Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Northern Michigan University

BYLAWS
Article 1 - Membership and Voting

1.1 Membership in the Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation shall consist of all persons who are in the bargaining unit and hold academic rank in the Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

1.2 The Department Head (DH) and/or members may call and/or chair meetings.

1.3 Meetings involving only members may be called and chaired by the department’s bargaining council representative or appointee.

1.4 All members shall have the right to vote. Any member on leave or not in attendance may exercise the right to vote electronically or by proxy vote.

1.5 A quorum of a simple majority of members present or proxied is needed for voting to take place at meetings; otherwise a simple majority of voice, electronic, hand, or secret vote will decide voting issues, except that approval to changes in by-laws and requests for DH evaluation outside the usual triennial schedule shall be a 2/3 majority.

Article 2 - Departmental Governance

2.1 Department Headship

2.1.1 The DH will serve as the chief administrative officer of the department and officially represent and advocate for the department in departmental matters and concerns within the university and throughout the community.

2.1.2 The DH, after meeting with the department, will develop mutually agreeable written guidelines to structure assignments that will take into account large sections in single courses, number of preparations, nature of preparations, laboratory supervision and planning, supervision of special learning activities, supervision of field activities, clinical experience, number of advisees, or administrative duties and other assigned responsibilities. These guidelines will be reviewed annually by the DH and department. At a faculty meeting of the Winter semester prior to the submission of Summer and Fall schedules the department and DH shall review and agree to the annual guidelines for structuring assignments.

2.1.3 The DH shall coordinate the assignment of faculty members to ensure peer evaluation of instruction.

2.1.4 An evaluation of the DH will be conducted at least every three years by the Department in accordance with the Master Agreement.

2.1.4.1 The DH shall submit a self-assessment document, Part I, to the Departmental faculty as specified in the Master Agreement.

2.1.5 When the departmental headship becomes vacant, replacement procedures will follow the requirements in the Master Agreement.

2.2 Division Coordinators/Athletic Training Program Director
2.2.1 The DH shall, with input from the members, establish academic divisions and appoint coordinators to divisions and, for the division of the Athletic Training Program, an Athletic Training Program Director.

2.2.2 Responsibilities of Coordinators/Athletic Training Program Director are:
    (a) Prepare outcomes assessment (AQIP) reports for their division to be included in HPER departmental annual report.
    (b) Plan their division course offerings for each semester and individual faculty teaching schedules and submit to DH for approval.
    (c) Work within their division to submit new course offerings, programs and/or program revisions for consideration by CUP and/or the GPC.
    (d) Serve as the primary contact for students or other persons and/or agencies with questions about their division and for the Campus Visit program.
    (e) Assign majors to appropriate academic advisors, as needed, within their division.

2.2.3 Coordinators/Athletic Training Program Director with accreditation and/or program review responsibilities shall coordinate and fulfill all accreditation or program review duties and responsibilities, with assistance from division faculty, in accordance with appropriate accreditation and/or program review standards and guidelines.

2.3 Academic Divisions

2.3.1 Membership in an academic division shall consist of departmental bargaining unit faculty with primary teaching responsibilities in that division. Additional faculty and/or staff may be invited to participate in division meetings when appropriate.

2.3.2 Division Responsibilities
The primary areas of responsibilities for each academic division are:
    (a) to oversee its respective program/s;
    (b) to establish policies and procedures for conduct of its program/s;
    (c) to carry out curriculum development and review of its program/s;
    (d) to participate in the search for new faculty recruited for its division staffing;
    (e) to recommend to the DH faculty/staff for division curricular and/or programmatic needs;
    (f) to gather assessment data for inclusion in the Departmental AQIP reports.

2.4 Academic Senate Representative

2.4.1 In accordance with the constitution and bylaws of the Academic Senate, the members shall elect a representative to the Academic Senate. The term of office will be for two years. Academic senators are eligible for re-election and preferably shall have been on the NMU faculty at least three years.

2.4.2 Nominations will be accepted by the bargaining council representative and the election shall be held one month prior to the replacement date as determined by the Academic Senate bylaws.

2.4.3 The Senator shall represent the interests of the department in the Academic Senate and consult with and report to the members.

2.5 Bargaining Council Representative
2.5.1 The members shall elect a departmental bargaining council representative to provide for bargaining council representation in the preparation of collective bargaining contract proposals and to chair departmental bargaining unit meetings. When necessary, the bargaining council representative may appoint a departmental member to chair such meetings.

2.5.2 The term of office shall be for two years. Bargaining Council representatives are eligible for re-election.

2.5.3 Nomination and election of the representative shall be held one month prior to the replacement date as determined by the Master Agreement.

2.5.4 The Bargaining Council representative shall serve as the liaison between the Bargaining unit members and the Bargaining Council and shall consult with and report to the members as appropriate.

2.6 College of Professional Studies -- College Advisory Council (CAC) Representative

2.6.1 Members shall elect a College of Professional Studies, College Advisory Council representative.

2.6.2 Nominations will be accepted during a regularly scheduled membership meeting. The election of the representative shall be held one month prior to the replacement date as determined by the bylaws of the College of Professional Studies.

2.6.3 CAC representatives are to be elected for 2-year terms. Elections will be held in even numbered years. CAC representatives are eligible for re-election.

2.6.4 The representative shall make reports to and consult with bargaining members as appropriate.

Article 3 - Committees

3.1 Standing Committees

3.1.1 There will be three (3) standing committees: the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), the Scholarly Resources Assessment Committee (SRAC) and the Committee of the Whole. Ad hoc committees can be established as needed.

3.1.2 Committees shall meet as necessary. The time and place of the meetings shall be announced to all department members when appropriate.

3.1.3 Each committee is responsible for developing its internal procedures.

3.1.4 Any member may forward input to any of the departmental committees. At the committee’s discretion, non-members may be invited to provide input where appropriate.

3.2 Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)

3.2.1 The FEC shall be composed of a minimum of three members who hold the rank of Assistant Professor or above and who will be selected by the members at the first regular bargaining unit meeting of the academic year. It is recommended that a minimum of two (2) tenured faculty members serve on this committee. The committee shall elect a chairperson.
3.2.2 All members shall serve a 1-year term with the provision that at least one member from the previous year’s FEC shall serve an additional 1-year term.

3.2.3 Faculty members currently applying for tenure or promotion are not eligible to serve on the FEC.

3.2.4 Responsibilities

3.2.4.1 The FEC shall initiate and conduct tenure reviews for probationary faculty.

3.2.4.2 The FEC shall conduct promotion reviews upon request by a faculty member.

3.2.4.3 The FEC shall evaluate sabbatical applications based upon the evaluative criteria specified in the Master Agreement.

3.2.4.4 The FEC shall evaluate and rank reassigned time applications and submit to the Faculty Grants Committee.

3.2.4.5 The FEC shall, with input from faculty and according to the guidelines and criteria in the Master Agreement, prepare an evaluation statement, Part II, of DH evaluations and submit to the DH and Dean of the College of Professional Studies.

3.2.5 The DH shall serve as a voting member on the FEC when sabbatical applications are submitted.

3.3 Scholarly Resource Assessment Committee (SRAC)

3.3.1 The SRAC shall be composed of a minimum of three (3) members who will be selected by the members at the first regular department meeting of the academic year. The committee shall elect a chairperson.

3.3.2 The SRAC will compile and coordinate the feedback and dissemination of an annual scholarly resources assessment (SRA) according to guidelines in the Master Agreement.

**Article 4 - Professional Development Funds**

4.1 Each full-time faculty member with an academic or full year appointment in the Department shall receive professional development funds to support approved faculty travel as specified in the Master Agreement. Other approved expenditures in support of professional development may be made upon the approval of the department and Department Head. Individuals requesting such funds shall submit written requests to the department members and DH at an appropriate departmental meeting for approval.

4.2 Individually allocated funds not used in any year for professional development shall be carried forward for that individual as specified in the Master Agreement.

4.3 Any unused professional development funds, as specified in the Master Agreement, shall revert to the Department’s professional development account.

4.4 Funds that revert to the Department’s professional development account will be made
available to the eligible faculty in the department by the DH in consultation with the department. At the first faculty meeting of the academic year the DH will consult with the members regarding how such funds shall be distributed.

4.5 At the start of the fiscal year (or when the information becomes available), the DH shall apprise the members in writing of any excess professional development monies available in the Department’s professional development account.

Article 5 – Faculty Load for the Direction of Graduate Research, Graduate Practicum and Theses

5.1 Faculty of record who wish to count activities in this article as a part of the normal teaching assignment shall be allotted load credits as specified below.

5.2 Directors of theses shall be allotted one load credit per thesis as a part of their normal teaching assignment.

5.3 Readers of theses shall be allotted one-half load credit per thesis as a part of their normal teaching assignment.

5.4 Directors of graduate research projects shall receive one-half load credit per project or practicum as a part of their normal teaching assignment.

5.5 Supervisors of a graduate practicum shall receive one-half load credit per practicum.

5.6 Limits on the number of Directors, Readers and Supervisors of graduate work shall be the same as the Master Agreement.

Article 6 - Changes to Departmental Bylaws

6.1 Any member of the Department or the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, as specified in the Master Agreement, can offer changes to the Departmental Bylaws

6.2 Proposed changes from within the department shall be submitted in writing or electronically to the members. Proposed changes from the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be considered under the procedures specified in the Master Agreement.

6.3 A 2/3 majority of the membership is needed for passage of changes to the Departmental Bylaws.

6.4 Department approved changes to the Bylaws shall be submitted for review according to the Master Agreement.

6.5 A faculty member shall be elected by the members to serve as the department’s representative to the Bylaw Review Committee.

Article 7 - Criteria for Appointment, Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure

7.1 Academic Titles and Minimum Criteria for Appointment
Appointments to the department will follow procedures established in the Master Agreement.

7.1.1 Special Instructor: Special attainments, skills, certifications, license or experience
7.1.2 **Instructor:** An earned Master’s degree from an accredited institution or foreign educational institution whose degree is recommended for acceptance by the dean of the college upon concurrence of the department head and the faculty of the department and/or active candidacy for a terminal degree at an accredited institution and/or certification/s or license/s or experience commensurate with programmatic needs and/or accreditation standards, subject to the review and approval of the appropriate dean and the Provost and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

7.1.3 **Assistant Professor:** An earned Doctorate from an accredited institution or an earned Master’s degree from an accredited institution plus certification/s or license/s necessary for programmatic needs and/or accreditation standards or experience commensurate with programmatic needs and/or accreditation standards subject to review and approval of the appropriate dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Exceptions may be made because of unusual scholarly and/or professional achievements.

7.1.4 **Associate Professor:** An earned doctorate from an accredited institution or an earned Master’s degree from an accredited institution plus certification/s or license/s necessary for programmatic needs and/or accreditation standards or experience commensurate with programmatic needs and/or accreditation standards subject to review and approval by the appropriate dean, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and normally six (6) years of full-time higher education experience at the rank of Instructor or above; evidence of teaching excellence and scholarly or creative professional achievement. Exceptions may be made because of unusual scholarly and/or professional achievements.

7.1.5 **Professor:** An earned doctorate from an accredited institution and normally twelve (12) years of full-time higher education experience at the rank of Instructor or above; evidence of teaching excellence and distinguished scholarly or creative professional achievement. Exceptions may be made because of unusual scholarly and/or professional achievements.

7.2 **General Principles for Faculty Evaluation**

7.2.1 Tenure Earning and Tenured Faculty annual and triennial Evaluations and Term Appointment Evaluations shall be submitted to the FEC according to the procedures and processes outlined in the Master Agreement.

7.2.2 Evaluation of a faculty member shall be based on and consistent with: the expectations, goals and any assignments of criteria stated in the initial letter of appointment; the departmental bylaws; previous evaluations; and the judgmental criteria in the Master Agreement. Evaluations will be part of an ongoing record of the faculty members’ progress toward promotion and/or tenure or Continuing Contract Status.

7.2.3 Non-tenured faculty, Continuing Contract, Term and Tenured Assistant and Associate Professors will be evaluated annually. Tenured and non-tenured Professors will be evaluated triennially consistent with Article V in the Master Agreement.

7.2.4 **Judgmental Criteria for Tenure Earning and Tenured Assistant and Associate Professors**

The judgmental criteria will focus on three areas: 1) assigned professional responsibilities; 2)
7.2.5 Judgmental Criteria for Tenured and non-tenured Professors

The judgmental criteria will focus on three areas: 1) assigned professional responsibilities; 2) scholarship and/or professional development; and 3) service, with effectiveness in assigned professional responsibilities being the most important criterion.

Professors are expected to remain active in each judgmental area, consistent with the triennial statement of plans and to maintain the qualitative and quantitative standards identified in Section 7.6. Meeting these standards shall generally be acceptable for a recommendation for reappointment.

7.2.6 The evaluation of a faculty member on a Continuing Contract appointment will focus on their effectiveness in assigned responsibilities and departmental service. This does not preclude an evaluation of their scholarship and/or professional development.

7.2.7 The evaluation for promotion of Continuing Contract faculty members shall be based upon the evaluative criteria of the rank for which they are making application.

7.2.8 The evaluation of a term appointment faculty member will focus on assigned professional responsibilities and service, unless a term faculty intends to apply for Continuing Contract Status; in which case, the evaluation shall focus on their record of teaching and departmental service. This does not preclude an evaluation of their scholarship and/or professional development.

7.2.9 Faculty members shall submit a statement of plans according to Article 7.3.4. The statement of plans in conjunction with annual evaluations will be a part of an ongoing record of the faculty member’s progress toward promotion, tenure and/or Continuing Contract Status. Prior to evaluation materials being submitted to the dean, the faculty member, the FEC and the DH shall meet to agree to the statement of plans, including the area of emphasis between scholarship and/or professional development and service. This meeting is intended to assist the faculty member in working toward promotion, tenure and/or reappointment. The faculty member may, at the department level, modify the statement of plans to meet this intention.

7.2.10 At the departmental level, it is possible for new material to be added to the evaluation materials according to procedures in the Master Agreement.

7.3 Judgmental Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

7.3.1 The broad outlines of the judgmental criteria for promotion and tenure, focusing on the three judgmental areas of (1) assigned professional responsibilities, (2) scholarship and/or professional development, and (3) service, are found in the Master Agreement. Tenured and Tenure -earning Faculty are expected to be active in all areas. The more specific criteria and principles contained in these bylaws, including the examples used, must be understood to amplify the language in the Agreement, not diverge from it and are not exhaustive.
7.3.2 Qualitative Assessment of Judgmental Criteria and Ratings

The FEC and DH shall assess and rate the quality of a particular activity in the evaluative criteria above. This assessment shall be based on the quality of the work, taking into account the number of activities and the degree of depth in and commitment to each by the faculty member, and recognizing that circumstances and individuals vary.

In developing summary statements and deciding upon quality, both the DH and FEC should consider the type of artifacts/outcomes and type or level of peer reviews, the degree to which the activity meets scholarly standards contained in Appendix K as well as such factors as the following (not in priority order):

- the effort required in the performance of the activity
- what distinguishes the activity from the contributions of others or from the member’s previous work
- the area/s of emphasis as indicated in the member’s statement of plans for that evaluation period
- the level and/or type of peer review and/or artifact or outcome
- the degree of an activity’s contribution to: a. a member’s teaching and/or professional development, b. the discipline through scholarship and/or research and/or c. the Department, College, University, students, the profession or discipline and/or the wider community through service.
- the level to which the activity/activities exceed minimum requirements in the area of evaluation.

On the basis of the foregoing considerations, one of the following ratings will be assigned for each evaluative criterion by the FEC and DH shall be referenced in their respective portions of evaluation documents.

Exceptional (E): Awarded when the member provides documented evidence of the contribution in the area of evaluation that is determined to be clearly superior.

Distinctly Above Average (DAA): Awarded when the member provided documented evidence of the contribution in the area of evaluation that is determined to be better than average.

Average (A): Awarded when the member provides documented evidence of the contribution in the area of evaluation that fulfills the minimum acceptable level of performance.

Below Average (BA): Awarded when the member provides documented evidence of the contribution in the area of evaluation that is below the minimum acceptable level of performance.

Qualitative expectations for annual and triennial evaluations related to the member’s area/s of emphasis:

The minimum expectations are that all members attain at least an average (A) rating in Assigned Professional Responsibilities and in the area which is NOT the member’s area of emphasis for that evaluation period.

The minimum expectations are that all members attain at least a Distinctly Above Average (DAA) rating in areas which ARE the member’s area of emphasis for that evaluation period.

Exceptions to quantitative expectations

An exception may be granted when there is documented evidence of clearly superior or
exceptional qualitative work in an evaluative area that can substitute for or subsume the number of activities expected in the same or other areas.

An exception may be granted in the number of professional development activities when professional development funds or other circumstances beyond the member’s control prohibit accomplishing what was planned in this area.

Appendix A identifies types of activities for Assigned Professional Responsibilities. Appendix B identifies types of activities for Professional Development. Appendix C identifies general guidelines or principles for scholarly activity. Appendix D identifies types of activities for the Scholarship of Discovery. Appendix E identifies types of activities for the Scholarship of Integration. Appendix F identifies types of activities for the Scholarship of Application. Appendix G identifies types of activities for the Scholarship of Teaching. Appendix H identifies types of activities for Service.

7.3.3 The examples for each judgmental criterion that are found in the Appendices are not intended to be complete or in priority rank. Other types of activities may be considered. The lists include common types of activities, but it is not expected that any individual will be active in all the examples listed. In the areas of scholarship and/or professional development and service, the bylaws specify the types, number and quality of activities which are required in each rank. Beyond the commonalities, faculty members may choose appropriate examples which are either identified in the bylaws, the Master Agreement or which reflect the members’ judgment as to their inclusion. The examples a faculty member uses for scholarship must have a tangible artifact or outcome and most should have some form of peer review acceptable to the Department.

Appendix I identifies examples of peer reviews for our disciplines. Appendix J identifies examples of artifacts and outcomes for our disciplines.

7.3.4 Statement of Plans

7.3.4 1. A statement of plans for the next evaluation period is required and shall immediately follow the narrative portion of the evaluation. The statement of plans will begin with the following two items:

a) The faculty member shall provide a statement that identifies the area of emphasis the faculty member intends to pursue between scholarship and/or professional development and service for the next evaluation period.

b) Following this statement, the faculty member will list or outline anticipated activities in the following three areas:
   a) Assigned Professional Responsibilities
   b) Scholarship and/or Professional Development
   c) Service

A faculty member shall have the option for each evaluation period to change the areas of emphasis between Scholarship and/or Professional Development and Service, pending concurrence and/or confirmation from the Faculty Evaluation Committee and/or the DH as

specifies in Sections 7.3.4.2 and 7.3.4.3 below.

7.3.4.2 For annual and triennial evaluations, the FEC, and the DH, after meeting with the faculty member, shall confirm: a) the area of emphasis between scholarship and/or professional development and service and include this confirmation in their respective portions of the evaluation process.

7.3.4.3 For Promotion and/or Tenure applications, the determination of the area of emphasis between scholarship and/or professional development and service shall be the result of a dialog among the faculty member, the FEC and the DH. Concurrence with the faculty member’s area of emphasis will be provided by the FEC and included in its respective portion of the written report subject to approval of the DH. The area of emphasis shall have been documented in the immediate past evaluation period.

7.3.4.4 Scholarship and/or Professional Development Procedures for All Tenured or Tenure Earning Ranks and Continuing Contract faculty who seek promotion

The faculty member should address the statement of plans from the previous evaluation period to demonstrate effectiveness in this area. The faculty member must include a Statement of Plans for the next evaluation period which identifies anticipated activities and the area of emphasis between scholarship and/or professional development and service and shall have the option for each evaluation period to change this emphasis as per Section 7.3.4.

The faculty member shall use the Appendices, examples in the Master Agreement or personal judgment to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship and/or professional development and to demonstrate continued work toward achievement of the member’s plan in this area.

7.3.5 For promotion to the next rank, faculty must meet the qualitative (Section 7.3) and quantitative expectations (Sections 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6) of the rank for which they are applying.

7.4 Criteria for Promotion to Assistant Professor

Effectiveness in assigned professional responsibilities is the most important criterion, however, Assistant Professors are expected to be engaged in scholarship and/or professional development and service as specified below.

General qualitative expectations: Generally, the candidate for promotion should have an overall Average (A) – Distinctly Above Average (DAA) rating expected in combinations.

7.4.1 Assigned Professional Responsibilities for Assistant Professor

a. Teaching Effectiveness, as evidenced through qualitative and/or quantitative student evaluations, shall minimally be in an Average range, based upon the type of student evaluation used. Teaching effectiveness shall be documented through:

1). submission of a quantitative and qualitative assessment of their teaching based upon items a. – l. in Appendix A under Teaching Effectiveness,
2) submission of student evaluation materials identified in the Master Agreement.
3) any supporting documentation of teaching effectiveness
4) teaching effectiveness as evidenced through peer evaluation

b. Other Assigned Professional Responsibilities: If a faculty member has additional assigned responsibilities, the faculty member must describe and qualitatively and/or quantitatively assess one’s effectiveness in carrying out those responsibilities. Items m – r in Appendix identify examples of other assigned professional responsibilities. The minimum qualitative expectation is
7.4.2 Scholarship and/or Professional Development Activities for Assistant Professor
a. When scholarship and/or professional development is the area of emphasis: Rating shall be minimally Average (A) consistent with the faculty member’s plans from the previous evaluation period.
   1 professional development activity
   2 scholarly activities, one of which shall be peer reviewed

b. When scholarship and/or professional development is not the main area of emphasis: Rating shall be minimally Average (A) consistent with the faculty member’s plans from the previous evaluation period.
   1 professional development activity
   1 scholarly activity

7.4.3 Service Activities for Assistant Professor
a. When Service is the area of emphasis: Ratings shall be minimally Average (A) consistent with the faculty member’s plans for the previous evaluation period.
   1 example of Department, College or University committee membership +
   1 example of community/professional membership service +
   1 additional example of service

   OR
   2 examples of Department, College or University committee membership +
   1 additional example of service

b. When Service is not the area of emphasis: Rating shall be minimally Average (A) consistent with the faculty member’s plans for the previous evaluation period.
   1 example of Department, College or University committee membership +
   1 additional example of service

   OR
   2 examples of Department, College or University committee membership

7.5 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor
General qualitative expectations: Generally, for promotion to Associate Professor the candidate should have an overall Distinctly Above Average (DAA) – Exceptional (E) rating expected in combinations; however any individual criterion may have an average minimum when other areas are higher.

7.5.1 Assigned Professional Responsibilities for Associate Professor
a. Teaching Effectiveness, as evidenced through qualitative and/or quantitative student evaluations, shall minimally be in a Distinctly Above Average range, based upon the type of student evaluation used. Teaching effectiveness shall be documented through:
   a. submission of a quantitative and qualitative assessment of their teaching based upon items a. – l. in Appendix A under Teaching Effectiveness,
   b. submission of student evaluation materials identified in the Master Agreement.
   c. any supporting documentation of teaching effectiveness
   d. teaching effectiveness as evidenced through peer evaluation
b. Other Assigned Professional Responsibilities: If a faculty member has additional assigned responsibilities, the faculty member must describe and qualitatively and/or quantitatively assess one’s effectiveness in carrying out those responsibilities. Items m – r in Appendix identify examples of other assigned professional responsibilities. The minimum qualitative expectation is Average (A).

7.5.2 Scholarship and/or Professional Development Activities for Associate Professor

a. When scholarship and/or professional development is the area of emphasis: Overall rating shall be minimally DAA in scholarly activities and A in professional development consistent with the faculty member’s plans from the previous evaluation period.

1 activity in professional development
2 peer reviewed artifacts and/or invited presentations

b. When scholarship and/or professional development is not the main area of emphasis: Overall rating shall be minimally A in both scholarly activities and professional development consistent with the faculty member’s plans from the previous evaluation period.

1 activity in professional development
2 scholarly activities; one of which is a peer reviewed artifact or invited/refereed presentation

7.5.3 Service Activities for Associate Professor

a. When Service is the main area of emphasis. Ratings shall be minimally DAA consistent with the faculty member’s plans from the previous evaluation period.

1 example of Department, College or University committee membership +
1 example of community/professional membership service
+ 1 example of leadership in service to Department, College, University or community/professional organizations
+ 2 additional examples of service
OR
2 examples of Department, College, University committee membership
+ 1 example of leadership in service to Department, College, University or community/professional organizations
+ 2 additional examples of service

b. When Service is not the main area of emphasis. Ratings shall be minimally Average consistent with the faculty member’s plans from the previous evaluation period.

1 example in Department, College, University committees (membership) +
1 example in Department, College, University membership OR community/professional committee membership
+ 1 additional example of service

7.6 Triennial Evaluation Criteria for Professor and Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Qualitative Expectations: Generally, for promotion to Professor the candidate should have an overall Distinctly Above Average (DAA) – Exceptional (E) rating, expected in combinations; however scholarship and/or service may have an average minimum when other areas are higher; professional development has a minimum average (A) expectation.
7.6.1 **Assigned Professional Responsibilities for Professor**

**Assigned Professional Responsibilities** – Rating Distinctly Above Average (DAA) - Exceptional (E) in teaching effectiveness and Average (A) in other assigned professional responsibilities.

a. **Teaching Effectiveness**, as evidenced through qualitative and/or quantitative student evaluations, shall minimally be in a Distinctly Above Average (DAA) range, based upon the type of student evaluation used. Teaching effectiveness shall be documented through:
   a. submission of a quantitative and qualitative assessment of their teaching based upon items a. – l. in Appendix A under Teaching Effectiveness,
   b. submission of student evaluation materials identified in the Master Agreement.
c. any supporting documentation of teaching effectiveness
d. teaching effectiveness as evidenced through peer evaluation

b. **Other Assigned Professional Responsibilities**: If a faculty member has additional assigned responsibilities, the faculty member must describe and qualitatively and/or quantitatively assess one’s effectiveness in carrying out those responsibilities. Items m – r in Appendix identify examples of other assigned professional responsibilities. The minimum qualitative expectation is Average (A).

7.6.2 **Scholarship and/or Professional Development Activities for Professor**

a. **When Scholarship and/or Professional development is the main area of emphasis**: Ratings shall be minimally a DAA in scholarly activities and Average in Professional Development consistent with the faculty member’s plans from the previous evaluation period.
   2 professional development activities minimum
   3 peer reviewed artifacts and/or invited presentations

b. **When scholarship and/or professional development is not the main area of emphasis**: Rating shall be minimally Average in Scholarly activities and Average in Professional Development consistent with the faculty member’s plans from the previous evaluation period.
   1 professional development activity minimum
   2 scholarly activities, one of which is a peer reviewed artifact or invited presentation

7.6.3 **Service Activities for Professor**

a. **When Service is the main area of emphasis.** Rating shall be minimally DAA consistent with the faculty member’s plans from the previous evaluation period.
   1 example of departmental, college or university committee service membership +
   2 examples of departmental, college or university or community and/or community or professional membership service +
   1 example of leadership to department, college or university or community and/or profession +
   3 additional service activities

b. **When Service is not the main area of emphasis.** Rating shall be minimally Average consistent with the faculty member’s plans from the previous evaluation period.
   1 example of departmental, college or university committee membership service +
   1 example of departmental, college or university and/or community and/or professional membership service +
   1 example of leadership in department, college or University committee service or in the community or profession +
   1 additional service activity
7.7  **Judgmental Criteria for Tenure**

7.7.1 If the applicant is applying for promotion to either Associate Professor or Professor concurrent with the application for tenure, the criteria for recommending tenure to the applicant shall be the same criteria as that for promotion.

7.7.2 If the applicant for tenure is NOT also applying for promotion the criteria for recommending tenure shall be the same judgmental criteria as that for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

7.8  **Continuing Contract Status Appointment Eligibility**

7.8.1 Faculty members who have completed five (5) years of full-time service in term contracts for the same department at the University and are reappointed in that department for a sixth year shall be eligible for Continuing Contract Status appointment.

7.8.2 A Continuing Contract appointment application evaluation will be based primarily upon an evaluation of the faculty member’s cumulative record of teaching and departmental service. This focus does not preclude an evaluation of their scholarship and/or professional development.

7.8.3 Faculty members who are eligible for Continuing Contract Status appointment shall be reviewed using the same process and calendar as for a tenure review.

7.8.4 For faculty members who are applying for Continuing Contract Status, the evaluation period covers multiple years, starting with the first term position in their current department. The evaluation period ends the day before the first day of the fall semester during the calendar year in which the application is initiated.
APPENDIX A – ASSIGNED PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Assigned Professional Responsibilities includes teaching in the case of teaching faculty, and other duties or responsibilities which are assigned by the University, College and/or Department and/or are stipulated in the letter of appointment.

Teaching Effectiveness

a. Demonstrates a solid understanding of the subject matter taught, and of the materials used as part of the courses.

b. Maintains effective rapport with students in the classroom that engages them in the learning process.

c. Creates a positive learning environment through good organization and appropriate use of instructional techniques and instructional technologies.

d. Receives positive evaluation by students and peers.

e. Continuously reviews and/or revises course materials, including textbooks, syllabi, evaluation instruments, lesson notes, and course outline including the utilization of student feedback.

f. Is available to students for consultation outside of class.

g. Provides students with objectives relevant to the course(s) taught, appropriate references, and criteria for evaluation.

h. Experiments with or develops instructional and/or evaluation methods and/or teaching technologies.

i. Utilizes technology to enhance instruction and/or evaluation.

j. Provides opportunities for students to learn about the primary source of information associated with the particular course(s).

k. Demonstrates excellence and relevance of courses as evidenced by feedback from previous students or alumni (alumni in the field) that relate to courses or curriculum.

l. Provides opportunities and/or facilitates field trips, outside resource instructors, student research projects, and directed studies, and/or service learning opportunities.

Examples of non-teaching Assigned Professional Responsibilities

m. Academic advising, registration and consultation with students.

n. Supervise and/or coordinate student teachers, internships, field work, and field experiences, etc.

o. Supervise, direct and/or read research thesis graduate papers and projects.

p. Duties as an academic division Coordinator/Athletic Training Program Director.
q. Duties associated with accreditation and/or program evaluation and/or curriculum development

r. Completes other duties as assigned or as stipulated in the member’s letter of appointment
APPENDIX B – PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Professional Development generally involves those activities which enhance a member’s instruction, expand their professional knowledge base, maintain currency in one’s field, including achieving and/or maintaining certification, registration, continuing education credits, and/or licensure for programmatic and/or academic needs.

a. Participate in activities designed to enhance and/or maintain currency in one’s academic field or discipline such as: attend professional meetings, conferences, institutes, seminars, clinics, classes, workshops or other appropriate venues.

b. Participate in continuing education activities (CEU’s)

c. Complete a peer reviewed post graduate certification or registration process

d. Earn and/or maintain certification/s and/or license/s specific to one’s role as an educator and/or researcher

e. Engage in post-doctoral work designed to expand ones’ professional competence

f. Participate in specialized training related to one’s role in the profession and/or University.
APPENDIX C – GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR SCHOLARSHIP
All forms of scholarship must involve the production of a tangible artifact or outcome and for most forms peer review is expected. Scholarship involves evidence of the contribution to a discipline or area of specialization within a discipline or of an interdisciplinary nature by scholarly investigation and/or creative activity and of its publication or other dissemination in one of the following general ways:
   1. In the classroom; or
   2. Among practitioners in the discipline/s; or
   3. Among a wider community

It is intended that the faculty member clearly contributes to the discipline through any of the following general means:
   1. Scholarly investigation, creative activity and/or research of an original and/or previously unreported nature; or
   2. Applied research, investigation or scholarly analysis of existing research, information, and creative endeavors resulting in the development of new/different information, applications and/or interpretations;
   3. In disciplines where practice and tradition include faculty involvement in student research which is subsequently published or otherwise disseminated, such research shall not be barred from consideration as appropriate scholarly activity, insofar as faculty involvement is shown to fulfill the expectations in 1 or 2 above.
   4. Interdisciplinary Research which involves collaborative efforts of faculty with faculty from other disciplines and/or departments or others outside the University community that may include, but is not restricted to:
   a. Creative performance/s, presentation/s, and/or direction
   b. Interdisciplinary curricular innovations
   c. Interdisciplinary research or scholarship resulting in a presentation or publication
   5. Direction of Student Research which may include Directed Studies, Special Topics, etc.
APPENDIX D – SCHOLARSHIP OF DISCOVERY

The scholarship of discovery generally involves original production or testing of a theory, principle, knowledge, or artistic creation.

a. Conduct traditional experimental, survey, quantitative and/or qualitative study and research.

b. Involvement in student research associated with courses, practica, directed studies, theses, dissertations, etc. which is subsequently published or otherwise disseminated.

c. Involvement as a faculty research consultant on student research projects associated with courses, practica, directed studies, theses, dissertations, etc. which result in a tangible artifact or outcome.

d. Involvement in interdisciplinary scholarly endeavors as in a. above.

e. Involvement in collaborative scholarly activities with colleagues on or off campus as in a. above.

f. Or other activities that reflect the scholarship of discovery.
APPENDIX E – SCHOLARSHIP OF INTEGRATION

The scholarship of integration generally involves using knowledge found within and across disciplines to create an original understanding or insight that reveals larger intellectual patterns.

a. Publish a textbook or synthesis summarizing what is known about a topic or process

b. Participate in, choreograph and/or direct a creative performance/s

c. Publish an edited anthology

d. Publish a theoretical analysis.

e. Participate in interdisciplinary activities that involve collaborations with faculty from other departments and/or others from outside the University community that contribute to the integration of knowledge, research, analysis, interpretation, etc. across various disciplines.

f. Or other activities that reflect the scholarship of integration.
APPENDIX F – SCHOLARSHIP OF APPLICATION

The scholarship of application generally involves bringing knowledge to bear in addressing a significant issue or problem by using existing research or creative activities to influence current or future conditions.

   a. Submit substantive external and/or internal grant proposal/s. Substantive could be a monetary amount or could be the submission of multiple grant proposals

   b. Administration of grant/s

   b. Provide expert testimony

   c. Produce technical report/s or document/s

   d. Produce white paper/s associated with consultancies

   e. Produce white paper/s associated with grant/s

   f. Public policy analysis/es

   g. Make presentation/s at professional conferences, scientific meetings, or other venues which are based on one’s scholarly activity or area of expertise

   h. Share knowledge based upon scholarly endeavors with colleagues, students, and/or the wider community through such activities as: delivering lecture/s, paper/s, speech/es, or presentation/s, conducting seminar/s or similar activities at colleges and/or universities or in the community outside the university or any other appropriate venue. (May be peer reviewed or invited).

   i. Submit scholarly work for publication

   j. Or other activities that reflect the scholarship of application.
APPENDIX G – SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING

The scholarship of teaching generally involves proposing and empirically testing a pedagogical procedure that transforms or improves teaching practices.

a. Write/prepare/submit peer reviewed/evaluated pedagogical material

b. Propose and empirically test a pedagogical procedure/s to transform or improve teaching practices

c. Conduct a systematic comparison of learning environments

d. Conduct an impact analysis for learning activities beyond the classroom, (e.g. ASL)

e. Conduct a comprehensive assessment of teaching methodologies.

f. Prepare a qualitative and/or qualitative reflection/analysis in annual/triennial evaluations for courses taught, innovative techniques used or created.

g. Participate in interdisciplinary endeavors related to curricular innovations, improvements, and/or advancement

h. Experiment with or develop instructional and/or evaluation methods and/or teaching technologies

i. Contribute to the development of resources relevant to teaching content area (e.g., course handbook, brochure, or materials).

j. Conduct research associated with field courses, defined as those courses which require at least an overnight experience in the outdoors.

k. Or other activities that reflect the scholarship of teaching.
APPENDIX H – SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Service generally involves service on departmental, college, and University wide committees, service to the student body, and service through professional organizations, and professionally related community service.

a. Commitment and/or contribution to the work of a departmental, college, and/or university level committee evidenced through active membership

b. Commitment and/or contribution to professionally related community service evidenced through active membership. Community may be defined as local, state, national, or international areas.

c. Serves as an officer or committee member who contributes to the work of a departmental, college, and/or university committee. Contribution as a member could take the form of writing reports, proposals, leadership, trainings, etc. undertaken in the interests of those committees.

d. Serves as an officer or committee member who contributes to the work of a community organization, professional organization, or groups that are relevant to the faculty member’s role at the University or area of expertise. Contribution as a member could take the form of writing reports, proposals, leadership, trainings, etc. undertaken in the interests of those committees, organizations or groups.

e. Contributes other services to the community, professional organizations, and groups that are relevant to the faculty member’s role at the University or area of expertise.

f. Serves as a faculty advisor to student organization/s.

g. Assists in the recruitment and/or retention of students through participation in one or more of several programs: e.g., mentoring programs, Family Weekends, Month of Majors, Faculty Sport Sponsor Program, athletic department programs to attract student-athletes, Campus Visit Program, etc. Note: The use of Campus Visits for service is not permitted for Division Coordinators/Athletic Training Program Director.

h. Conducts/leads non-credit workshops, institutes, discussion groups or similar at the request of and/or for the interests of others.

i. Gives presentation/s as a guest lecturer in NMU classes, other educational institutions, or to various organizations or banquets at the request of and/or for the interests of others.

j. Organizes professionally related institutes, short courses, professional conferences, seminars, workshops, clinics, etc.

k. Edit/s, and/or review/s such items as monograph/s, textbook/s, chapter/s in textbook/s, article/s in professional periodical/s, paper/s, abstract/s, book review/s, professional pamphlet/s, laboratory manual/s, or other documents undertaken at the request of and for the interest of others.

l. Undertakes special tasks related to the academic and/or support services of the university.

m. Serves in a mentoring capacity to faculty and/or staff or others beyond the departmental level.
Proposed Bylaw changes from Health, Physical Education and Recreation. Draft approved on April 15, 2011.
Base document approved on September 17, 2006.
Approved by Provost & Vice President Paul Lang on June 16, 2011.

n. Serves as a consultant

o. Provides AAUP service
APPENDIX I – EXAMPLES OF ACCEPTABLE PEER REVIEWS

a. Publication (print and/or electronic format) in a peer reviewed or vetted journal or similar publication in the member’s discipline or area of expertise or scholarship.

b. Accepted presentation of creative work in a juried performance

c. Presentation of scholarly work as a result of a refereed or competitive selection process

d. Receive a written review/s of one’s research, may be in print or electronic format

e. Evaluation/s of a submitted grant proposal/s

f. Peer letter/s, email/s, or other electronic communication acknowledging scholarly accomplishments

g. Invitation to present scholarly work in appropriate venues

h. Receipt professional award.

i. Obtaining an external or internal grant.

j. Invitation to publish

k. Invitation to edit and/or review professional materials, such as textbooks, chapters in textbooks, articles in professional periodicals, book reviews, papers, etc.

l. Acceptance for presentation/s in professional venues

m. Invitation/s to present or share with colleagues, on or off campus, scholarly work and/or results

n. Request/s for reprint/s.

o. Request/s for consultation

p. Citation/s of research and/or scholarly endeavors

q. Evaluation/s of presentations in professional venues

r. Peer review/s and/or critique/s of your teaching/presentation/research/scholarly endeavor/s

s. Other acceptable peer reviews within specific disciplines may be considered.

t. Departmental peer review related to any form of scholarship that does not yield a peer review identified above or in the Master Agreement. A faculty member may propose and prepare a reflective critique and/or presentation to the committee of the whole and/or to the FEC related to any form of scholarship which addresses the qualitative standards for the evaluation of scholarship as identified in Appendix K.
APPENDIX J – EXAMPLES OF ARTIFACTS AND OUTCOMES

Not all artifacts or outcomes will be in print format and not all artifacts or outcomes are appropriate for publication. Both print and electronic/digital formats can be acceptable artifacts or outcomes; live performances/choreography/direction that may not be recorded, but that include the program of same can be an acceptable artifact or outcome. Faculty may submit flash/thumb drives, CDs, active links in a document, or other digital recording devices as an artifact or outcome.

a. Peer reviewed or vetted publications, such as monographs, textbooks, chapters in textbooks, articles in professional periodicals, papers, abstracts, book reviews, professional pamphlets, edited anthologies, theoretical analyses and/or syntheses, etc.

b. Documented dance presentation/s/choreography and/or direction

c. Documents associated with teaching or courses, such as course manuals, field manuals, procedural manuals, laboratory manuals, etc.

d. Grant proposal/s

e. Technical report/s, such as research reports, risk management plans, by-laws, development of standards related to the member’s discipline, etc.

f. White papers/s associated with consultancies and/or grant/s

g. Submitted artifact of a scholarly activity for presentation and/or publication

h. Samples of student’s work that reflect the member’s scholarly endeavors.

i. Documents that report, analyze, synthesize and/or reflect on endeavors related to teaching activities, or any other scholarly activity

j. Documents and other appropriate media submitted for peer review as identified in t. in Appendix I can be acceptable as an artifact or outcome.

k. Written evaluation of documents or other appropriate media in j. above.

l. Other acceptable artifacts or outcomes within specific disciplines may be considered.
APPENDIX K – EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR DEPARTMENTAL PEER REVIEW OF SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY*

The Faculty Evaluation Committee and/or the Committee of the Whole shall evaluate submissions of scholarly activity for peer review when such activity is not identified in Appendix I or in the Master Agreement. Such peer review shall result in a written (print or electronic) evaluative response to the requesting member. Such peer review shall be guided by responding to the following:

1. **Clear Goals**
   a. Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly?
   b. Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable?
   c. Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

2. **Adequate Preparation**
   a. Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field?
   b. Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work?
   c. Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?

3. **Appropriate methods**
   a. Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals?
   b. Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected?
   c. Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

4. **Significant Results**
   a. Does the scholar achieve the goals?
   b. Does the scholar’s work add consequentially to the field?
   c. Does the scholar’s work open additional areas for further exploration?

5. **Effective Presentation**
   a. Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work?
   b. Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences?
   c. Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?

6. **Reflective Critique**
   a. Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work?
   b. Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his/her critique?
   c. Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?