**Rank and Status Expectations and Review Guidelines1**

College of Family, Home and Social Sciences

*Approved by Academic Vice President’s Council 26 June 2019*

*Supersedes AVP Approved FHSS Policy Dated 29 August 2009 and 16 March 2016*

The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines and procedures for the college level review of candidates for promotion and continuing faculty status (CFS). It is supplemental to the University Rank and Status Policy (URS) and is cross-referenced to the university document where appropriate.2 As stated in section 1.5 of the university’s Rank and Status Policy, college and department rank and status policies may not contradict or waive any requirement of the university’s Rank and Status policy or apply a lower standard. If there is a conflict between this policy and the university’s Rank and Status policy, the university’s policy governs. The recommendation of the college rank and status committee and Dean’s recommendation provide a crucial analysis of the candidate’s file by colleagues in related disciplines that is independent of the candidate’s own department.  Consequently, while not definitive, the college’s role in the evaluation of candidates for promotion is central to the overall rank and status process.

This document outlines FHSS faculty expectations for the rank and status review. Separate sections address expectations for professorial and professional faculty. Another document provides guidance for faculty and departments as they assemble their files. Faculty and departments are encouraged to consult that document for advice on assembling files and structuring their R&S process.

This document will help each faculty member to assess his or her progress towards CFS, especially in the crucial conversations between chairs and faculty in annual stewardship reviews. It also provides information for departments and schools that can be utilized in refining faculty expectation documents and assessing faculty performance. These College guidelines are intended to be broad enough to encompass the range of disciplinary perspectives in FHSS, but the document is written with the full understanding that faculty have diverse expectations, both across fields and within them. Working within these and university R&S guidelines, department and school faculty are expected to create documents that provide disciplinary guidance regarding acceptable publication outlets, teaching practices and citizenship (URS 1.5; 3.4.3; 3.3.2; 3.2.2). The information provided in this document should help candidates to understand the expectations and process used at the College level.

When reviewing this document, faculty members should remember that they bear the burden of becoming familiar with the university’s policies, procedures, and standards of review that are articulated in department, college, and university R&S documents. When evaluated for candidacy, CFS and rank advancement, each faculty member is responsible for presenting persuasive evidence to the university that he or she is appropriately qualified for receiving candidacy, continuing faculty status or rank advancement (URS 1.2). They must clearly demonstrate in final reviews by their performance that they meet or exceed the department, college, and university standards as set forth in their rank and status documents (URS 4.4).
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Part I: Expectations

GENERAL EXPECTATIONS

The general expectations for faculty members in the College of Family, Home and Social Sciences are articulated well in the University Rank and Status Document (3.1.1).

Brigham Young University is a private university with unique goals and aspirations that arise from the mission of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. A faculty member's responsibility is to engage in high-quality citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and to make affirmative contributions to the university mission. Faculty should provide students an education that is spiritually strengthening, intellectually enlarging, character building, and leading to lifelong learning and service (See The Aims of a BYU Education.) It is a condition of employment that faculty members act in accordance with university policies and the Church Educational System Honor Code, including the Dress and Grooming Standards, and refrain from behavior or expression that seriously and adversely affects the university mission or The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. LDS faculty also accept as a condition of employment the standards of conduct consistent with qualifying for temple privileges. They are expected to live lives reflecting a love of God, a commitment to keeping his commandments, and loyalty to the Church. They are expected to be role models to students of people who are proficient in their discipline and faithful in the Church. All faculty are expected to be role models for a life that combines the quest for intellectual rigor with spiritual values and personal integrity. They are expected to engage in continuing faculty development, and to maintain high levels of performance throughout the course of their careers.

The “dual hybrid” nature of Brigham Young University makes us unique among contemporary higher education institutions (Wilkins & Whetten, 2012). While expecting high-quality scholarly and creative activity from faculty, we also have a primary focus on undergraduate education and expect excellent teaching. As a religious institution sponsored by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, we focus on a holistic mission - “to assist individuals in their quest for perfection and eternal life” (BYU Mission Statement) while also expecting our faculty to provide a state-of-the-art “broad university education” and excellent preparation for students within their fields of choice (BYU Mission Statement). These two “intentional dilemmas” form the basis of BYU’s dual hybrid nature (Wilkins & Whetten, 2012, p. 20). “Participants in hybrid-identity organizations must learn to deal with inherent dilemmas or tensions, many of which cannot be definitively resolved” (Wilkins & Whetten, 2012, p. 37). Nevertheless, we work earnestly to integrate these ideals by striving to meet the challenge of Pres. Spencer W. Kimball, who said, “Your double heritage and dual concerns with the secular and the spiritual require you to be ‘bilingual.’ As scholars you must speak with authority and excellence to your professional colleagues in the language of scholarship, and you must also be literate in the language of spiritual things. We must be more bilingual, in that sense, to fulfill our promise in the second century of BYU. BYU is being made even more unique, not because what we are doing is changing, but because of the general abandonment by other universities of their efforts to lift the daily behavior and morality of their students.” (Kimball, *The Second Century of BYU*, 1975)

As another reflection of our dual hybrid nature, in our teaching and research at Brigham Young University we place emphasis on the importance of inspiring learning both in and outside of the classroom, and emphasis is placed on experiential learning opportunities that “occur outside the formal classroom setting through experiences” (Worthen, 2016). Whereas research is highly valued at BYU, the motivation behind research endeavors may be somewhat unique in that the primary motivation should be to benefit our students and to improve their experiential learning opportunities. As a result, successful integration of research and teaching is an important goal for BYU faculty members.

Within this unique context and with those ambitious expectations, decisions to hire, retain and promote faculty members are even more important than in the typical university. These decisions—typically given in a secret ballot—sometimes require soul-searching judgment. Such a complex standard is not easily captured by a written document. However, since hiring, promoting and retaining faculty members are the primary means by which a university ensures the achievement of its core mission, no other set of decisions is of equal importance. Recommendations for advancement to candidacy for continuing faculty status (CFS), granting of CFS, and promotion are made under the guidelines and policies of the Brigham Young University Rank and Status Document. Like the University, the College of Family, Home, and Social Sciences recognizes that departments and units within the college set their own clear and unique requirements given their disciplinary norms and expectation. As a result, “reviewers at the college and university levels should give appropriate deference to the department's perspective, although they should also conduct their own independent evaluation. College and university level reviews should reflect the perspective of the college and university at large” (URS 7.8).

The College of Family, Home, and Social Sciences expects that faculty members will contribute to the mission and aims of a BYU education through excellent performance in all three areas of faculty responsibility. Beyond a demonstrated record of achievement, the college also expects that a clear record of continuing accomplishment and potential in all areas of faculty productivity will be necessary for a positive decision for promotion or for continuing faculty status.

EXPECTATIONS FOR CANDIDACY FOR CONTINUING FACULTY STATUS

(OR THIRD YEAR REVIEW)

(*See URS section 4.3)*

A third-year review assesses teaching, research/creative activity, and citizenship occurring during the first two years of employment in a CFS-track position. This review evaluates the candidate critically with regard to progress made toward the expectations for promotion to associate professor with CFS (as listed below in the section entitled, “Expectations for promotion to associate professor with continuing faculty status”). This review is not as extensive as the CFS review (e.g., no external reviews of scholarship), but it should be taken seriously and should prepare the candidate for the final CFS review.

The third-year review is both formative and summative. Poor performance in one (or more) of the areas can result in a decision to not recommend the candidate for candidacy for continuing faculty status. It is formative because it is meant to be encouraging to faculty who are making solid progress toward promotion and CFS and to provide suggestions for faculty who may need to improve in selected areas of performance.

Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor

with Continuing Faculty Status

Faculty in the College of Family, Home, and Social Sciences have the option to seek CFS and promotion in the 6th or 7th year of candidacy per a university approved exception that is unique to our disciplines (see URS 4.1). Candidates with prior university level experience at another institution may also seek credit for that service when hired (see Faculty Hiring Policy 3.16). Terms of the probationary period in these cases are specified in the approved offer letter.

SCHOLARSHIP EXPECTATIONS

*(SEE URS SECTIONS 3.4.3; 3.4.4.1; 5.2)*

Faculty seeking candidacy for CFS and/or promotion are expected to create a high-quality and programmatic body of research over the course of their career. Judging what is a sufficient record of high quality scholarship (URS 5.2) is a difficult and complex task that should take into account a variety of dimensions, including the views of external reviewers, citations, book reviews and/or other evidence of influence, the reputation of the outlet, the nature of the review process, and colleagues’ own judgments of the merits of the arguments and the methods, among other things. Critical peer review of scholarship, including juried creative works, by academic peers is essential to the evaluation. Department R&S documents provide more specificity with regard to disciplinary standards and expectations for scholarship (URS 3.4.3), and articulate the relative value of scholarly products noted in URS 3.4.2; 3.4.4.2 that are based on disciplinary norms. Scholarship that is read, critiqued, cited, and influences the work of academic peers is important for consequential impact in any FHSS discipline. Blind, academic peer review is typical in most journal disciplines. National academic press editorial board peer review, that often includes additional external academic peer review, typically plays into book and book chapter publication decisions. While the quantity of publications may vary from candidate to candidate, nothing can substitute for work that withstands the scrutiny of outside reviewers and has an impact on the discipline.

Though quantity of publications matter, each reviewer at each stage of the process must judge the quality of the contribution and make it an important component of the evaluation. Different reviewers will place different weights on the components of each file, but it is expected that departments, both through their documents and through the individual process of mentoring will help faculty understand how to best make the case for favorable evaluation. In all cases, it will be difficult to build a case for CFS and promotion when much of the record is based on non-critically peer reviewed scholarship, work that is not evaluated by suitable academic peers, lower-tier publications, practitioner focused outreach that repackages the scholarship of others, or work published by presses without strong disciplinary reputations (including non-academic presses). Other factors that reviewers may consider include the flow of publications and creative work, the complexity of the work, the thematic nature or focus of the work, the degree to which the candidate is becoming known for their expertise, the quality and impact of publication venues, evidence of leadership in collaborative work, and the degree to which the candidate shows increasing ability to publish in high-quality journals over time, among other things.

Outside evaluators as well as faculty reviewers at each level of review will examine the work to assess quality, organization, breadth and depth of inquiry, relevance to field, originality, methodological rigor, style and analysis. Reviewers, both internal and external, will likely evaluate such things as productivity rate, extent of leadership roles in co-authored work, patterns of publication, quality, and impact of scholarly work and how it compares with same-rank faculty norms in the field regarding where scholarship is typically published or presented at the career stage being evaluated. Work that has been submitted for publication and is under review at the time of the faculty member’s rank and status review will not be counted as completed work (it is obvious evidence for a pipeline of future work, but has yet to be fully vetted by academic peers). Works *in press* that have yet to be published on-line or in print are counted as completed works and should be accompanied by appropriate documentation of acceptance from editorial reviewers (URS 3.4.4.1F). For books, at a minimum the book must be in production at the proof stage in order to be considered as a scholarly artifact for the faculty member review.

In recognition of Brigham Young University’s distinct religious mission, we hope that all scholarship within the college is “bathed in the light and color of the restored gospel and . . . perfumed lightly with the spirit of the Gospel” (Kimball, 1967). Beyond this, it is essential to the university’s mission that some faculty engage in scholarship that specifically addresses topics or issues with religious, moral, and ethical implications or that touches on matters of concern to BYU’s supporting institution. This work is encouraged and supported by the college. It is expected that this work will be excellent and that its production and publication will meet the quality standards for scholarship outlined above. Because the University values such work, the College R&S Committee will accord it appropriate consideration as scholarly products.

The college also strongly encourages faculty to be engaged in and carefully document student-centered research to the degree possible and wherever appropriate. Faculty involvement in student-centered research may vary depending on career stage (i.e., rates of involvement may be lower as a faculty member attempts to establish her/his own research agenda), and exists in a variety of forms (e.g., mentored research that results in student presentations or publications; involving students in coding, translation, data collection, inputting data, statistical programming; field work; archive retrieval and documentation; visual documentation and reporting of materials and findings; courses that include research projects, etc). “This uniquely student-focused approach to world-class research is at the heart of our current emphasis on inspiring learning. Faculty mentored student research on cutting-edge topics is one of the primary focuses of that initiative – an initiative whose aim is clearly and exclusively on student learning.” (Worthen, 2017). Though the quality of research should be consistently high, it is possible that quantity of what faculty produce may be less when engaging in excellent student-centered research (Rasband, 2017). A narrative approach may be helpful to allow faculty across the college to clearly indicate how they have engaged in student-centered research and how this has impacted their research trajectory, as this will likely vary widely across departments and disciplines. Departments and faculty members should also make an effort to assess the quality of the mentored experience that students have.  As such, departments are encouraged to establish guidelines that accurately capture student-centered research in your disciplines.

For collaborative work, including work with students, faculty should articulate their role and recognize that a successful file will include evidence that the faculty member is contributing ideas, establishing an independent scholarly agenda, and taking the lead in a portion of their published works. When disciplines differ regarding what the order of authorship means in terms of author contributions, it is the candidate’s responsibility to inform reviewers regarding norms along with details of their unique contribution to collaborative work.

Obtaining external funding to support research or creative works is encouraged and counted as part of the scholarly portfolio. It is also understood that for some scholarly agendas application for and obtaining funding may be essential to accomplish the work. As a result, grant applications and the successful securing of external funding are valued scholarly activities. External funding, like all scholarship, “should infuse and inspire the faculty member’s teaching both directly and indirectly. It must not interfere with or detract from teaching, but support and strengthen it” (URS, 3.41; see also Scholarly Work at Brigham Young University Policy)

TEACHING EXPECTATIONS

*(See URS section 3.3)*

Excellence in teaching is expected of all BYU faculty members and a high threshold must be sustained in order to gain CFS and promotion. Teaching is carefully considered in the evaluation process. Performance in the scholarship and teaching areas of the faculty appointment are strongly correlated. Faculty should treat their students with dignity and respect. They should love learning, share the excitement and joy of that learning with their students, and endeavor to nurture spiritually strengthening classroom experiences. To that end, their courses should be organized, rigorous, fair, interesting, clear, caring, current, and incorporate an appropriate level of spiritual content (e.g., relevant spiritual readings). Courses should demonstrate by their organization, content, and delivery that the faculty member cares about and can provide a learning experience of high-quality. Faculty members are expected to develop a coherent and effective body of teaching that contributes to the mission of the department and to the broader mission and aims of a BYU education. Faculty are also expected to contribute to the teaching mission through mentoring students. Mentoring can occur in a variety of settings (e.g., research, teaching, student organizations, informally, etc.) or through a variety of methods depending upon the discipline and work of the faculty member. “Internships, study abroad programs, fieldwork, service learning opportunities, and even on-campus work are all experiences that, when properly structured, can provide opportuni­ties to both inspire students to learn and help students learn to be inspired.” (Worthen, 2016). As such, mentoring may also reflect the faculty member’s engagement in productive scholarship or citizenship.

The type of documentation for demonstrating high quality teaching performance does not vary as much by disciplinary standards and typically includes examination of course learning outcomes, faculty course related materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, textbooks, reading materials or other content, grading rubrics, etc.), example student course products and grading, examples of mentoring experiences and products, peer evaluations of teaching, student evaluations of teaching, and self-evaluations, among others. Given the high emphasis that BYU places on the goal of teaching that is spiritually strengthening, it is also important that instructors document their efforts toward achieving that goal. It should be underscored that the evaluation of teaching should always include rigorous and thoughtful peer-reviews of teaching conducted by colleagues in the discipline, in addition to student and self-evaluations.

CITIZENSHIP EXPECTATIONS

*(See URS section 3.2****)***

Faculty seeking CFS or promotion are expected to exhibit consistently the best attributes of a disciple, a scholar, and a mentor. As detailed in section 3.2 of the university rank and status document, citizenship at BYU entails adhering to the highest standards of personal behavior, exemplifying honor and integrity, being loyal to the sponsoring Church and mission of the University, performing administrative assignments, serving on department, college, and university committees, interacting with students and colleagues with civility and respect, promoting harmony and collegiality, lending professional expertise to give service to the community and the Church, and attending and participating in department, college, and university meetings. Reviewers presume that the candidate supports the aims of a BYU education and is living in accordance with standards required for BYU employment.

There is an expectation at the 3rd year and CFS reviews that the citizenship assignments of faculty will have been relatively light. However, these assignments should have been carried out diligently and responsibly. The faculty member must contribute to the intellectual and spiritual vitality of the department and avoid behaviors that harm the mission of the department, college, and university.

Citizenship also involves service to the profession/discipline and may involve such activities as serving on editorial review boards, providing ad hoc reviews for journals, serving on grant panels, participating in professional meetings, leadership in professional organizations or any of a number of potential activities that serve the faculty member’s discipline. In general, faculty are expected to take more of a leadership role in these activities as their career progresses.

EXPECTATIONS FOR FULL PROFESSOR

*(See URS section 5.3)*

Promotion to full professor is reserved for those who make significant and sustained contributions in all areas of faculty responsibility. It is not simply doing more of what the candidate accomplished for continuing faculty status and promotion to associate professor. A full professor contributes significantly to meeting the needs of the university community and enhancing its standing through research, teaching, and citizenship. As such, the expectations and methods for evaluating those expectations presented earlier in this document for promotion to associate professor with CFS also apply to this section. The candidate for full professor must continue their efforts in all areas and make significant contributions in scholarship, teaching, and citizenship.

As is the case for CFS, reviewers will consider a diverse set of evidence that will include measures such as national or international recognition by disciplinary peers, significant influence on scholarly discourse in the field, an established record of high quality scholarship, citation counts relative to national peers in the discipline, published reviews of books by nationally recognized academic presses, service on editorial boards of respected journals, editorships, invitations to write external reviews for tenure and promotion, service on federal grant review committees, offices in national or international professional organizations, invitations to serve as commentators or discussants in disciplinary conferences and other venues. Faculty who are not publishing quality scholarship in visible and rigorously peer reviewed disciplinary outlets are typically less likely afforded significant opportunities to serve in these capacities. National or international disciplinary reputation should stem more from one’s academically peer reviewed scholarly work rather than from advocacy, practical application, outreach publication, or policy work.

In the area of teaching, reviewers will consider all evidence of a dedication to teaching. This includes fulfilling teaching assignments in the department, mentoring students, experiential learning efforts, keeping courses current and interesting, and contributing to the AIMS of a BYU education. All of the methods used to document effective and excellent teaching at the CFS review apply at this stage.

In the area of citizenship, reviewers will consider evidence of increased leadership in department, college, or university assignments, influence in professional organizations beyond the university such as national and regional associations or journals, and a reputation for collegiality, civility, and loyalty to the Church documented in URS section 3.2.

EXPECTATIONS FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH CONTINUING FACULTY STATUS FOR PROFESSIONAL FACULTY

Professional faculty should meet the same standards of high-quality citizenship, professional service, and teaching as professorial faculty and to contribute significantly to the university mission (URS Section 3.1.1). The standards that apply in the areas of citizenship and teaching apply to professional faculty (URS 6.4 and 6.5.1).

Professional faculty normally do not have expectations in the area of scholarship.  However, if they do have scholarship expectations, they should demonstrate “consistent productivity of high-quality scholarship over their entire careers” (URS 3.4.3) that is commensurate with specific expectations outlined in the memorandum noted below.

The exact responsibilities of professional faculty are detailed in a memorandum between the faculty member and the department at the time that the faculty member is hired on the professional track (URS 6.2). The department, college, and university then assess the faculty member’s performance in the areas of responsibility identified in the memo.

Part II: College Rank & Status Process

This section outlines the candidate review process followed at the College level of the Rank & Status process. Following URS 7.10.1, the College Rank and Status Committee consists of at least three individuals, all of whom have continuing faculty status. The Dean of the College appoints the Committee and the Committee Chair.

Following URS 7.8, it is the practice that “Reviewers at the college and university levels should give appropriate deference to the department's perspective, although they should also conduct their own independent evaluation. College and university level reviews should reflect the perspective of the college and university at large.”

The preferred composition of the college committee is to have representation from all departments and schools within the college on the College Rank & Status Committee. In practice, however, there may be times when a particular department may not be able to provide a representative to serve on the committee, but generally the College strives to have a member from each department represented on the committee. The process for appointment typically involves careful consultation between the associate dean and the department chair to identify faculty for prospective service. Normally the Dean appoints full professors to serve on the committee, but the Dean may also select associate professors to serve. The Dean may also appoint more than one member from a department to serve during years in which the College has a large number of cases to consider or under circumstances in which the Dean believes more resources may be necessary.

The Dean appoints an Associate Dean to sit on the committee to oversee the Rank & Status process. The Associate Dean participates in and manages the process but does not vote. The Committee Chair, in consultation with the Associate Dean, appoints a primary and a secondary reader for each candidate file. Primary and secondary readers are responsible for thoroughly reading the file and leading the discussion regarding the file within the committee. A primary reader is responsible for providing a first draft of the committee report. It should be noted, however, that all individuals appointed to the Rank & Status Committee are expected to read the files carefully and participate fully in the drafting and completion of committee reports.

At the beginning of each meeting, the chair of the College R&S committee makes a strong statement of confidentiality. In line with expectations for departments, all documents and deliberations of the College R&S Committee will remain confidential (URS 7.9.9 and 7.9.10). The Primary and the Secondary reviewers lead the College Committee through a deliberation on the file. All three phases of faculty responsibility are discussed. If it is determined that additional information is needed, the committee may “request, receive, or obtain additional information from the faculty member or others” (URS 7.5). After deliberations have concluded, the committee chair calls for a vote on the file (URS 7.10.2). Voting is conducted via secret ballot. College committee members do not vote on candidates from their home department during the college process. Their vote happens in the departmental process. The committee chair records the vote on forms made available by the College.

After the deliberation and the vote, the committee works during the next week to complete a draft of the committee report. Suggestions for changes to the committee report are made and the draft is finalized by the committee chair, which is then forwarded to the Dean along with the committee’s vote. Every effort is made to include the variety of opinions evident in the committee within the report. This is especially essential when votes for a candidate are split. In cases where a joint report is not possible, the minority opinion has the option to submit a separate report (URS 7.10.2).

The second level of review at the college is conducted by the Dean. The Dean is given all materials assembled by the candidate along with external reviewer letters and letters from each of the prior levels of review (department R & S review committee, department faculty with CFS vote, department chair, and college R & S committee). The Dean then provides an independent evaluation of the candidate (URS 7.10.3).

Consistent with University policy (URS 7.9.12), the College will inform a candidate when a negative recommendation has been made by either the College Committee or the Dean of the College. Although not required by URS policy, the College practice is to notify candidates when their file has been forwarded to the university with a positive recommendation. However, specific vote counts are not shared with the candidate, nor are any concerns that arose in the review process to that point mentioned for positive recommendations. Constructive feedback from all levels of review are provided to successful candidates when the multilevel review process is complete.
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