

National Technical Institute for the Deaf
Rochester Institute of Technology

Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to the Rank of Associate
Professor
College Policy

Approved by NTID Tenured Faculty
December 2014

Revised to conform with changes to E5.0
May 2016

Communication expectations revised and approved by faculty
April 2022

Table of Contents

Calendar of Action for Tenure Review.....	2
NTID Tenure Committee Membership	4
NTID Tenure Expectations	7
Teaching and/or Tutoring	7
Communication.....	8
Scholarship.....	12
Service.....	13
NTID Tenure Documentation.....	15
Dossier.....	15
Access to Tenure Review Documentation as per RIT Tenure Policies.....	17
NTID Tenure Review	18
Department head recommendation and form.....	18
Tenured Department Peer Recommendation Form.....	21
External review	22
Tenure Committee recommendation and form	23
President/dean confidential recommendation and form	26
Provost recommendation	28
President recommendation	28
Sample Letter to External Reviewers Who Have Agreed to Review the Candidate’s Scholarship.....	29
Guidelines for External Reviewers.....	32
Administrative guidance on scholarship expectations for NTID faculty preparing for mid- tenure, tenure, and promotion review.....	34

Calendar of Action for Tenure Review

TIME¹ ACTION

February	Election of tenure committee members from each of the two faculty groups is completed.
May 1	Formation of tenure committee(s) is completed with the appointment of the outside faculty member(s) by Faculty Senate.
May 7	Candidate is notified of committee membership and the website of the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor.
May 7	President/dean convenes the tenure committee for an initial organizational meeting. The committee elects its chairperson.
May 14	Candidate and the candidate's department head provide the office of the AVP with separate lists of the names of potential external reviewers.
May 15	Office of AVP communicates with external reviewers and secures agreement from at least four to write reviews.
Sept. 1	Candidate submits his/her tenure portfolio on-line in pdf format.
Sept. 2	Committee chair forwards candidate materials to external reviewers.
Sept. 30	External peer reviews due.
Oct. 5	Tenured department peers and department head begin their review of the candidate's portfolio.
Oct. 20	Department faculty peers and department head submit individual recommendations to the office of the AVP.

¹ The dates given are deadlines. Next working day will be used for any date that falls on a weekend or holiday.

- Oct. 20 AVP submits the candidate's portfolio, the department head's recommendation, and the individual department faculty recommendations to the office of the president/dean.
- Oct. 25 Committee receives the candidate's dossier from the office of the president/dean and starts its deliberations. The dossier includes the candidate's portfolio, the assessments/ recommendations of the department peers and of the department head, the candidate's Statement of Expectations and annual reviews, and the external review letters. In the case of full tenure review, the committee also receives documentation from the candidate's comprehensive mid-tenure review.
- Jan. 15 Committee submits its recommendation to the president/dean.
- Feb. 8 President/dean sends his/her confidential recommendation to the provost together with the candidate's dossier.
- April 15 Provost informs the candidate of the tenure decision.

NTID Tenure Committee Membership

A. Number of tenure committees

The number of tenure committees in any given academic year should be such that no one committee is required to conduct more than four reviews of either kind (comprehensive mid-tenure or tenure). The president/dean of NTID will determine the number of tenure committees required for each academic year. In the event that it becomes necessary to empanel more than one committee, assignment of candidates for mid-tenure and tenure review to each committee shall be conducted by the president/dean by lottery.

B. Membership

Each tenure committee will be composed of seven tenured faculty members, all of whom shall have the rank of either associate professor or full professor. Six of the members shall be elected from the college of NTID in accordance with the procedures outlined below, and the seventh shall be appointed by the Academic Senate from one of the other colleges of RIT.

C. Length of Term

In general, tenure committee members will be elected to two-year terms. To ensure compliance with RIT policy which requires that individual college procedures provide that at least one committee member will have been on the college tenure committee during the preceding year, terms will be staggered. In that way, normally, elections for only three of the needed six college-internal positions will be held in any given year. A schedule to accomplish such staggered terms will be developed by the office of the president/dean.

D. Committee Elections

NTID faculty will be arranged in two groups for the purpose of determining tenure committee membership. Three committee members

will be elected from each group. In addition, to cover the eventuality that elected members may not be able to serve, one alternate will be elected from each group.

Group One

- Department of American Sign Language and Interpreting Education
- Department of Communication Studies and Services
- Department of Science and Mathematics
- Department of Visual Communications Studies
- MSSE Teacher Education Program

Group Two

- Department of Business Studies
- Department of Engineering Studies
- Department of Information and Computing Studies
- Department of Liberal Studies
- Department of Performing Arts
- STEM Academies/Transition Programming

The associate vice president for academic affairs will solicit nominations of tenured faculty from each group and will compile a list of nominees who are willing to serve. Individuals may self-nominate.

E. Voting

The list of nominees from each group will be submitted to the tenure-track and tenured faculty of that group, and a vote by ballot will be conducted. The faculty will vote for a maximum number of individuals as determined by the number of vacancies to be filled (i.e., "Vote for two," etc.).

F. Election

If the ballot produces a sufficient number of tenure committee representatives, the alternate(s) from that group will be determined to be the individual(s) receiving the next highest vote total(s). An alternate will replace an elected representative should one of the elected

representatives from a group be unable to serve because of circumstances beyond his/her control.

G. Exceptions to Two-Year Terms

As noted above, tenure committee members will generally be elected to two-year terms, and elections will be staggered to ensure compliance with the RIT policy requiring that at least one committee member will have been on the college tenure committee during the preceding year. In order to maintain a staggered election schedule, the exceptions to the two-year election rule will occur in “off election” years when it is necessary to hold an election to accommodate the need for a larger number of tenure committees than had been used in the preceding year. In such cases, all committee members expecting to serve the second year of a two-year term will do so, but sufficient additional representation will be elected for a one-year term only.

Conversely, in years when the college has more tenure committee members expecting to continue serving the second year of a two-year term than will be needed, due to a reduction in the number of committees required, the members chosen to continue their terms will be determined by the number of votes received by each individual during the original election. Therefore, records of the election process, complete with the number of votes received by each individual, must be kept on file in the office of the associate vice president for academic affairs.

J. Department heads serving on tenure committees

Department heads with faculty rank are eligible to vote for representatives and serve on tenure committees. However, a department head may not be a member of a tenure committee, which is reviewing a candidate from his/her department. In such circumstances, the department head will be replaced by an elected alternate.

K. Ensuring Uniformity

The president/dean of NTID will bring together all tenure committees in a given year to review process and procedures in order to ensure uniformity.

NTID Tenure Expectations

The primary context for NTID tenure review is the candidate's Statement(s) of Expectations as well as his/her annual expectations during the probationary period. While individual expectations will differ in detail, in general, a candidate must satisfy expectations defined under each of following four categories: 1) Teaching and/or Tutoring, 2) Communication, 3) Scholarship, and 4) Service.

Teaching and/or Tutoring

Teaching

NTID faculty members are expected to demonstrate high quality and effective teaching that is respectful of students and facilitates their learning. To accomplish this, it is expected that faculty will maintain high standards in all aspects of effective teaching, including the range and depth of topics covered, the quality of course materials, and the currency of course content. In support of successful teaching, it is expected that a faculty member's teaching activities will demonstrate a commitment to student success, and to continual improvement in their own teaching and learning.

Expectations for teaching extend beyond assigned courses. Faculty members are also required to contribute to the college's mission by participating in activities which may include but are not limited to: mentoring junior faculty, directing individual studies, involving students in research, directing internships, designing and revising courses, providing thoughtful student career mentoring and advising, and participating in curriculum design or revisions.

Evidence of teaching quality and effectiveness shall be in the form of student evaluations, peer evaluations, documentation related to course/curriculum development, and supporting letters.

Tutoring

Tutoring may be a major component of their primary responsibility or a minor one, combined with traditional classroom teaching. Effective tutoring involves the successful application of educational principles combined with an understanding of individual student needs and learning styles necessary to ensure student success. Because tutoring takes place outside of the traditional classroom, tutors are also expected to develop and maintain working relationships with the primary instructor of the courses they support. Tutors are also expected to maintain currency in the content area in which they support students and demonstrate a continual improvement in their approach to teaching, tutoring and learning.

Expectations for tutoring extend beyond assigned courses. Faculty members are also required to contribute to the college's mission by participating in activities which may include but are not limited to: mentoring junior faculty, directing individual studies, involving students in research, and providing thoughtful student career mentoring and advising.

Communication

At NTID, communication is understood to mean communication with people who are deaf and people who are hearing in all modalities combined with sensitivity to deaf cultural issues.

NTID faculty are expected to strive for, achieve, and maintain the ability to communicate in American Sign Language² (ASL) at a level of vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, comprehension, and fluency that allows effective participation in communication situations applicable to work and social topics. In consideration of the needs of the academic and social environment of NTID,

² According to the Communication Task Force Report, approved by the college faculty in February, 1991, "ASL fluency is defined somewhat broadly to include those who may use an English-like word order and incorporate signing space, directionality, and other features which are characteristics of ASL vocabulary and its principles, and strong sign reception abilities."

the target goal, established by the 1991 Communication Task Force, is an ADVANCED level of skill as measured by the Sign Language Proficiency Interview (SLPI).

A rating of INTERMEDIATE PLUS is acceptable only where the candidate can clearly show strong evidence of progress and sustained effort toward an advanced rating. A candidate who does not have an SLPI rating of ADVANCED should assemble a portfolio, the contents of which cumulatively demonstrate the candidate's ability to communicate effectively in ASL inside and outside the classroom. The portfolio might include such components as SRS/SRATE ratings related to communication skills; written evaluations by proficient users of ASL; evidence of successful participation in sign communication development activities such as ASL classes, individual tutoring, and videotaping of classroom performance; records of involvement with student clubs and other extra-curricular student activities, and evidence of interactions with the deaf community on and off campus. Other forms of evidence may also be included.

NTID faculty are also expected to strive for, achieve, and maintain the ability to use spoken communication strategies and techniques. Spoken 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, faculty are expected to participate in learning activities whereby they develop a knowledge of specific spoken communication strategies and classroom techniques and their applicability in communication situations.

FOR FACULTY HIRED JULY 1, 2022 AND LATER

NTID faculty are expected to strive for, achieve, and maintain the ability to communicate in American Sign Language (ASL) at a level of vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, comprehension, and fluency that allows effective participation in communication situations applicable to work and social topics. A candidate is required to demonstrate an ADVANCED level of skill as measured by the Sign Language Proficiency Interview (SLPI).

In addition to the SLPI rating of ADVANCED, a candidate is required to provide documentation of the ability to communicate effectively in ASL inside and outside the classroom. Such documentation might include SRS 1:1/SRATE ratings related to communication skills; written evaluations by proficient users of ASL; evidence of successful participation in sign communication development activities such as ASL classes, individual tutoring, and videotaping of classroom performance; results from other American Sign Language assessments; records of involvement with student clubs and other extra-curricular student activities, and evidence of interactions with the deaf community on and off campus. Other forms of evidence may also be included.

NTID faculty are also expected to strive for, achieve, and maintain the ability to use spoken communication strategies and techniques. Spoken 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, faculty are expected to participate in learning activities whereby they develop a knowledge of specific spoken communication strategies and classroom techniques and their applicability in communication situations. Accordingly, candidates must include documentation of learning activities related to spoken communication.

Interpreting Sign Language Proficiency Interview Rating Scale

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 Institute 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/she will meet the Institute'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, 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/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:

SLPI RATING SCALE	Tenure Review and Promotion to Associate Professor
Superior Plus	
Superior	
Advanced Plus	
Advanced	Meets Institute expectations.
Intermediate Plus	Acceptable if candidate shows good progress toward Advanced rating; must be accompanied by strong evidence of a variety of ongoing efforts to improve performance.
Intermediate	Generally not acceptable.
Survival Plus	Not acceptable regardless of job responsibilities.
Survival	
Novice Plus	
Novice	

Scholarship

Tenure-track faculty are required to demonstrate excellence in the pursuit of scholarship and professional activities in accordance with both the [RIT definition of scholarship](#) and the individual candidate's annual expectations. The expectation is that scholarship will be peer-reviewed and disseminated. Scholarship which has been disseminated but not yet reviewed by peers external to the Institute may be submitted as part of the candidate's portfolio, but will not carry equal weight. Scholarly activities should have some relevance to the primary area of professional responsibility. Materials stemming from these activities may be produced in traditional, digital or other electronic formats. For the purpose of tenure consideration, the major elements of endeavor related to scholarship and professional activities may include one or more of the following:

- primary or joint authorship of articles in professional journals, books, book chapters or other peer-reviewed publications.
- creation of work shown in international, national, state, or regional galleries, museums and public display areas and/or demonstration of participation in other related artistic endeavors at an equivalent level.

- NTID DEFINITION OF CREATIVE WORK

The candidate should define his/her role in the creation of the work in terms of whether it is a solo or collaborative project, and whether it was commissioned, invited, or submitted. International and national exposure or circulation is considered more significant than regional, and regional is more highly regarded than local. Evaluation of an artistic achievement will include reviews by scholars in the field and other outside evaluators solicited by the committee. Evidence includes but is not limited to the following:

1. A candidate's portfolio which reveals significant and developing achievement in the field/s of specialization. Evidence of creative work (artistic works, films, electronic media productions, literary or dramatic works, designs, invitations, or exhibitions) may be submitted in any of the following ways: critical reviews, printed color images, slides, videotapes, DVD and CD, or any other current technology.
2. Participation in exhibits may be solo or in group format. Solo participation may be invited or curated. Group participation may be invited or curated, juried or open, as follows:

- An invited exhibition, solo or as a member of a group, will typically occur as a result of a personal invitation from a nationally or regionally recognized gallery or museum.
- A curated exhibition, solo or as a member of a group, is an exhibition of the candidate's work, which is reviewed by an individual curator or exhibition committee for exhibition in a gallery or museum, a university exhibition space or a non-profit artist's space. Typically, the exhibition curator establishes a theme and seeks artists whose work is appropriate to the theme. Invitations to submit work for review may come from advertisements, personal contacts with artists, or other curators. Artists typically submit a set of slides, an artist's statement, and resume.
- A juried show is an exhibition where the selection process includes the artist's submission that match a particular theme or medium and payment of a submission fee. The exhibition venue may hire an outside curator to jury the work. Jurors vary by experience and reputation. An artist's work achieves greater recognition if the juror is well known and represents a recognized institution or gallery and if the artist wins a prize and/or the exhibit provides a catalogue.
- An open show is one in which there are no requirements set for acceptance other than one's membership in a group. All work is accepted since no review process exists.

3. Commissions/Freelance activities
4. Gallery affiliations
5. Grants
6. Honors & awards

- presentation of papers, workshops and other training activities at state, national or international professional society meetings.
- primary or joint authorship, direction, design, or performance in theatre production.
- receipt or award of grants which support scholarship.

Service

Following the [RIT definition of service](#), the tenure candidate should have made meritorious contributions to the college or university at large in one or more of the following ways:

- service as department chair³
- service within the department, e.g., department coordinator, department committees.
- service on college or university committees.
- contributions towards student recruitment, retention, and placement.
- service that supports and enhances the campus community through complementary education, student organizations, and special programs and events.
- service to the community that advances public confidence in NTID as a college and RIT as an institute of higher education.
- service to community agencies and organizations that advance special NTID and RIT interests.
- service to the profession through participation in state, national or international societies, committees, or organizations.
- other community service in the public interest.

³ In very unusual circumstances, the primary responsibility of a pre-tenured faculty member, as laid out in his/her Statement of Expectations and annual plans of work, may be academic administration. Where such a case arises, corresponding weight to the performance of those responsibilities must be given in any tenure-related evaluation.

NTID Tenure Documentation

Dossier

Upon notification by the president/dean that he/she will be reviewed for either mid-tenure comprehensive review or full tenure, the candidate, with the assistance of the dean's office, prepares the documentation listed below in the form of a dossier. The documentation should be provided in files uploaded to a secure central repository online. The dossier should be organized with the following:

- A. The candidate's original letter of hire and Statement of Expectations with any revisions thereto (added by the dean's office).
- B. Curriculum Vitae – The CV should document the candidate's entire academic career **with accomplishments since entry onto the tenure track clearly distinguished.**
- C. Statement on Teaching and/or Tutoring, with related documentation including, where appropriate, a statement on the candidate's teaching philosophy, and a list of courses taught/tutored.
- D. Statement on Communication, including SLPI rating letter and a description of the candidate's communication development and experiences.
- E. Statement on Scholarship, with related documentation.
- F. Statement on Service, with related documentation.
- G. Student evaluations (SRS/SRATE results)⁴ and peer reviews of teaching (if applicable).
- H. External peer reviews (added by the dean's office).

⁴ 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.

- I. Letters of support from peers, students, and others competent to comment on the merit of the candidate's accomplishments.⁵
- J. The candidate's annual reviews (added to the dossier by the dean's office after the department peer review).

In files C-F, the candidate should summarize his/her achievements in each area since entry onto the tenure track. The four statements combined may not exceed 20 pages for full tenure review, excluding the SLPI rating letter.

In addition, the candidate may submit any material in a separate electronic folder that s/he feels would advance their opportunity to be awarded tenure. The material should support and provide evidence of the statements made and the accomplishments cited in the candidate's vitae and written statement and should be clearly labeled to support relevant sections of the statement narrative⁶.

Before tenure review begins, the dean's office adds A and H from the list above to the dossier. After review of the dossier by the department peers, but before the tenure committee review, the dean's office adds the candidate's annual reviews (labeled "J" above), the department head's confidential review and the department peer reviews to the dossier.

⁵ Occasionally, providers of support letters prefer to send their letter directly to the tenure committee through the office of the AVP or president/dean.

⁶ Candidates should expect that additional material or clarification may be requested by peers during the departmental review period and/or by the college tenure 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.

[Access to Tenure Review Documentation](#) as per RIT Tenure Policies

Documentation	Access of each party					
	Candidate	Department Tenured Faculty	Department Head	Tenure Committee	Dean	Provost
Candidate's Portfolio	-	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Candidate's Annual Reviews	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department Faculty Letters	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Department Head Recommendation	No	No	-	Yes	Yes	Yes
Tenure Committee (or equivalent) Recommendation	No	No	No	-	Yes	Yes
External Review Letters	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dean Recommendation	No	No	No	No	-	Yes
Provost Evaluation	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	-

NTID Tenure Review

The candidate submits his/her portfolio on-line in PDF format by September 1.

Department head recommendation and form

Using the form provided, the candidate's department head submits his/her recommendation for or against tenure, supported by comments regarding the candidate's performance relative to each of the four major expectations for tenure to the office of the president/dean by October 20.

TENURE REVIEW
Department Head Recommendation Form

I have worked with the candidate for _____ years in the capacity of _____.

In my judgment and on the basis of my evaluation of all available information,

_____ has met the expectations for
tenure.

_____ has not met the expectations for
tenure.

My recommendation is based upon the following assessment of the candidate's performance relative to the expectations for tenure as these are stated in the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor.

- 1) Teaching and/or Tutoring
- 2) Communication
- 3) Scholarship
- 4) Service

Prepared by _____
Department _____
Date _____

Return this form directly to the office of the associate vice president by
October 20.

Department peer recommendations and form

On October 5, the tenured faculty of the department begin their individual review of the candidate's portfolio and the external review letters. Department peer recommendations for or against tenure, supported by comments concerning the candidate's performance relative to each of the four major expectations for tenure, are submitted to the office of the AVP on the Peer Recommendation Form by October 20.

TENURE REVIEW

Tenured Department Peer Recommendation Form

I have worked with the candidate for _____ years in the capacity of

In my judgment and on the basis of my evaluation of all available information,
_____ has met the expectations for
tenure.

_____ has not met the expectations for
tenure.

My recommendation is based upon the following assessment of the
candidate's performance relative to the expectations for tenure as these are
stated in the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate
Professor (pp. 7-10).

- 1) Teaching and/or Tutoring
- 2) Communication
- 3) Scholarship
- 4) Service

Prepared by _____
Department _____
Date _____

Return this form directly to the office of the associate vice president by
October 20.

External review

A critical component of tenure review is the participation of a minimum of four reviewers, external to RIT, who will evaluate the candidate's scholarship. Reviewers will normally, but not necessarily, come from an academic setting, but in all cases, should have expertise in the candidate's field of scholarship.

By May 14 of his/her sixth year, the candidate for tenure review submits a list with the names, positions and contact information of four potential peer reviewers to the office of the AVP.

- The list may not include dissertation advisors and may include the name of only one co-author.
- In addition, and in the same time frame, the candidate's department head submits a different list with at least four names of potential peer reviewers to the office of the AVP.
- The office of the AVP immediately communicates with the individuals named to ascertain their willingness to serve as reviewers, with the goal of securing agreement to review the candidate from at least two individuals from each list.

In the event that this process fails to secure four reviewers, the office of the AVP seeks additional names, equally, from the candidate and the candidate's department head. Upon confirmation that a reviewer has accepted the invitation, the committee chairperson sends a copy of the Guidelines for External Reviewers together with a request to the reviewer to submit the review to the office of the president/dean by September 30. The office of the AVP must carefully document all steps to secure external review letters. In the event that the requisite number of external letters is not forthcoming, the candidate will not be penalized.

Tenure Committee recommendation and form

On October 25, the president/dean submits the candidate's dossier to the tenure committee, including the candidate's portfolio, the recommendations of the candidate's department peers, the recommendations of the candidate's department head, copies of the candidate's annual reviews, and the external review letters.

The committee schedules a meeting to begin review of the candidate's dossier. At this meeting, it clarifies the candidate's primary area of job responsibility and associated expectations.

After it has completed its preliminary review of the candidate's dossier, the committee determines if additional or clarifying information is necessary. If so, the committee develops a list of questions for the candidate and sends this to the candidate through the office of the AVP. The candidate has one week to respond, either in writing or in video format, after receipt of the request.

The full committee next conducts at least one meeting for the purpose of discussing the candidate's performance relative to the tenure expectations and arriving at a recommendation for or against the award of tenure. (A recommendation in favor of tenure requires the agreement of at least five members of the committee.) The recommendation is prepared by the committee chairperson⁷ using the form provided. Conflicting opinions among committee members should be clearly stated. The form is signed by each committee member and delivered to the office of the president/dean by January 15.

⁷ In cases where the committee chair and the candidate belong to the same academic unit, the chairperson delegates the preparation of the final committee report to another member of the committee.

TENURE REVIEW
Tenure Committee Recommendation Form

The recommendation of this tenure committee is:

_____ number of votes in support of tenure

_____ number of votes against tenure

It is therefore the judgment of the committee, on the basis of evaluation of all available information, that

_____ has met the expectations for
tenure

_____ has not met the expectations for
tenure

In the following, we provide a rationale for our judgment of whether the candidate has satisfied the expectations for tenure as these are stated in the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor.

- 1) Teaching and/or Tutoring
- 2) Communication
- 3) Scholarship
- 4) Service

Committee chairperson: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Committee member: _____ Date: _____

Return this form directly to the office of the associate vice president by
January 15.

President/dean confidential recommendation and form

After reviewing all of the documentation, the president/dean prepares his/her own letter of recommendation. This recommendation, together with all associated documentation pertaining to the candidate, is forwarded to the provost by February 8.

TENURE REVIEW
President/Dean Confidential Recommendation Form

In my judgment, and on the basis of my evaluation of all available information,

_____ has met the expectations for
tenure

_____ has not met the expectations for
tenure

My recommendation is based upon the following assessment of the candidate's performance relative to the expectations for tenure as these are stated in the NTID Policy on Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor.

President/Dean _____
Date _____

Provost recommendation

After reviewing the assessment of each recommending body, together with all associated documentation pertaining to the candidate, the provost prepares his/her own recommendation for the president of the university. In the event of conflicting assessments, the provost follows the procedures outlined in paragraph [E05.0.3.c.4\(b\)](#) of the Institute Policies and Procedures Manual.

President recommendation

The president of the university makes a recommendation for or against tenure to the board of trustees.

TENURE REVIEW

Sample Letter to External Reviewers Who Have Agreed to Review the Candidate's Scholarship

Dear Dr. _____:

Thank you for your willingness to serve as an external reviewer of the scholarship of Assistant Professor _____, who is undergoing tenure review. Professor _____ is a member of the Department of _____ at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID) a college of Rochester Institute of Technology.

NTID's mission is to: "provide deaf and hard-of-hearing students with outstanding state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, complemented by a strong arts and sciences curriculum that prepare them to live and work in the mainstream of a rapidly changing global community and enhance their lifelong learning.

Secondarily, NTID prepares professionals to work in fields related to deafness; undertakes a program of applied research designed to enhance the social, economic and educational accommodation of deaf people; and shares its knowledge and expertise through outreach and other information dissemination programs."

Your name was selected from a list of several nominees submitted to me by the candidate and the candidate's department head. I trust you will feel free to express your views as frankly as possible. Your review will be seen by the tenured faculty in the candidate's department, the department head, and the tenure committee as well as the president/dean of NTID and the RIT provost. It will not be seen by the candidate.

As an external reviewer, you are asked to assess the candidate's scholarship in his/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.

The tenure policy for Rochester Institute of Technology requires promotion review during or before the sixth year of appointment as an assistant

professor. The actual timing may vary depending on personal circumstances, including possible extensions of the tenure clock due to family or medical leave, or other personal circumstances. However, the criteria for promotion and tenure remain the same for all faculty, regardless of their length of service.

Your evaluation should consider the quality of the work and the impact on the field rather than the rate or timeline of the accomplishments, particularly given the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic (refer to addendum below) and/or other personal circumstances that may have lengthened the tenure clock.

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 summary of NTID faculty expectations, and copies of the RIT definition of scholarship and the NTID definition of creative work. Please be mindful of these documents as you prepare your assessment.

Based on our recent (*conversation or correspondence*) confirming your agreement, we would like to receive your review by September 30. Do not include your name or other means of identification in the report itself. Please send your review electronically to the office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs in care of: Recca Karras, rxkncx@rit.edu.

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 future of the candidate.

Yours sincerely,

Tenure committee chairperson

Addendum:

There are many possible impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic that began in March 2020, including but not limited to the following examples. We ask that you consider these when evaluating the faculty candidate.

- Research labs and libraries were shut down in March 2020 and re-opened with limited capacity and service beginning ~August 2020.
- Faculty research supplies and equipment orders were delayed; lab renovations were stalled; and restrictions were placed on human subjects research.
- K-12 schools went remote from March 2020 through the end of the spring; in fall 2020, some K-12 schools in the region were fully remote and some were hybrid with several days per week in person and the remaining days remote.
- Many childcare centers were shut down from March 2020; they were slowly reopened during the summer and fall of 2020 with more limited capacity.
- Faculty dealt with possible family and health issues throughout the pandemic.
- Faculty teaching loads generally increased related to the need to offer classes in multiple modes (e.g., hybrid or HyFlex)

Enclosures:

- Candidate's CV and statement (scholarship section)
- Candidate materials pertaining to scholarship
- Guidelines for External Reviewers
- Administrative guidance on scholarship expectations for NTID faculty
- preparing for mid-tenure, tenure, and promotion review
- RIT policy on scholarship
- NTID definition of creative work (where applicable)

TENURE REVIEW

Guidelines for External Reviewers

1. The University is seeking an independent, unbiased assessment of the candidate's scholarship and related activities as part of the candidate's tenure review. 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. If you are not familiar with tenure in an academic setting, please limit your comments to an evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work as this relates to your field of expertise.
2. Prior to preparing your evaluation, please review the enclosed document "NTID faculty expectations", which provides some important detail regarding the nature of faculty work at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf.
3. You are asked to provide brief comments in your assessment 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/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 satisfies other expectations being assessed internally, is his/her scholarship, as revealed by both the quality and quantity of publications, creative work, and unpublished work, such that you are confident that he/she has earned the award of tenure? Please explain the basis of your assessment.
4. In writing your assessment, you are urged to be as frank and direct as possible. Please do not include your name or other means of identification in the report itself. Your review will be seen by the tenured faculty in the candidate's department, the department head, and the tenure committee as well as the president/dean of NTID and the RIT provost. It will not be seen by the candidate. Please ensure that we receive your review by September 30.

Administrative guidance on scholarship expectations for NTID faculty preparing for mid-tenure, tenure, and promotion review

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members are expected to develop a scholarship/research agenda and the results of this work should be disseminated in a manner that involves the review by peers in the faculty member's field of scholarly endeavor. Given the multiple discipline areas that NTID serves, there are many different ways in which NTID faculty can develop, produce, and contribute to scholarship and research efforts. It is incumbent upon each faculty member to determine discipline-appropriate avenues (including, but not limited to, publication in recognized and reputable peer-reviewed journals, presentation at professional conferences, and public performance and exhibition of artistic creations) that can be clearly documented as involving a rigorous review by professionals in the field. The NTID Administrative Guidelines for Tenure and Simultaneous Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor and the NTID Policy on Promotion in Rank of Tenured Faculty provide a list of appropriate scholarly activities.

Determining whether or not a scholarly product will undergo an appropriately rigorous peer review is the responsibility of the individual faculty member who should consult with others (e.g., department chairperson, journal editor, conference and event organizer, etc.) to document the manner in which a research/scholarship effort has been peer-reviewed. In submitting a portfolio for consideration for a mid-tenure, tenure, or promotion review, faculty members should present evidence to clarify the nature of the peer review their scholarship has undergone. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the university provost, through recommendations provided by a faculty member's departmental peers and chairperson, the tenure/promotion review committee, and the NTID president to determine whether or not such products have indeed been peer-reviewed and disseminated in a manner consistent with expectations for tenure or promotion.

The NTID guidelines for tenure and promotion in rank state, in part, that "tenure-track faculty are required to demonstrate excellence in the pursuit of scholarship and professional activities in accordance with both the RIT definition of scholarship and the individual candidate's annual expectations." For post-tenure promotion, the guidelines state that "all tenured faculty are expected to engage in scholarship. In general, the successful candidate for promotion to associate professor will be able to demonstrate significant

contributions in this domain, whereas the candidate for promotion to professor will be able to demonstrate a more advanced level of sustained and impactful work.” Given the breadth not only of faculty members' disciplines but also the ways in which research and scholarship can be conducted in any of these fields, there can be no single way to define the phrases "excellence in pursuit of scholarship," “significant contributions,” and “a more advanced level of sustained and impactful work” within NTID. Rather, faculty members themselves bear the responsibility of determining a successful research agenda and in explaining how their resulting scholarly efforts satisfy the stated criteria.

NTID faculty members enjoy wide latitude in the kind of scholarly projects that they pursue and how they work with others to accomplish those projects. Work may be based on a faculty member's field of training or fields of study associated with their primary job responsibilities, whether or not these areas directly relate to the field of deaf education. Faculty should be mindful that scholarly contributions are typically assessed on significance, impact on the field, and attention to the missions of the department and the college. Therefore, candidates for tenure and promotion should indicate the manner in which their research benefits the education of deaf and hard-of-hearing students, whether directly or indirectly. Further, faculty members often will collaborate on scholarly projects such that the resulting products have multiple co-authors. The nature of co-authorship depends heavily on a given field of study as do the concepts of "sole authorship" and "first authorship." Providing a single NTID-wide definition of the relative importance of any of these methods of authoring a scholarly product is impossible. Instead, faculty members bear the responsibility of explaining the importance of their contributions to the overall product, as well as the impact of that product when submitting a portfolio for the mid-tenure, tenure and promotion, or post-tenure promotion review.

The minimum scholarship expectations for tenure-track and tenured faculty, as outlined in the NTID Faculty Workload Guidelines, are described below:

- At the time of the third-year review, pre-tenure faculty members should have produced at least three peer-reviewed scholarship products, one of which must be a publication. Similarly, at the time of review for tenure, faculty members should have completed a minimum of six peer-reviewed products, at least half of which are peer-reviewed publications

- in recognized academic/professional journals or the equivalent (e.g., monographs, book chapters and major creative works). Scholarship products other than publications may consist of peer-reviewed presentations at professional conferences or the equivalent (e.g., creative works). The faculty member must demonstrate that they have made a significant contribution and played a leadership role in the production of each scholarship product by providing specific details concerning the nature of their contributions.
- Tenured assistant professors seeking promotion to the rank of associate professor should demonstrate a clear record of professional activities since the award of tenure and have a minimum of two peer-reviewed publications in recognized academic/professional journals or the equivalent (e.g., monographs, book chapters and major creative works) and two conference presentations or the equivalent (e.g., creative works). The promotion candidate must demonstrate that he or she has made a significant contribution and played a leadership role in the production of each scholarship product by providing specific details concerning the nature of their contributions.
 - Tenured associate professors seeking promotion to the rank of professor should demonstrate a sustained record of scholarship, having a minimum of three peer-reviewed publications in recognized academic/professional journals or the equivalent (e.g., monographs, book chapters and major creative works) and two conference presentations or the equivalent (e.g., creative works) in the five years prior to seeking promotion to professor. The promotion candidate must demonstrate that he or she has made a significant contribution and played a leadership role in the production of each scholarship product by providing specific details concerning the nature of their contributions.

Whether or not “excellence in pursuit of scholarship,” “significant contributions,” and “a more advanced level of sustained and impactful work” can be achieved by satisfying the minimum expectations indicated above as they pertain to research and scholarship depends will depend on factors such as the following: a faculty member’s specific contribution to each scholarship product, the length and scope of each contribution in relation to discipline norms, the quality of contributions in terms of the publication/presentation venue, the impact of the product, and the rigor of peer review as well as other indices of quality, such as scholarship-related awards. A faculty member is

responsible for clarifying and describing the venues and impact of each scholarly contribution. Finally, for specific guidance, individual faculty members should attend to feedback provided by the chairperson in the annual review.