness in administering and managing the University library, or other sub-unit.
- C. A description of steps taken to evaluate and improve the librarian's performance, including:
1. Studying relevant literature in the field and incorporating new ideas and knowledge into one's professional assignment.
  2. Taking or teaching courses directly related to professional assignment (*e.g.*, foreign languages, library science, computer science, business management, or subject specialty courses).
  3. Attending and presenting at seminars, workshops, and conferences.
  4. Participating in professional development leaves to improve performance.

## 7. PROCEDURES FOR CFS AND RANK ADVANCEMENT REVIEWS

### 7.1 Overview

Initial and final CFS reviews and rank advancement reviews include evaluations at the dean and University levels. Essentially the same procedures apply to initial and final CFS and rank advancement reviews, **except that external review letters are not required in initial (third-year) reviews**. Faculty preparing for third-year and final reviews are solely responsible for their preparation, including preparation of their files. Failure of others to communicate with or to assist the faculty member being reviewed is not an excuse for lack of preparation or grounds for requesting an independent examination of the Academic Vice President's recommendation.

### 7.2 Content of the Portfolio

Faculty members are responsible for preparing their portfolios. The portfolio is to be used in initial, final, or rank advancement reviews and should be professional and complete as defined in this document. It should begin with a personal statement that contains a self-assessment of teaching, scholarship, and citizenship. This personal statement should also address any areas of concern raised in any previous reviews and should include letters from such reviews. Additional materials to include in the



## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

portfolio are described in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 (teaching), 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 (scholarship), 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 (citizenship), and 6.2 (librarians). Evidence to be included in the portfolio is summarized in Appendix A. The materials for the third-year review should be included in the portfolio for the sixth-year review.

### **7.3 Size of the Portfolio**

The faculty member should be selective about what to include in the portfolio, which is an indication of professional maturity. A concise portfolio that emphasizes the best evidence is more persuasive than one cluttered with documents. Personal letters from students to the faculty member should not be included.

### **7.4 Additional Information**

Reviewers at any level (faculty or University) may request, receive, or obtain additional information from the faculty member or others. If such additions materially affect those reviewers' recommendation, the relevant information should be shared with lower levels of review so that those individuals can consider whether to change their recommendations. Such additions include but are not limited to documents indicating the acceptance of additional publications, additional student evaluations, and late-arriving external review letters. However, the faculty member should not submit, and reviewers need not accept, documents that were available to the faculty member at the time the portfolio was submitted. Documents that strengthen the file need not be shared with prior review levels that made positive recommendations, and documents that weaken the file need not be shared with prior review levels that made negative recommendations, since those documents would not change the recommendations.

### **7.5 Faculty Review**

#### **7.5.1 Faculty Review Committee**

The faculty review committee should be composed of at least three faculty members, all of whom have CFS and at least the rank to which the candidate is being considered for advancement. The dean appoints the committee and the committee chair. The dean is not a member of this committee. If there are insufficient members of the faculty with the required status and rank to compose this committee, the dean of that faculty unit will identify qualified faculty members from another faculty unit to complete the committee.

#### **7.5.2 Waiver**

The faculty review committee chair will ask the faculty member to sign the waiver provided in Appendix B waiving any rights of access to reviews solicited from

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

students, faculty, external peers, and others. The signed waiver letter should be included in the faculty member's portfolio and copies should be provided to individuals solicited to provide reviews of the faculty member.

### **7.5.3 Review Letters of Citizenship Activities**

The dean may solicit review letters evaluating a faculty member's citizenship activities from those who have closely observed these activities. Review letters should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the service (see Section 3.4.3).

### **7.5.4 Student Evaluations of Teaching**

For all reviews, the portfolio will include a report of student evaluations for each class taught and a complete set of student comments. Trends in ratings, as well as the types of classes, should be considered. The faculty review committee may also solicit written or oral comments from a representative sample of students (see Section 3.2.2.F).

### **7.5.5 Peer Evaluations of Teaching**

The faculty review committee will review and evaluate the teaching portfolio as described in Section 3.2.2.C. In addition, the dean will include statements of his/her own experience visiting classrooms of the candidate. The faculty review committee may also choose to visit the candidate's classes after scheduling with the candidate.

### **7.5.6 External Reviews of Scholarship**

In final CFS and rank advancement reviews, the dean will obtain at least two external reviews of the body of the faculty member's scholarship. These external reviews must be conducted by faculty members at other institutions where academic rank is the norm and whose own rank is the same or higher than that for which the candidate is applying. The external reviewers should not have personal or professional ties to the faculty member that might be expected to, or have the appearance to, bias the reviews (such as former advisors or mentors). The faculty member may recommend reviewers and should describe his or her relationship, if any, with each. Ultimately, however, the dean is responsible for selecting the reviewers. The dean will send the reviewers the faculty member's portfolio, information about the faculty member's teaching assignment, and a summary of the University and discipline standards for assessing teaching and scholarship. The dean's report in the candidate's file will describe 1) how and why the reviewers were selected, 2) their standing in the field, and 3) their relationship (if any) with the faculty member.

Appendix C is a sample letter to external reviewers. Deans and faculty review committees should allow adequate time for selecting and contacting potential

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

reviewers, conveying materials, and receiving review letters, which must be included in the portfolio.

### **7.5.7 Faculty Deliberations, Faculty Meeting/Vote, and Review Committee Report**

While under review by the faculty review committee, the candidate's electronic portfolio will be made available to the entire unit's CFS track faculty except the faculty under review. Once the committee has completed its review, it will call a meeting open to all CFS faculty and all CFS-track faculty in the unit except for the candidate. The committee will present its evaluation and its recommendation(s) which will be followed by a group discussion. After the discussion, all eligible faculty members will vote by secret ballot to recommend either granting or denying the application. The committee will then write a report to the dean evaluating the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and citizenship and summarizing the deliberations. The report will include documentation of the meeting with the full faculty unit (date and individuals in attendance), the committee's vote, and the entire (eligible) faculty's vote. A minority report, if any, should also be included in the report. Finally, the report will provide recommendations for improvement of the candidate's work.

Only faculty with CFS are eligible to vote in initial and final CFS decisions; only faculty with at least the rank being sought are eligible to vote in rank advancement decisions. Members of the faculty review committee vote with that committee, and if eligible, also vote with the unit's faculty members. Only faculty members physically or virtually present for the deliberations may vote.

### **7.5.8 Dean's Report**

After the faculty review committee's vote and the faculty unit's vote, the dean will write a separate evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and citizenship and include it in the portfolio. The report will include a statement of the faculty or program scholarship standard and/or an indication of what constitutes acceptable evidence of scholarship in the candidate's discipline. The report will also assess the faculty member's progress in addressing concerns raised in past annual and rank and status reviews. The dean will then forward the portfolio to the AAVP-Faculty. If the dean's recommendation differs from that of the committee, the dean must address the reasons for those differences.

### **7.5.9 Faculty and Disciplinary Perspective**

Because the candidate's own faculty unit is most familiar with the candidate's performance and the standards in the faculty unit and the discipline, the reports of the

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

faculty review committee and the dean should specifically address the candidate's performance in light of faculty standards and the standards of the discipline to help guide reviewers at the University levels. Reviewers at the University levels should give appropriate deference to the faculty unit's perspective, with emphasis on auditing the fairness of the process up to that point. University-level reviews should reflect the perspective of the faculty and University at large.

### **7.5.10 Informing the Faculty Member of a Negative Recommendation**

If the faculty review committee or the dean recommends denying candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement, the dean will inform the faculty member, and explain the reasons for the recommendation, in order to allow the faculty member the option to respond or withdraw the application. The withdrawal of an application for candidacy or CFS constitutes notice of resignation from the University at the end of the contract year. The University, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

Withdrawal of an application for rank advancement allows the candidate to submit their file at a later cycle after it has been strengthened by additional activities. If the faculty member elects not to withdraw the application, it will be forwarded to the AAVP-Faculty. The faculty member may add a letter of response to the concerns which will be included with the file before it is sent to the AAVP-Faculty.

## **7.6 University Review**

### **7.6.1 Promotion Review Committee**

The Promotion Review Committee is composed of a minimum of seven faculty members, all of whom have CFS. Committee members are recommended by their dean or director (one from each faculty unit except the Faculty of Religious Education, which may share a member with the library) and appointed by the AAVP-Faculty. The term of service is typically five years. A quorum consists of at least three-fourths of the appointed members, rounded up to the nearest whole number of members. The AAVP-Faculty serves ex officio as chair of the committee, voting only in case of tie votes.

### **7.6.2 Promotion Review Committee Vote**

The Promotion Review Committee will recommend, by simple majority vote, to grant or deny CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement, and will forward its recommendations to the Academic Vice President. In cases of promotion to professor, only committee members holding that rank will vote.

**7.6.3 Recommendations that Differ from Faculty Recommendations**

If the Promotion Review Committee's recommendation differs from that of the dean, the Promotion Review Committee may ask the dean for clarification or for additional information for the purpose of further consideration. The Promotion Review Committee will then forward its recommendation to the Academic Vice President.

**7.6.4 Academic Vice President's Decision or Recommendation**

After considering the Promotion Review Committee's recommendation, in cases of CFS candidacy, the Academic Vice President will make the decision to grant or deny CFS candidacy. The Academic Vice President's decision is informed by the recommendations produced by the faculty, dean, and University-level reviewers.

In CFS and rank advancement cases, the Academic Vice President will make an independent recommendation to the University President to grant or deny CFS or rank advancement. In extraordinary circumstances, the Academic Vice President may recommend a delay of the review. The Academic Vice President's recommendation, informed by the recommendations produced by the faculty, dean, and University-level reviewers, is the University's official recommendation to the President.

If the Academic Vice President's recommendation to the President is against the granting of CFS or rank advancement, the candidate will be informed of the recommendation by means of a letter delivered to him or her, preferably in person, by the Academic Vice President. The letter will summarize the recommendation and its underlying reasons. Upon receiving the letter, the faculty member may 1) withdraw the application in writing within ten calendar days, 2) allow the recommendation to go forward for the President's final decision without comment, or 3) request an independent examination of the Academic Vice President's recommendation as detailed in Section 8.

If the Academic Vice President's recommendation is to delay the review, the candidate will be informed of the recommendation by means of a letter delivered to him or her, preferably in person, by the Academic Vice President. A recommendation by the Academic Vice President to delay the review is not subject to independent examination. Upon receiving the letter recommending a delay, the faculty may 1) withdraw the application in writing within ten calendar days, 2) allow the recommendation to go forward for the President's final decision without comment, or 3) reject the offer of a delay, in which case the Academic Vice President's

recommendation becomes a denial, and the faculty member may exercise any of the three options listed in the previous paragraph.

By withdrawing an application for CFS candidacy or CFS, a faculty member resigns from employment at the University, effective at the end of the current contract period. The University, at its sole discretion, may grant the individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

## **8. INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION**

### **8.1 Filing a Request for an Independent Examination.**

A faculty member may request an independent examination of the Academic Vice President's recommendation to deny CFS or rank advancement. A recommendation to delay a review for CFS or candidacy for CFS, which delay was not rejected by the faculty member, cannot receive an independent examination; however, a second recommendation to delay the same proposed action may be examined. A request for an independent examination may be based on either or both of two grounds: 1) that, given the information available in the portfolio, the Academic Vice President's recommendation was unreasonable, or 2) that a substantial procedural error occurred in the rank and status process.

Any request for an independent examination must be submitted in writing by the faculty member to the Academic Vice President within ten calendar days after receiving the letter stating the Academic Vice President's decision to recommend denial of CFS or rank advancement.

### **8.2 Examining Panel**

The examining panel is composed of two members of the Deans' Council (but not the AAVP-Faculty or the dean of the faculty member's faculty unit) appointed by the President and three faculty members who have CFS. The President will designate one of the members of the Deans' Council to chair the panel. The three faculty members of the examining panel will be drawn from a pool nominated by their deans as potential panel members. One of these will be chosen from the pool by the President, one will be chosen by the faculty member being reviewed, and the third will be chosen from the pool by lottery.

### **8.3 Faculty Advocate and University Representative**

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

The faculty member may select an advocate from among all BYU–Hawaii faculty who have CFS to assist in the preparation and presentation of the materials to be presented to the examining panel. The faculty advocate may not be a practicing attorney and may not provide legal counsel or representation to the faculty member. The faculty member may privately engage an attorney to provide legal counsel at his or her own expense, but the faculty member's attorney will not be permitted to represent the faculty member in writing or in person in any aspect of the independent examination or to attend or otherwise participate in the examination meeting or any other meeting conducted under this policy.

The Academic Vice President shall prepare and present the University's response to the case presented in the independent examination or may appoint a faculty member who has CFS or an administrator to serve as the University representative to prepare and present the University's response to the case presented in the independent examination. Ideally, the University representative should be someone who participated in the review process and whose recommendation coincides with and supports the University's official recommendation to the President.

### **8.4 Availability and Redacting the File**

The AAVP-Faculty will give the faculty member a copy of the file. The names and other information identifying any external and internal reviewers (not including the faculty unit review committee and dean) will be removed from the confidential review letters of teaching, scholarship, citizenship, and professional service and from any other portions of the file, as provided in the faculty member's waiver statement. The University representative and the panel chair will be given unredacted copies of the file.

### **8.5 Confidentiality**

The information provided to the faculty member and the University representative will be held strictly confidential and will not be disclosed except as follows:

- A. The faculty member may share the information with the faculty member's advocate, and the University representative may share the information with such University employees as are reasonably necessary in preparing a case for the independent examination.
- B. If the faculty member or the University representative determines that information must be disclosed to any additional persons, including witnesses, to adequately present the case or the response, the faculty member or the University representative will request permission from the chair of the panel.

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

The number of witnesses should be kept to a minimum. Witnesses will submit their testimony only in writing.

Violations of confidentiality may be considered in the independent examination and may be dealt with as the panel deems appropriate, including by exclusion of witness statements or evidence, or in extreme cases, by dismissal of the request for independent examination.

### **8.6 The Faculty Member’s Statement**

Within 30 calendar days after receiving the file, the faculty member will provide a written statement to the AAVP-Faculty, who will distribute it to the chair of the panel and to the University representative. The statement will:

- A. Outline all claims on which the request for the independent examination is based.
- B. Outline all arguments and information that the faculty member wishes to have considered.
- C. Include copies of all documents (except those already in the file) that are referenced in the statement, including any witness statements.

### **8.7 Response Statement**

Within 30 calendar days after receiving the faculty member’s statement, the University representative will provide a written response statement to the AAVP-Faculty, who will distribute it to the chair of the examining panel and to the faculty member. The statement will:

- A. Outline all responses to the claims on which the case for requesting the independent examination is based.
- B. Outline all arguments and information upon which the recommendation of the Academic Vice President was based.
- C. Include copies of all documents mentioned in the response to the faculty member’s statement, including any witness statements.

### **8.8 Examination Meeting**

At least five business days prior to the examination meeting, the chair of the panel will provide to each member of the panel the complete, unredacted rank and status file, and the written statements prepared by the faculty member and by the University representative. Only members of the panel, the faculty member, the faculty member’s advocate, and the University representative may attend the examination meeting. The



## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

faculty member and the University representative will be invited to answer questions from the panel and to clarify the case they each prepared. The faculty member will decide whether he or she, or the advocate, will take the lead in answering questions and clarifying for the panel. The amount of time allotted to the questions and clarifications will be limited, balanced for each side, and determined by the chair of the panel. At the conclusion of the questions and clarifications, the faculty member, the faculty member's advocate, and the University representative will be dismissed before panel deliberations begin. Exceptions to this process may be granted at the sole discretion of the chair of the examining panel.

### **8.9 Additional Information**

At the discretion of the chair, the examining panel may request, receive, or obtain additional information from any source, including information not considered by other reviewers.

### **8.10 Presumptions**

In considering the substantive merits of the case, the examining panel will presume that the Academic Vice President's recommendation is reasonable and justifiable. Therefore, the faculty member has the burden of persuasion to demonstrate that the Academic Vice President's recommendation is unreasonable in light of all the information that was available in the file at the time of the file review or that a substantial procedural error occurred.

To show a substantial procedural error, the faculty member has the burden of persuasion to demonstrate:

- A. That a procedure required by this Hiring, Rank, and Status Policy was not carried out according to policy; and
- B. that the error affected the outcome of the review such that upon full consideration of the case, including any information that was excluded or misconstrued because of a procedural error, the granting of CFS or rank promotion would likely be warranted.

### **8.11 Examining Panel's Recommendation**

After considering the faculty member's case and the University's response, the examining panel will recommend by majority vote that the Academic Vice President's recommendation be sustained or reversed. The panel may make other recommendations regarding the case. Within ten calendar days of the meeting, the chair of the panel will give the panel's recommendation and its reasons in writing to

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

the President. Copies will be sent to the Academic Vice President, the AAVP-Faculty, the faculty member, the University representative, and the dean.

## 9. PRESIDENT'S DECISION

After receiving the recommendation of the Academic Vice President and the results of any independent examination, the President will decide whether to grant CFS or rank advancement, or to delay the review, or take any other action. The President has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the President's sole discretion, to make the decision. All determinations in the Rank and Status process other than the President's decision are only recommendations. The President will give the faculty member written notice of the decision. Copies of the letter will also be sent to the Academic Vice President, the AAVP-Faculty, and the dean.

If the President's decision is delayed beyond the conclusion of the existing contract year as a result of the independent review or for any other reason, the faculty member may, at the University's sole discretion, be employed on an at-will or temporary basis until the President's decision is made.

If the President's decision is to grant CFS or rank advancement, the CFS or rank advancement will be effective immediately.

If the President's decision is not to grant CFS or candidacy, the faculty member's employment at BYU–Hawaii will terminate at the conclusion of the current contract unless the University, at its sole discretion, grants the individual up to a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

### 9.1 Exhaustion of Remedies and Waiver of Claims

A faculty member may not initiate civil litigation or civil administrative remedies against the University or its employees, agents, officers, or trustees until all the remedies provided by this policy have been exhausted. Failure to pursue an independent examination within the stated deadlines or to exhaust the remedies provided by this policy will constitute a waiver of the faculty member's right to pursue any claim arising out of the University's actions in the matter, unless the right to pursue a statutory claim is preserved by law.

## **APPENDIX A: CHECKLIST OF MATERIALS TO INCLUDE IN PORTFOLIO**

Please use the portfolio template (downloadable at Faculty Resources webpage) and include the following material in the portfolio as a single PDF portfolio. See Section 7.2 regarding content to include in the portfolio. See Section 7.4 regarding the size of the file.

### **Curriculum Vitae (CV)**

Use colored text or some other method to distinguish work performed since entering the CFS track employment at BYU-H, or since last rank advancement.

### **Reports (added to the portfolio by the dean)**

1. Faculty review committee's report
2. Dean's report
3. At least two external review letters and a copy of the waiver letter (not for third-year review) (see Section 7.5.6).

### **Previous Review Reports (added by the applicant)**

1. Third-year review report letter (for the final CFS review)
2. Faculty Annual Reports with dean's comments

### **Reflective Personal Statements/Brief Narratives**

Self-assessment in the form of a brief narrative should be included at the beginning of each of the teaching, scholarship, and citizenship sections. For candidates in the final CFS review, these statements should also address any areas of concern raised in prior reviews (see Sections 3.1.2, 7.2). *The combined length of all narratives should be no more than eight single-spaced pages, and shorter if possible.*

### **Teaching (Section 3.2)**

1. A list of courses taught by semester, with enrollment numbers (identify new courses developed).
2. Evidence/Certificate of completion of CLT's Confab and Colloquium.
3. A description of other teaching activities.
4. Teaching portfolio (syllabi, reading lists, assessment means, handouts, technology used for instruction, sample student works, instructor's feedback on student works, and other materials relevant to course planning and delivery).

## Official BYU–Hawaii Policy

5. A description of steps taken to evaluate and improve one’s own teaching.
6. A description of products of high-quality teaching and mentoring.
7. Other relevant materials or awards.
8. Student evaluation data and student comments

**Scholarship (Section 3.3)**

1. An annotated list of all scholarly and creative works since arriving at BYUH for third-year or final CFS review or since last promotion for rank advancement (indicate whether each work is peer reviewed (as defined in Section 3.3.3), and describe your contribution to jointly authored works).
2. Examples of and/or links to scholarship and a brief explanation why they were selected (all other scholarship should be made available for review in the dean’s office).
3. A list of awards or recognition of scholarship.
4. Other relevant materials (such as but not limited to documented evidence of research for creative or performative work).

**Citizenship (Section 3.4)**

5. A description of committee assignments and other citizenship activities at the University.
6. A description of citizenship activities in the profession.
7. A description of other citizenship activities.
8. Review letters of citizenship activities.

**APPENDIX B:  
WAIVER**

Date

To Prospective Reviewers:

As part of the review process for continuing faculty status (CFS) or rank advancement, I recognize that letters of evaluation will be requested from supervisors, peers, or students. For your information, the following represents my choice regarding the waiver of my rights to see those letters.

I waive the right to see the letters of evaluation requested in the review process.

Signed by Faculty Member

I do not waive the right to see the letters of evaluation requested in the review process.

Signed by Faculty Member

**APPENDIX C:  
SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS OF SCHOLARSHIP**

Date

Addressee

Dear Professor \_\_\_\_\_:

Professor John/Mary Doe is being reviewed in his/her sixth year of service to determine whether his/her performance merits continuing faculty status (i.e. analogous to tenure) and rank advancement to associate professor [or, advancement to full professor]. The process will begin this fall semester.

Our policy requires evaluations from knowledgeable peers in the academic community. Our evaluation considers all aspects of performance--citizenship, teaching, and scholarly and creative work. Teaching is emphasized heavily at BYU–Hawaii and constitutes about 2/3 of Professor Doe’s appointment. We are interested in your assessment of the enclosed artifacts of Professor Doe’s scholarly contributions noted in the enclosed vitae and/or samples. Your evaluation should also describe your relationship with Professor Doe.

We need your assessment by (date). It would be helpful, however, if you could respond very briefly at your earliest convenience by phone (xxx-xxx-xxxx), fax (xxx-xxx-xxxx), e- mail (address), or letter to let me know that we can count on receiving your assessment by that time. [We offer an honorarium of \$\_\_\_\_\_ for this service. Please include your social security number so that we can make arrangements for the honorarium payment.]

Enclosed for your consideration are a copy of Professor Doe's curriculum vitae, information about his/her teaching assignment based on the contract of his/her choice, samples of his/her scholarly work, and a summary of our university and faculty standards for assessing **scholarship**. Also included is a form indicating Professor Doe's choice regarding the waiver of his/her rights to see the external review letters. The faculty member will see your letter only if he/she retains the right to review letters. However, if there is a negative decision and the faculty member appeals it, his/her entire file will be made available to him/her, although with names and other identifying factors will be removed.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,