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I. Introduction

Academic promotion is a process of formal recognition by the college of a faculty member’s achievements and contributions to the college’s overall mission. As an outcome of the promotion process, academic rank is designated as a title, which denotes a person’s attainment of excellence within the field of education.

More specifically, at NTID, academic rank signifies that a person has acquired extensive knowledge in his or her specialty, has the skills to communicate that knowledge to a variety of audiences (deaf and hearing), and has demonstrated a commitment to RIT/NTID and the community beyond the campus.

Comparing the process of promotion with the tenure process serves to clarify further the nature and meaning of promotion. Faculty members can be considered more than once for promotion in academic rank. Because of this, promotion differs significantly from tenure. The emphasis in promotion is on past and present achievements (i.e., merit) with extensive peer involvement and review. The faculty member chooses freely to participate in the process. Tenure, on the other hand, emphasizes the individual’s past performance as a predictor of the likelihood for sustained high quality after receiving tenure (i.e., future worth). Tenure is a one-time compulsory process with peer and administrative review.

In sum, promotion qualifications focus more on merit of the faculty member’s professional and scholarly contributions; whereas, the criteria for tenure decisions focus more on the long-term worth of the faculty member to the college.

The guidelines which follow are intended to guide the promotion process rather than to lay down rigid rules, and their application should be tempered with sound judgment and common sense.

II. Guidelines for Promotion - Areas of Attainment

According to RIT Policy on Faculty Rank, there are three areas of attainment to be considered in assessing a candidate for promotion:

A. Academic and Professional Qualifications
B. Scholarship
C. Service

Weights given to specific activities in a candidate's agreed upon plans of work must be honored in assessing performance in each of these three areas related to promotion.

A. Academic and Professional Qualifications

The major qualifications for promotion are related to primary area(s) of job responsibility and include performance, currency in field of expertise and communication competence.

1. Primary Area(s) of Job Responsibility

At NTID a faculty member can be involved in the instructional process by having a primary job responsibility in one or more of the following areas:

---

1 See RIT Policies and Procedures Manual, Section E6.0--Appendix C to this document.
2 Not infrequently, faculty have different job functions over time, or even concurrently. It is therefore possible that promotion candidates may have more than one primary area of responsibility.
• **Instruction:** Teaching knowledge and/or skills to RIT/NTID students

• **Research:** Conducting research related to the educational experiences of RIT/NTID students.

• **Academic Support:** Providing services that enable RIT/NTID students to succeed in the mainstreamed academic environment

• **Administration:** Providing academic leadership and supervising faculty and programs involved with education of RIT/NTID students

2. **Currency in Field of Expertise**

Currency in the field of expertise must be related to the primary area(s) of job responsibility and must indicate sustained effort directed toward professional and career update. This may be evidenced by technical or professional certification, an earned graduate or terminal degree from an accredited academic institution, or other appropriate activities.

3. **Communication Competence**

Professional qualifications include the ability to communicate effectively with individuals who are deaf and hearing in those modalities appropriate to RIT/NTID and one’s primary area(s) of job responsibility. This is necessitated by the fact that RIT/NTID is a college for deaf students and employs deaf and hearing faculty and staff. Given that effective communication is essential to the success of the instructional process—whether it occurs in the form of full-time teaching or in the form of other educational activities for which faculty have a primary responsibility—it is expected that RIT/NTID faculty will attain the ability to communicate effectively as one of their professional qualifications.

College expectations and guidelines for faculty communication development require that faculty show evidence of efforts undertaken and skills developed in sign language and spoken communication strategies and techniques.

In documenting this skill development, faculty should follow the guidance provided in the Communication Task Force Recommendations [1991] as follows:

**Communication Expectations**

For promotion to associate or full professor, a faculty member must have participated in appropriate learning activities to maintain and improve communication skills in sign language and spoken communication strategies and techniques, as well as sensitivity to issues of deaf culture.

Documentation should include a summary of the candidate’s communication related activities while in current rank.

One or more of the following should be included to demonstrate participation in learning activities/efforts:

1. Evidence of satisfactory completion of courses and seminars completed related to sign language, spoken communication, cultural aspects, sensitivity, history or similar topics related to deafness.

---

3 Spoken communication [originally referred to as oral communication] is considered to be speech, with or without voice, used expressively and/or receptively, alone or to complement a message communicated with signs. Although no skill level is specified for spoken communication, faculty are expected to participate in learning activities whereby they may develop a knowledge of specific spoken communication strategies and techniques and their applicability in communication situations.
2. Description of progress in courses and seminars.
3. Evidence of ongoing participation in activities involving deaf people
4. Other (as determined by faculty member)

One or more of the following is expected to be included regularly as part of the annual appraisal process to document skill development:

1. Observations or testimonials by individuals qualified to assess sign language and spoken communication strategies and techniques
2. Student evaluation/feedback (SRS/SRATE results)
3. Sign Language Proficiency Interview [SLPI] Rating
4. Certification from RID, NAD or other certification related to sign language or spoken communication strategies and techniques
5. Other (as determined by individual faculty member)

In addition to evidence of a commitment to communication skill development, the documentation must also include a copy of the letter indicating the candidate’s SLPI rating.

B. Scholarship

A proper expectation for all members of the faculty is scholarship and professional activity beyond the primary area(s) of job responsibility. This may include, but is not limited to, research and creative activity in a professional specialty, writing and publication in a specialized area, development of courses and curricula that are used outside RIT/NTID, and/or investigation of alternative learning strategies. **Scholarship considered for promotion should be documented, peer reviewed and disseminated.**

C. Service

Contributions to the college or university at large include relationships with students and colleagues outside the classroom, or other typical setting. Such contributions might be found in college and university committee work, student advising, and student activities, consistent with the candidate’s primary area(s) of job responsibility, interests, and talents. Contributions to the community include activities linking the professional skills of members of the faculty to the world beyond the campus, and other community service in the public interest.

---

4 The SLPI assesses sign language as it is used among skilled sign language communicators in the United States, and includes the full range of American Sign Language (ASL) from pure linguistic descriptions of ASL to English meaning-based signing. This full range is characterized by (a) meaning-based sign language vocabulary selection consistent with standardized signs in current use by skilled language users, and (b) a variety of grammatical features that are consistent with effective use of gestural-visual language for communication. These grammatical features include: (a) space, indexing, eye gaze, sign movement directionality, and body shifts to separate ideas and to identify and discuss persons, places, and objects present and not present; (b) classifiers for describing and representing persons, places, and objects and their movements (for example, use of the index finger to represent “a person”); (c) sign-word order which facilitates effective communication in gestural-visual language; and (d) facial expressions and other body movements (non-manual signals) to support and add to information communicated (for example, affirmative and negative head movements). In addition to vocabulary and grammatical features, clarity of sign production, fluency, and comprehension are important to effective communication when using a gestural-visual language, and therefore are considered in SLPI ratings. (From F. Caccamise & W. Newell, “The Sign Communication Proficiency Interview: A Brief Description,” September, 2000).

5 See Appendix D: RIT Policy on Scholarship.

6 See Appendix E: RIT Policy on Service.
III. Promotion Procedures

A. Overview of Promotion Review Process

The promotion process includes several levels of peer review of a candidate’s qualifications. A college promotion committee for each rank representative of the total college faculty is charged to provide a comprehensive review of the candidate’s qualifications and peer recommendations. Based on this review, the college promotion committee renders a decision to recommend or not recommend promotion for each candidate to the president/dean.

Individual recommendations based on a review of a candidate’s documentation, and personal knowledge of the candidate’s qualifications are provided to the college promotion committee by sources within the department, and outside the department. These sources include:

1. The candidate’s departmental colleagues
   Departmental colleagues, including the candidate’s chairperson, share a unique working relationship with the candidate, because they work in the same primary area of job responsibility and/or the same or related discipline.

2. External peers
   Promotion candidates are required to provide a list of names of external peers from whom the promotion committee may solicit reviews of scholarship.

B. College Promotion Committees

1. Committee Composition

   • At least two college promotion committees are established-- one for promotion to associate professor, and one for promotion to professor.

   • Each college promotion committee is composed of five faculty members tenured to the college who are to make the most informed recommendations possible consistent with the criteria for each rank.

   • The associate professor promotion committee will be composed of five faculty members with the rank of associate professor.

   • The professor promotion committee will be composed of five faculty members with the rank of full professor.

   • One member of the committee will be drawn from each of the four discipline groups outlined below, with the fifth member to be appointed on an at-large basis. At least one committee member must return from the previous year.

---

7 The use of the term “chairperson” in this document refers to the candidate’s chairperson or other immediate supervisor, as appropriate.
8 The number of college promotion committees will be determined by the actual number of candidates seeking promotion to each rank.
9 The associate professor promotion committee will also be charged with reviewing lecturers seeking promotion to the senior lecturer rank, except that the at-large member will be replaced for this purpose with a senior lecturer. Similarly, the full professor promotion committee will review candidates for promotion to principal lecturer, with the at-large member being replaced, where possible, by a principal lecturer.
10 Should there be an insufficient number of faculty members in a given discipline grouping at a given rank, that slot will be filled by an at-large member.
### College Promotion Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline Group 1</th>
<th>Dept. of Liberal Studies</th>
<th>Dept. of Communication Studies and Services</th>
<th>1 faculty member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Group 2</td>
<td>Dept. of Business Studies</td>
<td>Dept. of Information and Computing Studies</td>
<td>Dept. of Engineering Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Group 3</td>
<td>Dept. of Science &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>Dept. of Arts &amp; Imaging Studies</td>
<td>1 faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Group 4</td>
<td>MSSE Teacher Education Program</td>
<td>Dept. of American Sign Language &amp; Interpreting Education</td>
<td>Dept. of Cultural &amp; Creative Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Duty to Serve

Service on a college promotion committee is a professional faculty responsibility. Accordingly, the office of the associate vice president (AVP) will assign college promotion committee members from a list of all eligible faculty by discipline groups and based on a lottery, according to a fixed algorithm. In order to help faculty develop plans of work appropriately, committee assignments for the upcoming promotion cycle will be made by April 15. (The only exemption is for faculty who will be on leave of absence during the promotion process.) Where a committee member is the chairperson of one of the candidates to be reviewed by the committee, the chairperson is excused and replaced by an alternate. The president/dean, AVP, and associate deans are not included in the lottery.

#### 3. Term

Faculty will normally serve a two-year term. Each college promotion committee will elect its chairperson. Before promotion committees begin their deliberations, the president will call all members together to give guidance on the implementation of the college’s promotion policy.

#### 4. Committee Workload

Promotion committees will normally be expected to review the documentation of no more than four candidates. However, in instances where more than eight candidates go up for review, committees may be asked to review as many as five candidates. A third committee will be formed if the number of candidates exceeds ten.

#### C. Initiation of the Promotion Process

On April 1, the office of the AVP informs all full-time faculty that if they wish to be considered for promotion they must inform their department chairperson in writing by May 1.

---

11 Since from time to time, a duly appointed committee member may become unable to serve, the AVP will also assign four alternate members by lottery, one from each discipline group. To the extent possible, and consistent with these guidelines, alternates will replace committee members from the same discipline group.
Normally, faculty will be in rank for at least five years before seeking promotion to the next rank.

The candidate may withdraw at any time after the process is initiated. If a candidate withdraws, he or she must provide formal notification to the office of the AVP.

D. The Promotion Portfolio

The candidate prepares a promotion portfolio in a single binder, of which two copies must be provided to the candidate’s department chair by September 15\textsuperscript{th}. (Where the number of peers needing to review the documentation warrants more than two copies, the office of the AVP will assist the candidate as necessary.) Section E below describes how the portfolio is to be organized.

All documentation remains confidential and access to it is limited to those from whom recommendations are solicited. It is kept in the office of the candidate’s chairperson during the period of review by departmental peers. In those instances where peers are physically located apart from the department chair’s office, arrangements will be made by the department chair to place documentation in an accessible and secure location.

E. Organization of Portfolio\textsuperscript{12}

The documentation contained in the candidate’s portfolio must be assembled in one binder\textsuperscript{13}, with the following tabs:

A. Curriculum Vitae – The CV should document the candidate’s entire academic career with accomplishments since the last promotion clearly distinguished.
B. Statement on Academic and Professional Qualifications, and related documentation including, where appropriate, a statement on the candidate’s teaching philosophy and list of courses taught/tutored.
C. Statement on Scholarship, and related documentation.
D. Statement on Service, and related documentation.
E. SLPI rating letter.
F. Student evaluations (SRS/SRATE results) since the last promotion (where appropriate)\textsuperscript{14}.
G. Letters of support from peers, students, and others competent to comment on the merit of the candidate’s accomplishments\textsuperscript{15}.

For sections B-D, the statements should summarize the candidate’s achievements in that area while in the current rank. The material provided in these three sections must not exceed 20 single-sided pages.

\textsuperscript{12} No materials may be added to the portfolio or sent to the promotion committee after submission to department chair.
\textsuperscript{13} Candidates should expect that additional material or clarification may be requested by peers during the departmental review period, and/or by the college promotion committee. Candidates are therefore advised that they may wish to have supporting documentation prepared in advance so that, if requested, they can provide information in a timely manner.
\textsuperscript{14} Where a candidate’s responsibilities involve instruction or other services to students, Section G should include data on summative student ratings. Data should minimally reflect a summary of ratings for a representative sampling of courses or services. For some candidates a combination of student ratings and ratings for other activities may be appropriate including those related to academic administration and leadership.
\textsuperscript{15} Occasionally, providers of support letters prefer to send their letter directly to the promotion committee through the office of the AVP or president/dean.
F. Criteria for Promotion in Rank

1. Promotion to Associate Professor

To merit the rank of associate professor at NTID, the candidate must show evidence of a high degree of expertise in his or her academic and professional qualifications, and must demonstrate significant levels of scholarship and service within and outside NTID.

Academic and Professional Qualifications
The candidate must show evidence of the following:

- A high degree of expertise in his or her primary area(s) of job responsibility.
- Currency in a field of expertise related to the primary area(s) of job responsibility, evidenced by technical or professional certification, an earned graduate or terminal degree from an accredited academic institution, or other appropriate activities.
- Communication competence and documentation as defined in Section II(3), pages 5-6 related to sign language, spoken communication and sensitivity to deaf cultural issues. In addition, an SLPI rating of Advanced or higher. A rating of Intermediate Plus will be considered when accompanied by strong evidence of a sustained effort to improve sign skills and evidence of good progress toward the Advanced level.

For additional guidance on interpreting the SLPI Rating Scale, refer to Appendix F.

Scholarship
Guided by the RIT definition of scholarship, the candidate should have made significant contributions within his or her area(s) of expertise, and in accordance with his or her annual expectations, in one or more of the following ways:

- Authorship of peer-reviewed articles in professional journals or magazines.
- Presentation of peer-reviewed papers at state or national professional society meetings.
- Receipt of external grant awards.
- Significant contributions to training programs, seminars, symposia, short courses or workshops at state or national professional meetings or at comparable educational institutions.
- Responsibility for curriculum/program design with established efficacy for use beyond NTID.
- Active participation in state or national professional, technical, education societies, committees, or organizations.
- Participation in design, implementation or evaluation of counseling services and/or counselor training at the local, state, or regional level.
- Creation of artistic works shown in juried state or regionally recognized galleries, museums and public display areas and/or demonstration of participation in other related artistic endeavors at this level.
- Authorship, direction, design or performance in a main stage theatre production.

Service
Following the RIT definition of service, the candidate should have made significant contributions to the college or university at large or community in one or more of the following ways:

- Active participation on college or university committees.

---

16 See Appendix D for RIT’s full definition of scholarship.
17 See Appendix E for RIT’s definition of service.
• Major contributions to internship and in-service training programs, seminars, mini-conventions, symposia, short courses or workshops.
• Program supervision and/or administration for faculty whose primary area of job responsibility does not include administration.
• Active involvement in college and university-related student and/or community activities.
• Service to the community that advances public confidence in NTID as a college and RIT as an institution of higher education.
• Service to community agencies and organizations that advances special NTID and RIT interests.
• Other community service in the public interest.

2. Promotion to Professor

To merit the rank of professor at NTID, the candidate must show evidence of superior performance in his or her academic and professional qualifications. The candidate must be recognized as a role model in the primary area(s) of job responsibility and demonstrate outstanding professional accomplishments and service within and outside NTID18.

Academic and Professional Qualifications

The candidate must show evidence of the following:
• Recognition as superior in his or her primary area(s) of job responsibility and as a role model for other professionals.
• Currency in a field of expertise related to the primary area(s) of job responsibility, evidenced by technical or professional certification, an earned graduate or terminal degree from an accredited academic institution, or other appropriate activities.
• Communication competence as defined in Section II (3), pages 5-6 related to sign language, spoken communication and sensitivity to deaf cultural issues. In addition, an SLPI19 rating of Advanced or higher. A rating of Intermediate Plus will be considered when accompanied by strong evidence of a sustained effort to improve sign skills and evidence of good progress toward the Advanced level.

Scholarship20

Guided by the RIT definition of scholarship, the candidate should have made outstanding, ongoing contributions within his or her area(s) of expertise, and in accordance with his or her annual expectations, in one or more of the following ways:
• Authorship or editing of a textbook, handbook, or training manual used by students and professionals throughout the country.
• Authorship of major research, review, or theoretical papers in professional journals.
• Authorship of invited papers at state, national or international professional society meetings.
• Principal investigator on external grant awards.
• Leadership in training programs, seminars, symposia, short courses or workshops at state, national or international professional meetings or at comparable educational institutions.
• Primary responsibility for curriculum/program design with independently established efficacy and national recognition.
• Leadership in state, national or international professional, technical, educational societies, committees, or organizations.
• Creation of artistic works shown in juried state or regionally recognized galleries, museums and public display areas and/or demonstration of participation in other

---

18 For clarifying detail, see Appendix C: RIT Policy on Faculty Rank and Promotion, E6.4.d (1).
19 Formerly known as the SCPI.
20 See Appendix D for RIT’s full definition of scholarship.
related artistic endeavors at this level.

- Authorship, direction, design or performance in a main stage theatre production.

**Service**

Following the RIT definition of service, the candidate should have made **outstanding** contributions to the college or university at large or community in one or more of the following ways:

- Leadership on college or university committees
- Leadership in internship and in-service training programs, seminars, mini-conventions, symposia, short courses or workshops.
- Program supervision or administration for faculty whose primary area of job responsibility does not include administration.
- Active involvement in college or university related student activities.
- Service to the community that advances public confidence in NTID as a college and RIT as an institution of higher education.
- Leadership in community agencies and organizations that advance special NTID and RIT interests.
- Leadership in other community activities in the public interest.

### G. Promotion Sequence of Events

#### Time Frame

It is the responsibility of the AVP to set a reasonable time frame and ensure consistency for all of the following activities relating to the promotion process. (See also Appendix B, Calendar of Action.)

1. **Establishment of College Promotion Committee/s**
   The office of the AVP coordinates the appointment process for the college promotion committees by April 15.

2. **Becoming a Candidate for Promotion**
   By April 1, the office of the president informs all full-time faculty that to become a candidate for promotion, a faculty member must inform his or her department chairperson or immediate supervisor in writing by May 1.

3. **Chairperson List of Candidates**
   The department chairperson prepares a list of all candidates for promotion and forwards this list to the office of the AVP by May 15.

4. **Academic Vice President List of Candidates**
   The AVP compiles and prepares a list of all candidates nominated from the departments and forwards this list to the president by June 1.

5. **President/Dean’s List of Candidates**
   The president/dean shares the list of all nominated candidates with the college faculty. Each college promotion committee is notified by the president of the candidates whom they are charged to review. The president in turn provides each candidate with a list of the faculty on his or her promotion committee by June 30th.

6. **Portfolio Submission and Recommendations**
   The candidate submits his or her documentation to the department chairperson by September 1st for peer review by the chairperson and the department faculty. Each of these individuals prepares a recommendation based on personal knowledge of the candidate’s qualifications and a review of the candidate’s documentation. Chair or faculty may seek clarification or additional information from the candidate as needed. Individual recommendations from the candidate’s department

---

21 See Appendix E for RIT’s definition of service.
peers are sent directly to the college promotion committee through the office of the AVP and are not shared with the candidate or with others.

7. **External peer review**

Simultaneous with the submission of the promotion portfolio, that is, by September 1st, the candidate and the candidate’s chairperson each provide the promotion committee chair with at least three different names and contact information of peers outside the university, who are qualified to comment on the candidate’s scholarship. The promotion committee chair solicits confidential written assessments of the candidate’s scholarship from at least four of these external peers. External reviews are due to the committee chair by October 27.

8. **Internal peer review**

a. **Department chairperson (or immediate supervisor)**

The department chairperson prepares an individual recommendation regarding the candidate’s qualification for promotion and shares this with the candidate by September 25th. In preparing this recommendation, the chairperson is expected to comment on the candidate’s responsiveness to suggestions in the annual appraisal process with respect to the level and quality of accomplishment in the three areas of attainment. Unless the candidate chooses to withdraw, he or she forwards the chairperson’s recommendation to the promotion committee through the office of the AVP by September 30th. (The candidate may add a written rebuttal in response to any perceived factual errors or omissions related to the chairperson’s recommendation.)

b. **Department faculty**

Department faculty peer review occurs between October 1st and October 27th. Using Form A, all tenured or tenure-track department peers, regardless of rank provide an individual recommendation that is sent directly to the college promotion committee through the office of the AVP.

9. **Portfolio Review by College Promotion Committee**

On October 27, after the departmental level of review is completed, the office of the AVP forwards the promotion portfolio, together with the candidate’s annual appraisals for the last five years, to the college promotion committee, at which point the committee chair schedules and facilitates the following meetings:

a. **Initial Review**

Committee review begins with consideration of the candidate’s portfolio, chair and peer evaluations, annual appraisals, and external reviews. At this juncture, the committee determines whether it needs more information to reach an informed judgment. The committee may wish to solicit such information from the candidate or the candidate’s peers (in the latter case, it must inform the candidate).

If the committee decides that it needs more information from the candidate, it must inform him/her in writing. The letter must specify exactly what the committee needs information about. The candidate then has two options for providing the requested information. The candidate must let the committee know within two working days after receipt of the committee’s request whether he or she will provide the requested information in writing and/or wishes to appear before the committee in person. When a candidate chooses the “in writing” option, he or she will have three additional working days after notifying the committee to submit the requested information as he

---

22 Appendices G and H provide the Provost’s guidance on external review. Appendices J and K provide a sample guideline sheet for external reviewers and a sample letter, respectively.

23 Departmental faculty who are not in the work environment during the promotion process should inform the office of the AVP of their intent to participate in the peer review.
or she sees fit. If a candidate opts to appear before the committee, the meeting should 
be scheduled three days after the committee receives that candidate’s request to 
appear.

b. **Final Review**
After all information is collected, the college promotion committee meets to discuss the 
candidate’s qualifications for promotion. It is important to note that all discussions 
remain strictly confidential.

10. **College Promotion Committee Recommendation**

a. At the completion of its deliberations, the college promotion committee votes. A 
simple majority determines the committee’s judgment, which is then recorded and 
substantiated on Form B. The committee chairperson sends a copy of its 
recommendation on Form B to the candidate through the office of the AVP by 
February 1. When completing Form B, the committee must state clearly if the 
candidate satisfies the expectations for each category.

b. After reviewing the college promotion committee recommendation, the candidate 
decides whether he or she will continue or withdraw from the process. In the latter 
case, he or she notifies the college committee chairperson and the office of the AVP 
by February 10.

On February 11th, unless notified of the candidate’s wish to withdraw, the promotion 
committee chair sends the committee recommendation through the office of the AVP 
to the president/dean. Included with the promotion committee recommendation are all 
supporting data, documentation, peer recommendations, and external reviews. (Any 
supplementary written material provided by the candidate during the initial review 
process is considered part of the candidate’s documentation.)

If the candidate decides to continue in the process, he or she has the option, and 
before the president/dean makes a final determination, of sending a written response 
to the president/dean discussing any aspect of the committee’s final recommendation. 
When a committee recommends denial of promotion, the candidate may request a 
meeting with the president/dean to discuss the reasons given by the committee for 
denial on Form B. The candidate may choose to withdraw from the process at any 
time.

11. **NTID President/Dean’s Recommendation**

Unless the candidate chooses to withdraw, the president/dean may request further 
information from the college promotion committee. The president then prepares a written 
recommendation, using Form C. This is then forwarded along with all peer 
recommendations, and the candidate’s portfolio (in the case of a rebuttal, the rebuttal 
statement(s) are also included) to the chief academic officer by March 1.

12. **Chief Academic Officer’s Recommendation**
The chief academic officer reviews each recommendation submitted and makes a 
recommendation concerning promotion to the RIT president by April 1.

13. **RIT President’s Decision**
All promotions are officially made by the president of RIT and communicated by the chief 
academic officer to the candidate by April 15.
Please report in writing whether or not you support the promotion of _________________. Your recommendation should be based upon your assessment of the candidate for the promotion sought as outlined in the NTID Guidelines, Procedures, and Qualifications for Promotion in Rank of Full-Time Faculty.

Write your recommendation in the space provided or attach to this form. Do not feel compelled to write an assessment for each promotion qualification but rather only in those areas where you consider yourself qualified to respond. Please review candidate portfolio prior to completion of form.

If after reviewing the portfolio you feel you need additional information, please feel free to request it directly from the candidate.

I have worked with the candidate for _______________ years in the following capacity:

A. • Performance in primary area(s) of job responsibility

Candidate □ is □ is not qualified in this area for the rank sought.
Appendix A
Form A: Department Peer Recommendation
(continued)

- Currency in field of expertise

Candidate □ is □ is not qualified in this area for the rank sought.

- Ability to communicate effectively with individuals who are deaf and hearing

Candidate □ is □ is not qualified in this area for the rank sought.

B. Scholarship

Candidate □ is □ is not qualified in this area for the rank sought.
C. Service to the college, university and community

Candidate  □ is  □ is not qualified in this area for the rank sought.

Circle one: RECOMMEND PROMOTION  DO NOT RECOMMEND ABSTAIN PROMOTION

Please indicate reason for abstention: __________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________________

. Name

________________________________________  Date

(Only signed forms with statements that explain the recommendation will be considered in subsequent review.) Please forward the completed form to the office of the associate vice president for academic affairs in an envelope marked "CONFIDENTIAL" by October 27th.
Appendix A
Form B: College Promotion Committee Recommendation

The recommendation of this college promotion committee regarding promotion of
__________________________ to the rank of ________________________________ is as follows:

______ number of votes in support of promotion

______ number of votes against promotion

In our judgment, the evaluation of all available information:

☐ warrants

☐ does not warrant

the promotion of this faculty member. Assessment of qualifications (strengths and areas in need of further development) follows. The committee will indicate clearly below whether the candidate meets the qualifications in each area:

A. • Performance in primary area(s) of job responsibility

• Currency in field of expertise
Appendix A
Form B: College Promotion Committee Recommendation
(continued)

• Ability to communicate effectively with individuals who are deaf and hearing

B. Scholarship
Appendix A
Form B: College Promotion Committee Recommendation
(continued)

C. Service to the college, university and community

________________________  ________________________
Committee Chairperson      Date
Appendix A
Form B: College Promotion Committee Recommendation
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A
Form C: President/Dean Recommendation

In my judgment, the evaluation of all available information □ warrants □ does not warrant

The promotion of __________________________ to be following rank:

(name of candidate)

__________________________, for the following reasons:

__________________________

President/Dean ___________________________ Date ___________________________
Appendix B
Calendar of Action for Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Office of the president/dean informs all faculty of promotion timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Appointment of college promotion committees is completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Faculty who wish to be considered for promotion inform their respective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>department chairs. (In the case of a department chairperson, the AVP is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>notified and in the case of an AVP, the president is notified.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>The department chairperson prepares a list of all candidates for promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from the department and shares it with the office of the AVP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>Office of the AVP prepares a list of all candidates for promotion from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>within college and forwards it to the president.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>Office of the president/dean randomly assigns candidates to college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>committees and notifies each committee of its assigned candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>June 30</td>
<td>President/dean provides each candidate with a list of the faculty on his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or her promotion committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>Each candidate for promotion submits two copies of his or her promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>portfolio to the department chairperson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>The candidate and the candidate’s chairperson provide the promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>committee chair with the names of peers outside the university who are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qualified to comment on the candidate’s scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>Promotion committee chairperson completes process of contacting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>external reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>September 25</td>
<td>Chairperson or other immediate supervisor prepares his or her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>recommendation and shares it with the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>September 30</td>
<td>Unless the candidate chooses to withdraw, he or she sends the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chairperson’s recommendation to the promotion committee through the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>office of the AVP. (The candidate may prepare and attach a response or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rebuttal.) In case of withdrawal, the candidate notifies the president/dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>October 1-October 27</td>
<td>The office of the AVP distributes Form A to department peers. Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>review by department peers occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>October 27</td>
<td>The department chairperson submits the candidate’s portfolio to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>office of the AVP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>October 27</td>
<td>All peer recommendations are sent through the office of the AVP to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>college committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>October 27</td>
<td>External reviews due to promotion committee chairperson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>October 28-February 1</td>
<td>Committee conducts review of candidate's portfolio, requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supplemental information where necessary, and comes to a final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on whether the candidate merits promotion. Decision is written up on Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B and delivered to the office of the AVP with a cover memo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>February 2</td>
<td>Office of the AVP delivers a copy of Form B to the candidate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>February 3-10</td>
<td>Candidate determines if he or she wishes to continue with process. If</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the candidate opts to withdraw, he or she notifies the college committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chairperson and the office of the AVP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 Next working day will be used for any date that falls on a weekend or a holiday.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>February 11</td>
<td>If the candidate does not withdraw, the committee chair sends Form B and all documentation to the president/dean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>February 16-28</td>
<td>Regardless of the committee vote, the candidate may provide the president with a written response to any aspect of the committee decision. If the committee has recommended denial of promotion, the candidate may request a meeting with the president/dean. President/dean may seek further input from the college committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>President/dean completes Form C and transmits to the chief academic officer by March 1 or next working day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Chief academic officer forwards to the university president a recommendation for or against promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>University president makes promotion decision, and chief academic officer notifies candidate about decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Extracts from RIT Policy on Faculty Rank and Promotion – E6.0

I. Faculty Responsibilities, Classifications and Ranks

Faculty responsibilities are divided into the following three categories: (a) teaching; (b) scholarship; and (c) service, as defined in E4.0 Faculty Employment Policies. The balance among these responsibilities varies by classification and rank. The table below lists all faculty classifications and ranks that may exist at the university. In certain, very unusual circumstances, the provost may approve a faculty rank preceded by “distinguished” for a person widely recognized for his or her knowledge and expertise.

II. Promotion of Tenure-track Faculty

A. General Guidelines

Promotion to the next higher rank in a tenure-track faculty classification is based on a faculty member’s academic and professional qualifications, and achievements in the categories of teaching, scholarship, and service as defined in E4.0 Faculty Employment Policies. Academic and professional qualifications refer to past and present professional and career experiences, professional recognition in the form of licenses, honors, degree attainments, and sustained effort directed toward professional and career development. Although engagement in teaching, scholarship and service is expected of all tenure-track faculty, no faculty member has to be deeply engaged in all of the activities identified in E4.0 at any one time.

Each college faculty shall develop, approve, and publish its own promotion policy and criteria, including qualities and achievements as well as acceptable forms of evidence and documentation based on the general criteria in E4.0 and this policy. College-level policies and criteria may be more but not less stringent than, and must be consistent with this policy and E4.0. In addition, the college's schedule for promotion must be consistent with the schedule in E6.0.D.5, and the “Dates for Faculty Actions and Academic Ceremonies” as distributed by the Provost’s Office.

B. Instructor to Assistant Professor

Tenure-track faculty are no longer hired at the rank of instructor. For existing tenure-track faculty at the rank of instructor, promotion typically occurs when the instructor has successfully met the promotion criteria set forth in the contract at the time of hire.

C. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

The promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor typically occurs at the same time as tenure evaluation and is covered in policy E5.0 Policies on Tenure.

D. Associate Professor to Professor

1. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

The basis for the promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor is effectiveness of teaching, the quality and scope of scholarship, and service including the leadership in or contributions to professional activities on and off campus.

Since receiving tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, candidates shall be judged in terms of whether they have an established record that indicates continued growth, development and accomplishment in teaching; research, scholarship or creative work; and service including leadership, as described in E4.0 Faculty Employment Policies. Candidates for promotion shall be judged in terms of whether they have a record that is deemed excellent overall.

Each college will have a procedure to ensure that it recommends to the provost either approval or denial of promotion to professor.
2. Nomination of a Candidate for Promotion to Professor

A candidate may be nominated for promotion in any one of the following ways:

• The department chair shall evaluate the rank status of each faculty member at least every two years at the time of annual review and may nominate a candidate for promotion.

• A Professor eligible to serve on the promotion committee (see E6.0.II.D.3) may nominate a candidate for promotion.

• A tenured faculty member may nominate him/herself for promotion.

The department chair shall notify the faculty member in writing of his or her nomination for promotion or of the receipt of the self-nomination.

3. Promotion Committee

a. Composition: Each college shall have a Promotion Committee, which shall be a college-wide committee composed of five or seven college faculty members, all of whom are tenured Professors in the college. Each college will have a procedure for establishing one or more promotion committees as needed. A minimum of one member must return from the previous year in order to provide continuity over time. This will provide for continuity over time. The dean of the college will ensure that a promotion committee is formed according to the college policy. If a college has fewer than five tenured Professors then the provost will ask the Academic Senate to establish an appropriate promotion committee that includes all the tenured Professors in the college. The committee will select its chair from its membership.

b. Responsibility: The Promotion Committee shall review the candidate based on the promotion criteria of the university as outlined in this policy and that of the college, the candidate’s documentation, and all internal and external letters of review or evaluation.

c. Voting: There shall be no abstentions or avoidances of voting by absence by members of the Promotion Committee. The Promotion Committee’s recommendation for approval or denial of promotion shall be in writing and include a statement of reasons that support the recommendation for or against promotion as well as the committee vote. The recommendation and all supporting documentation, including letters, shall be forwarded by the chair of the Promotion Committee to the dean of the college.

d. Joint Academic Appointment: In the case of a joint academic appointment that spans two colleges or two departments, a joint promotion committee shall be formed according to the college policies where the candidate’s primary appointment and tenure resides. The committee will be comprised of three tenured Professors of the college or department in which the candidate’s primary appointment and tenure resides and two tenured Professors from the college or department in which the candidate’s secondary appointment resides. The committee will select its chair from its membership. The committee shall review the candidate based on the promotion criteria of the university as outlined in this policy and that of the colleges, the candidate’s documentation, and all internal and external letters of review or evaluation.

4. Documentation

a. Documentation shall include the following: all agreements relating to the faculty member's conditions of employment; annual reviews and evaluations since the faculty member’s last promotion; documentation related to the faculty member's teaching performance, academic and professional qualifications, scholarship, and service; and such other information as the faculty and administration of a given college shall deem appropriate. The candidate may also include letters of support.
b. Letters of recommendation internal and external to the university:

i. Internal Letters: The Promotion Committee chair shall seek letters from all tenured Professors in the candidate’s department and require a letter from the candidate’s department head. Each letter must have a clear statement recommending for or against the promotion of the candidate.

ii. External Letters: The Promotion Committee chair shall seek letters from a minimum of four external reviewers. The chair should strive to seek two reviews from individuals recommended by the candidate and two reviews from individuals recommended by the candidate’s department chair (or the dean in cases where the department chair is nominated for promotion). In all cases, the reviewers should have fields of study within the candidate’s expertise and shall have no conflicts of interest with the candidate. Reviewers should be asked to comment on the overall quality of the candidate’s work.

iii. Handling of Letters: In order to assure that recommendations are completely candid and accurate, all letters of recommendations for or against the awarding of promotion shall remain confidential and will not be made available to the candidate.

c. A promotion candidate will provide materials and other documentation to an office as specified in the college’s promotion policy. Each college will establish its own dates for receiving materials from a promotion candidate that are consistent with the university’s dates noted on the “Dates of Faculty Actions and Academic Ceremonies” which is distributed by the Provost’s Office.

d. The documentation for each promotion candidate with a tenure-track appointment shall be maintained by the Office of the Dean of that faculty member’s college and access to it shall be governed by the university's policy on "Access to Official Professional Staff Files" (E31.0).

5. Process and Schedule

a. Nomination: By May 1 of the academic year immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member will undergo consideration for promotion, nominations for promotion will be received by the department chair.

b. Acknowledgement: By May 15 of the academic year immediately prior to the academic year in which the faculty member will undergo consideration for promotion, the candidate for promotion will receive a written acknowledgement of the initiation of the promotion process and a request of materials by the department chair. The department chair will also inform the dean of the college about the nomination. The dean will ensure that a promotion committee with an elected chair is in place by September 15 to receive the promotion documentation from the candidate.

c. Submission: By September 15, the promotion candidate submits his or her documentation to the Promotion Committee chair for review. The names of the suggested external reviewers should also be submitted at this time.

d. Request for Reviews and Letters for Support: By September 30, the Promotion Committee chair requests external reviews of the candidate and letters of recommendation for or against promotion from all the tenured Professors in the candidate’s department and the candidate’s department head.
e. **Review Begins:** By January 1, all materials, including all letters, should be made available for review by the Promotion Committee.

d. **Review Completion:** By February 1, members of the Promotion Committee will complete the review of all promotion materials and the Promotion Committee chair will submit a letter of recommendation for or against promotion to the college dean, including the tally of votes from members of the committee and a summary of the internal letters from the candidate’s department. This letter will be accompanied by all other letters and documentation.

g. **College Dean:** By March 1, the college dean will submit his or her letter of recommendation for or against promotion to the provost. This letter will be accompanied by all other letters and documentation, including the letter and vote from the Promotion Committee.

h. **Provost/President:** Between March 1 and April 15, the provost and the president will work together to formulate recommendations for or against promotion. These recommendations will be informed by all other letters and documentation, including the promotion committee’s vote.

To form a promotion recommendation, the provost may call upon the department chair, the college promotion committee, or the dean for clarification or additional information and may meet with any of them to reconcile opposing views. The provost may convene the chairs of each of the college promotion committees when:

- A college’s promotion committee and dean are in dispute over a candidate’s ability to be promoted;
- There is a disagreement between the provost and the dean as representative of the college regarding the candidate’s ability to be promoted;
- In special circumstances, to evaluate a proposal the title of "distinguished" to a faculty member who is a person widely recognized for his or her knowledge and expertise.

The group will relate its findings in writing to the provost. When satisfied on all points, the provost shall make the final recommendation to the president that considers all prior recommendations received.

i. **Final Decision:** All promotion decisions are made by the president. Notification regarding the promotion decision will be sent by the provost to the candidate by April 15.

6. **Granting or Denial of Promotion**

a. **Notification:** The granting or denial of promotion shall be in the form of a written communication from the provost to the candidate no later than April 15. The letter from the provost will express the reasons for the decision on promotion. In the case of denial, the letter shall set forth the specific reasons and the promotion committee vote. All letters of recommendation for or against the awarding of promotion shall remain confidential and will not be made available to the candidate.

b. **Effective date:** If awarded, the promotion becomes effective on the first day of the following academic year.

c. **Appeal:** If a candidate wishes to appeal a promotion denial, the university faculty grievance procedures are available to the extent provided in [E24.0 Faculty Grievance](#). The appeal is not to address the substance of the committee's recommendation but shall be limited to the question of whether the policies and procedures set forth in the promotion policy have been followed in the candidate's case.
Appendix D
RIT Policy on Scholarship – E4.0.4, section b

While teaching is the foremost activity of the RIT faculty, faculty are expected to engage in significant scholarship as measured by external disciplinary and professional standards as acknowledged by department and program practices of faculty review.

(1) “Scholarship” at RIT will encompass four elements:

Scholarship of discovery: When faculty use their professional expertise to discover knowledge invent, or create original material. Using this definition, basic research as well as, for example, the creation of innovative computer software, plays or artwork would be considered the scholarship of discovery.

Scholarship of teaching/pedagogy: When faculty engage in the scholarship of teaching practice through peer-reviewed activities to improve pedagogy. Using this definition, a faculty member who studies and investigates student learning to develop strategies that improve learning has engaged in the scholarship of teaching.

Scholarship of integration: When faculty use their professional expertise to connect, integrate, and synthesize knowledge. Using this definition, faculty members who take research findings or technological innovations and apply them to other situations would be engaging in the scholarship of integration.

Scholarship of application: When faculty use their professional expertise to engage in applied research, consultation, technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation or similar activities to solve problems. This definition recognizes that new intellectual understandings arise out of the act of application.

(2) The top priorities for Scholarship at RIT are to enhance the education of our students and our institutional reputation. Faculty engaged in either sponsored or unsponsored scholarship in any of the four areas defined above are expected to disseminate the knowledge acquired in these endeavors through normal scholarly means.

(3) All four aspects of scholarship are important for RIT, and must be recognized, valued, supported, and rewarded in the tenure, promotion, and merit salary increment processes in each unit.

(4) All tenured and tenure-track RIT faculty must be actively participating in the scholarship of their disciplines. There will be considerable variation, however, in the amounts of scholarship in which different faculty engage within the same departments and colleges, as well as throughout the university. Along with institutional service and student advising proportions of professional time devoted to teaching and scholarship will be determined by individual faculty Plans of Work.

(5) RIT will continue to fund faculty professional development for the benefit of RIT, including discretionary seed funds to assist in the initiation of faculty research programs. On-going faculty and graduate student research programs, however, must be supported through external fundings.

(6) While RIT will accept externally funded proprietary and classified projects, knowledge acquired through such projects must be available within a reasonable time frame for wider dissemination through publications, classroom teaching, or application to other projects.

*These definitions of “Scholarship” have been partially paraphrased and modified from definitions used by the American Association for Higher Education.
Appendix E
RIT Policy on Service – E4.0.4, section c

Service

While teaching and scholarship are important faculty responsibilities, services performed by faculty members are an indispensable part of the university’s daily life. Faculty members at all ranks are expected to provide some forms of service to the university, their college, their department, their professional community, or the community at large. They are encouraged to provide service at different levels and areas of the university.

The university values all forms of faculty service. Typical faculty service activities include but are not limited to the following: committee work at the departmental, college, or university level; improving the university’s program quality, reputation and operational efficiency; student academic or career advising; advising a student group; faculty mentoring; linking the professional skills of members of the faculty and students to the world beyond the campus; development of new courses and curriculum; and service to the faculty member’s professional societies, such as reviewing articles, organizing professional conferences, or serving a professional organization.
Appendix F
Interpreting SLPI Rating Scale 25

...It is the position of this Communication Task Force that faculty peers and administrators need only address two questions in developing their judgments regarding an individual’s sign language skills:

1. Has an individual fully met the university’s expectations?

2. If not, has the individual made acceptable progress toward the goal? It may be deemed appropriate in light of other qualifications and given extenuating circumstances, to accept other than the stated level at the time of the evaluation with the expectation that the individual will achieve that level of sign language in the reasonably near future.

It is to be judged whether an individual’s professional development effort up to the time of the review documents a sustained and good faith effort, as well as whether an individual’s SLPI rating suggests he or she will meet the university’s expectations.

The issue of sufficient documentation will probably always remain primarily a judgment call (e.g., has there been sustained participation and effort within a defined professional development plan; or spotty participation over time; or “last-minute” rush to attempt to meet expectations; etc.). Nevertheless, these judgments should be guided by the intent and spirit of the recommendations.

If an individual does not attain the expected rating on the SLPI by the time of review for tenure/promotion, and if it is determined by those conducting the review that it is appropriate to assess progress rather than current level of achievement, the question arises, “What rating is considered to be close enough to indicate that, with additional sustained effort, he or she would reasonably be able to successfully attain the expected rating in the near future?”

We make the following recommendations for interpreting achievement of SLPI ratings:

The Rating Scale

Because a rating of Advanced Plus satisfies all university ASL skill requirements, all candidates rated Advanced Plus and above will be given a rating labeled "Advanced Plus to Superior Plus Range”.

Sign Language Proficiency Interview Rating Scale

| Superior Plus | Able to have a fully shared and natural conversation, with in-depth elaboration for both social and work topics. All aspects of signing are native-like. |
| Superior     | Able to have a fully shared conversation, with in-depth elaboration for both social and work topics. Very broad sign language vocabulary, near native-like production and fluency, excellent use of sign language grammatical features, and excellent comprehension for normal signing rate. |
| Advanced Plus| Exhibits some superior level skills, but not all and not consistently. |
| Advanced     | Exhibits some superior level skills, but not all and not consistently. |

### Appendix F

**Interpreting SLPI Rating Scale**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate</strong> Plus</td>
<td>Exhibits some advanced level skills, but not all and not consistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to discuss with some confidence routine social and work topics within a conversational format with some elaboration; generally 3-to-5 sentences. Good knowledge and control of everyday/basic sign language vocabulary with some sign vocabulary errors. Fairly clear signing at a moderate signing rate with some sign misproductions. Fair use of some sign language grammatical features and fairly good comprehension for a moderate-to-normal signing rate; a few repetitions and rephrasing of questions may be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate</strong></td>
<td>Exhibits some intermediate level skills, but not all and not consistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to discuss basic social and work topics with responses generally 1-to-3 sentences in length. Some knowledge of basic sign language vocabulary with many sign vocabulary and/or sign production errors. Slow-to-moderate signing rate. Basic use of a few sign language grammatical features. Fair comprehension for signing produced at a slow-to-moderate rate with some repetition and rephrasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survival</strong> Plus</td>
<td>Exhibits some survival level skills, but not all and not consistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to provide single sign and some short phrase/sentence responses to basic questions signed at a slow-to-moderate rate with frequent repetition and rephrasing. Vocabulary primarily related to everyday work and/or social areas such as basic work-related signs, family members, basic objects, colors, numbers, names of weekdays, and time. Production and fluency characterized by many sign production errors and by a slow rate with frequent inappropriate pauses/hesitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survival</strong></td>
<td>(May be) Able to provide short single sign and 'primarily' finger-spelled responses to some basic questions signed at a slow rate with extensive repetition and rephrasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novice</strong> Plus</td>
<td>Exhibits some survival level skills, but not all and not consistently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Novice</strong></td>
<td>Able to provide single sign and some short phrase/sentence responses to basic questions signed at a slow-to-moderate rate with frequent repetition and rephrasing. Vocabulary primarily related to everyday work and/or social areas such as basic work-related signs, family members, basic objects, colors, numbers, names of weekdays, and time. Production and fluency characterized by many sign production errors and by a slow rate with frequent inappropriate pauses/hesitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Functional Skills</strong></td>
<td>(May be) Able to provide short single sign and 'primarily' finger-spelled responses to some basic questions signed at a slow rate with extensive repetition and rephrasing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G  
Provost’s 2102 Guidance

For tenured and tenure track faculty evaluation letters: Information for department chairs, peer committees, and deans regarding 3rd year review, tenure review, and promotion to full professor.

Summer 2012 Jeremy Haefner  
Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Overview: Effective evaluation letters in the faculty review process is critically important to insuring RIT has a system of faculty evaluation that supports sound decision-making with fair and consistent practices. Towards this objective, the following guidance is provided for effective evaluation letters. While this guidance is directed at department chairs, committees, and deans, the same guidance applies to academic unit colleagues who, according to policy, also provide evaluative input in the process.

Terms and definitions:

1. **Assessment or rating of faculty performance** refers to the judgment rendered in the letter—typically guided by RIT policy E7.0; e.g., annual evaluations rate performance using words such as outstanding, very good, satisfactory, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory. Scholarly work, for example, may be assessed using the same key words as annual evaluations.

2. **Criteria** refer to any articulated standards for various levels of faculty performance. For example, a college may articulate that in order to be promoted to full professor, the scholarship of the candidate must have achieved a national reputation as demonstrated by papers published and cited by other authors, invited talks, federal grants awarded, etc. To provide maximal flexibility, criteria might be framed with sufficient examples to give the reader a sense of the standards. In particular, standards embedded in criteria provide guidance for making an assessment of faculty work—they typically address both a quantitative and qualitative dimension. In addition, RIT’s scholarship policy criteria, included in RIT Policy E4.0, must be referenced and all scholarship or creative work must be peer-reviewed, documented and disseminated.

3. **Evidence** refers to the documentation and facts that support the assessment or rating. For example, multiple forms of evidence is required for an adequate assessment of teaching effectiveness—student ratings of teaching, peer-evaluation of teaching, curriculum development, etc. In particular, letters must reference the evidence used to formulate the judgment or assessment.

4. **Evaluation** refers to the totality of the judgment: the criteria used, the evidence considered and cited, the analysis, and the assessment of work.

5. **Scholarship** at RIT refers to a body of work that is peer-reviewed, documented, and disseminated.

6. **Evaluation** refers to the totality of the judgment: the criteria used, the evidence considered and cited, the analysis, and the assessment of work.

7. **Scholarship** at RIT refers to a body of work that is peer-reviewed, documented, and disseminated.
General guidance for all letters:

1. Letters considered for tenure and promotion are summative; they are rendering a judgment as to whether or not the candidate should be tenured or promoted. Letters considered for mid-tenure review and for promotion to Professor are summative and formative; summative to render a judgment about the faculty work to date and formative in the sense that the letters are to provide the faculty member with suggestions for real ways of improving his or her performance.

2. The chair, the college committee, and the dean must provide a thorough and careful evaluation of the applicant in the three areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service. The role is to evaluate, not to advocate for, the candidate. It is essential that these evaluations carefully and thoroughly assess the applicant’s strengths and weaknesses in relation to the established standards and criteria. Negative comments or votes must be explained. A statement such as “we do/do not recommend reappointment” is not sufficient. Each letter must explain clearly and with evidence the reasons for its recommendation. Each letter must specifically address how the candidate’s record of teaching, research, and service meets or does not meet the primary unit’s standards and criteria and the criteria and standards in university policy.

3. All letters should evaluate the faculty on the basis of known criteria, using evidence provided in the faculty dossier, showing an analysis of the evidence, and making an assessment based on the criteria. Typically, the evaluation is conducted in parts – teaching, research or scholarship, and service (including the ability to effectively contribute to the functioning of the unit) – with a capstone assessment culminating in the final evaluation.

4. There must be multiple forms of evidence to support teaching effectiveness.

While student ratings of teaching are one form of evidence that can be used to assess teaching, other forms are needed to provide the complete and holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness. Effective forms of evidence to support teaching assessment include:

- Student ratings of teaching;
- Collegial peer review of teaching pedagogy;
- Collegial peer review of the candidate’s courseware, e.g.:
  - Syllabi and assignments
  - Text and other materials
  - Graded work
  - Exams
- Collegial peer outcomes assessment, e.g., student preparedness for and success in subsequent courses;
- Assessment results that demonstrate student learning of course outcomes;
- Teaching awards and other recognitions, either internal or external;
- Alumni evaluations/feedback;
- Development of curriculum and/or instructional materials;
- Innovations in teaching;
- Quality and effectiveness of mentoring graduate students on projects, MS theses and PhD theses;
- Student advising assessment;
- Student performance on standard professional examination;
- Student project supervision;
- Demonstrated effectiveness in teaching courses that are understood to be the most challenging from an instructional viewpoint;

o. Enrollment in elective courses—i.e., a willingness to teach undesirable courses; and
p. Active interest in and concern for student welfare.

5. Evidence to support scholarship assessment can have many forms just as the scholarship itself can have many forms. Evaluating scholarship contributions should address the significance, impact and attention of the scholar’s work to the university’s mission. Note that the amount of scholarship is a function of workload and many colleges have established specific expectations through the plan of work. Regardless of amount, the assessment of scholarship quality is an expectation in all letters. Examples of evidence that can be referenced for the assessment of scholarship include:

a. External peer evaluations of published or exhibited scholarship/creative work, generally captured from external letters;
b. External funding in support of scholarship, research, and creative work;
c. Invention disclosures, patents or licensing agreements that demonstrate the technology transfer of ideas;
d. Professional reputation or standing of presses (publications), journals, shows, exhibits, conferences, etc., through which the scholarship has been disseminated;
e. Citations by other professionals of the candidate’s disseminated scholarship
f. Quantity of disseminated, peer-reviewed, and documented scholarship;
g. Development of research laboratories;
h. Invited seminars, presentations, exhibits, or other displays of work; and
i. Presentation of conference papers at national and international professional meetings.

6. Contributions in the area of service work can vary according to the needs of the college or university, the interest of the faculty member, the discipline, or professional society. The evaluator typically considers all these factors, as well as the quality and impact of the work, in assessing the service component of the faculty member.

**Department chair letter:** The role of the department chair evaluation letter is critical because it reflects the evaluation of a peer who is closest to the work of the candidate and because it captures the disciplinary nuances for other evaluators to consider.

**Committee letter:** Since external evaluations of the candidate’s scholarship are the purview of the college committee, the committee letter must provide information regarding how the external letters were solicited, how were the evaluators chosen, and which letters were submitted as official letters. The committee letter should provide an analysis of the external letters, indicating which ones give strong support for the candidate and which ones do not. Quotes taken from external letters provide evidence in support of the analysis.

**Dean’s letter:** The letter from the dean must reflect on the committee and the chair letters as well as provide his or her own evaluation of the candidate’s work using criteria, evidence, analysis, and an assessment.

**Mid-tenure evaluation:** In addition to having a summative evaluation, each letter for the mid-tenure evaluation must include formative language for the faculty member to use for improvement. This guidance and the subsequent faculty performance will be considered at the time of the tenure review.
MEMORANDUM

To: Deans  From: Jeremy Haefner, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  Subject: Guidance on external letters for mid-tenure, tenure, and promotion review  Date: 4 October 2011  Cc: Susan Provenzano

Policies E5.0 and E6.0 provide the framework for external letters to be used in review of faculty for tenure and promotion. Specifically, policy E5.0 states “The outside experts shall not have personal ties or conflicts of interest with the candidate.” This memorandum serves to provide guidance for external letters that can be included in dossiers for mid-tenure review, tenure review, and promotion review. This guidance is in effect for the academic year 2012-2013.

1. For the mid-tenure review, letters from thesis advisors or co-authors may be included in the official list of external letters in the mid-tenure review. However, to maximize objective feedback for the candidate, college review committees are encouraged to also seek letters from reviewers who are not thesis advisors or co-authors.

2. For tenure and/or promotion review, letters from thesis advisors or co-authors are not to be used in the official list of external letters. However, they may be included in the dossier as further evidence of the candidate’s work.
Appendix J
Guidelines for External Reviewers

1. The University is seeking an independent, unbiased evaluation of the candidate's scholarship as part of the candidate’s promotion application. If you are a relative or close personal friend or if you believe that your personal relationship to the candidate is such as to affect your assessment, please disqualify yourself.

2. In writing your comments, you are urged to be as frank and direct as possible. Please do not include your name or other means of identification.

3. You are asked to provide brief comments on each of the questions listed below to the best of your knowledge. You should also feel free to refer to any other matters, which you believe may assist the university in providing appropriate feedback to the candidate. In accordance with university policy, your evaluation of the record of scholarly performance should take into account quality, creativity, and significance for the discipline in question, including the potential benefits to deaf and hard-of-hearing students.

   a) Were you aware of the candidate's scholarship before now?

   b) How significant is the candidate's scholarship to the discipline and how is it relevant to the profession?

   c) Apart from his or her scholarly work, do you know of other contributions the candidate has made to the development of the discipline, for example, through organizing conferences, activities in learned societies or governmental commissions? How significant have these activities been from the standpoint of promoting teaching and scholarship in the discipline?

   d) Assuming that the candidate meets other criteria being assessed internally, is his or her scholarship, as revealed by both the quality and quantity of publications, creative work, and unpublished work, deserving of promotion in rank? Please explain the basis of your assessment.
Appendix K
Sample Letter to External Reviewers

Dear Dr. __________:

I am pleased that you are willing to serve as an external reviewer of the scholarship of (Assistant or Associate) Professor ____________, who is a candidate for promotion in rank to (Associate or Full Professor) in the Department of ____________ at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, a college of Rochester Institute of Technology.

Your name has been selected from a list of several nominees submitted to me by the candidate and the candidate’s department chairperson. Reviewers’ comments are provided to the promotion committee as well as to the provost but not to the candidate. I trust you will feel free to express your views on the candidate as frankly as possible.

As an external reviewer, you are asked to assess the candidate's scholarship in his or her field. Your assessment should include reference to the potential benefits of the scholarship to deaf and hard-of-hearing students. The candidate's teaching ability and general contributions to the University are being assessed internally.

Enclosed are the candidate's curriculum vitae and summary of scholarly accomplishments as well as examples of the candidate’s scholarship. Also enclosed is a copy of our guidelines for external reviewers, which includes the specific questions we would like you to address in your response. Finally, we also attach a copy of the RIT definition of scholarship and the standards for scholarship at NTID. Please be mindful of these documents as you prepare your evaluation.

Based on our recent conversation (or correspondence) confirming your agreement, we would like to receive your review by ____________. Please send your review either electronically or in the pre-paid envelope enclosed with the candidate’s materials.

The members of the faculty and I are grateful to you for undertaking this task. You may rest assured that this procedure is not simply a formality as your views and recommendations will have an important bearing upon the result of the candidate’s application for promotion.

Yours sincerely,

Promotion committee chairperson

Enclosures:
- Candidate CV
- Guidelines for External Reviewers
- RIT definition of scholarship
- NTID scholarship guidelines
- NTID Definition of creative cork (where applicable)
- Candidate statement (scholarship section)
- Candidate materials pertaining to scholarship