

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL AND RESOURCE
ECONOMICS
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT**

**FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEPARTMENT
GOVERNANCE
UNDER AAUP ARTICLE 30**

January 12, 2023

Table of Contents

This document contains the materials for [Article 30 in the AAUP/UConn Agreement](#) applicable to the Department of Agricultural Economics (ARE).

A. Voting Faculty.....	3
B. Performance Review	4
C. Merit Criteria.....	5
D. Promotion and Tenure.....	7
E. Workload Policies.....	9
F. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness Beyond SET	12
G. Departmental Administrative Positions	13
Appendix: Text of AAUP Collective Agreement Article 30 (Faculty Participation in Department Governance)	14

Note, for the full Collective Bargaining Agreement, please refer to: AAUP [Collective Bargaining Agreement](https://uconnaaup.org/resources/collective-bargaining-agreement/) (https://uconnaaup.org/resources/collective-bargaining-agreement/)

A. ARE Departmental Voting Faculty

The ARE departmental voting faculty shall consist of all persons who satisfy the following two conditions:

- a) ARE AAUP members, including the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, lecturer, in-residence or research associate professor, in-resident or research professor, and
- b) Hold a full-time appointment with ARE as a primary academic home base.

The following are not considered voting faculty members:

- a) Joint appointments in ARE whose primary residence is another unit; and
- b) Visiting professors of any rank.

Such appointments include tenure appointments and probationary ones and only for the duration of the individual's employment in relationship with ARE. Faculty members on leave are eligible to vote.

These guidelines are superseded by any college- or university-level bylaws with respect to voting, such as voting to select a departmental PTR committee where only tenure-track faculty members qualify to vote.

All reports on voting results must include (1) total number of eligible votes; (2) total number of positive votes; (3) total number of negative votes; (4) total number of abstentions; and (5) total number of absent votes.

B. Performance Review (approved by faculty December 16, 2022)

In accordance with AAUP article 30.2, each faculty member's performance will be reviewed in writing every 12 months. This process applies to all AAUP-eligible faculty regardless of rank or tenure status. The purpose of this process is to promote, maintain, and enhance excellence in job performance and to foster communication between the faculty members and their supervisors, in this case, the department head. Following AAUP article 30.5, the following principles are posited:

1. The performance review shall be based on the faculty member's assigned duties in teaching, research, and extension, including service, and any administrative appointment held by the member. The Performance Review should clarify or establish the faculty member's assigned duties for the next year.
2. Based on an evaluation of the performance review for the previous year in each area of assigned duties, the department head shall conclude whether the faculty member's performance is satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Unsatisfactory shall mean unsatisfactory in at least one area of the assigned duties.
3. Suppose that it becomes evident to the department head that a conclusion of unsatisfactory performance is imminent based on the previous year. In that case, the department head shall provide a written evaluation of the performance review of the previous year in all areas of assigned duties.
4. The warning shall trigger a meeting among the member and the department head to develop a plan to achieve a satisfactory Performance Review. Failure to meet the standards in the plan shall be considered a just case for an unsatisfactory performance.
5. The faculty member shall have the right to appeal an unsatisfactory review through a grievance process. In that case, the department shall establish a grievance committee to hear such appeals and provide its evaluation and recommendation to the department head.
6. Note that "satisfactory" performance is neither an endorsement for tenure nor promotion for untenured faculty members on the tenure track. Likewise, for all faculty, satisfactory performance is not per se meritorious.

C. General Merit Requirement: (approved by faculty vote 4/5/13)

Meritorious performance is defined as accomplishments above and beyond the expected responsibilities and assigned duties in the three functions of teaching, research, and extension weighted by percentage of assigned responsibilities. (The percent assignment need not necessarily be equal to the distribution of salary fund sources). A fraction of the merit will reflect University, public service and other activities not accounted for elsewhere. Split appointments will additionally be evaluated with input from other units (e.g., Sea Grant, CESE).

Teaching

Expected activities:

- Teach assigned class load
- Properly advise assigned undergraduates
- Supervise assigned graduate students and mentor their research

Meritorious performance:

- High quality student teaching evaluations relative to class size and level
- Above average number of undergraduates and M.S. advisees, minor advisees, or graduate students supervised
- Individual initiatives and participation in departmental efforts to increase enrollments/majors
- Demonstrate concern for students' welfare, career objectives, job opportunities, internships, club activities, etc.
- Receiving teaching awards

Research

Expected activities:

- Develop an experiment station project (junior faculty)
- Scholarly activity (publication of nonrefereed papers, unpublished research reports, keeping up with the literature)
- Participation in research-related activities (seminars, sabbaticals, keeping up with the research literature, attending professional meetings, moderating sessions)
- Develop a research program that provides graduate students with research opportunities and professional development
- Participation in department/college/university grants
- Active search for extramural grant funds

Meritorious performance:

- Publications in refereed journals commensurate with research appointment
- Refereed publications with students as lead or co-authors
- Scholarly book volumes, chapters in books,
- Delivery of keynote speeches, invited paper sessions, initiate symposia, selected papers, etc.
- Program of research that leads to national/international reputation
- Research grant awards as PI or co-PI
- Number of grad assistantships sponsored by extramural funding
- Receiving research awards

Extension/Outreach

Expected activities:

- Active participation with field staff/public policy makers/other public needs (lectures, continuing education courses, outreach activities)
- Development/continued development of an extension program
- Keeping up with literature, understanding of current issues and major policy developments in field of specialization
- Active pursuit of extramural funding for public service/extension activities

Meritorious Performance:

- Highly integrated (with other departments and industry) extension program with strong extension delivery with emphasis on quantity and quality of output rather than input (e.g., workshops, applied research publications, newsletters, news releases, and radio and television presentations) and impact evaluation
- Continued leadership within the state/region/nation in chosen extension program areas (involving teamwork with field extension staff, public officials, and consumer or industry organizations)
- Refereed publications in extension-appropriate journals
- Extension grant awards
- Receiving extension program awards

University/Public Service/Other Activities

Expected activities:

- Eagerness and availability to serve on department, college, and university committees
- Timely completion of mandated reports, training, and other university activities
- Membership in professional organizations

Meritorious performance:

- Leadership role in departmental, college and university committees
- Active professional involvement (officer in professional organizations, national/regional committees, editorial boards, journal reviews, regional project advisory committees, etc.)
- Active involvement in community, state, federal or international committees and task forces as a representative of the University of Connecticut
- Contributions to any of the three Land-Grant functions (teaching, research and extension) outside the boundaries of your appointment (e.g., publishing refereed journal articles without having a research appointment; conducting significant outreach activities without having an extension appointment).

D. Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment (approved by faculty December 16, 2022)

A motion to establish procedures for selecting the members of the Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee of the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics (hereafter, ARE PTR committee), set deadlines for material submission and define procedures.

Designating the ARE PTR committee members and chair

1. A faculty member who is serving on the Dean's PTR Advisory Committee is not eligible for nomination to the Department PTR committee. The member serving on the Dean's PTR committee should if possible be a full professor and this election will be held prior to the Department PTR committee.
2. The ARE PTR committee will have three members or include all eligible faculty members, whichever is smaller.
3. All tenured faculty are eligible to serve on the ARE PTR committee.
4. The members of the ARE PTR committee responsible for reviewing faculty portfolios will be designated before the end of the twelfth week of the semester prior to the semester in which their letter to the department head is required. Semester refers to the fall and spring academic terms.
5. When more than three ARE faculty members are eligible to serve on the ARE PTR committee, all eligible faculty members will be automatically nominated and voted on by all ARE faculty. Each member will serve a 3-year term. Terms will be staggered, with the member having served longest replaced by a new member, each year. The PTR member who has served longest is the Chair. In most years, only one person will be added to the PTR committee as one moves off.
 - a. For the first election, all eligible members will be considered nominated for a one-year, two-year, and three-year term, with the length of term based on a coin toss, or agreement by members. The person with the most experience on previous PTR committees will be the first chair.
6. A faculty member eligible for the PTR committee who has just served a three-year term may decline nomination for a fourth consecutive term, unless there are only three ARE faculty in total who are eligible to serve on the committee.
7. Membership in the PTR committee will not affect a sabbatical request. In the case of a sabbatical leave, a new member will be chosen by nomination and vote by faculty. The person elected will serve only for the period of the incumbent's sabbatical, after which the person on sabbatical will return to the PTR committee to complete their term.
8. Voting for PTR committee members will be coordinated by the department head or staff member assigned such task by the department head.

9. Voting may occur using physical paper ballots, or email ballots.
10. Ballots must remain confidential.
11. A valid vote has occurred when at least fifty percent of those eligible to vote have voted. If the vote is not held during a meeting, 5 business days will be allowed for faculty to vote - at which point the winners would be declared as long as 50% of eligible voters have voted. In the case that less than fifty percent of ballots have been returned after 5 business days, the department head will designate the members of the ARE PTR committee and the chair of the ARE PTR committee among the eligible faculty.

Submission procedures for faculty undergoing annual review or review for promotion and/or tenure

1. The candidate will submit a completed ARE PTR form to the ARE PTR committee and the department head no later than four months before the date the provost has set for the ARE PTR committee to report its recommendations and appraisals in writing to the department head. If no date is given, we will use the date from the previous year.
2. For candidates undergoing review for promotion/tenure, external letters of recommendation must be requested by the Department Head no later than four months before the date the provost or dean has set for the ARE PTR committee to report its recommendations and appraisals in writing to the department head.
 - In addition to any requirements established by the Office of the Provost, external letter writers will be provided a copy of the most recent ARE PTR form of the candidate for promotion or tenure.
 - External letter writers will be asked to submit their recommendations no later than **forty-five (45) calendar days** prior to the date the provost or dean has set for the ARE PTR committee to report its recommendations and appraisals in writing to the department head.
3. A reminder letter will be sent to all external letter writers if the requested letter has not been received no later than **forty-five (45) calendar days** prior to the date the provost or dean has set for the ARE PTR committee to report its recommendations and appraisals in writing to the department head.
4. The most recent ARE PTR form with accompanying external letters of recommendation must be submitted to the ARE PTR Committee no later than a month prior to the date the provost or dean has set for the ARE PTR committee to report its recommendations and appraisals in writing to the department head.

ARE PTR Committee procedures following submission of the ARE PTR form

1. The ARE PTR committee will invite input from other faculty members in the department regarding faculty being evaluated. Feedback from faculty input may be incorporated into the draft letter of the ARE PTR committee.
2. The ARE PTR committee should be every effort to include objective measures of each component of the candidate's appointment split in drafting the recommendation letter.

3. A response meeting will be held between the ARE PTR committee and the candidate to discuss any clarifications or questions about the draft recommendation letter, including but not limited to any negative findings.
4. The ARE PTR committee will formulate a consensus letter and jointly sign a recommendation letter delivered to the department head on or before the date the provost has set for the ARE PTR committee to report its recommendations and appraisals in writing to the department head; this letter will conform to guidelines established by the provost, including the reporting of the number of yes, no, and abstain votes in support of the candidate's reappointment, promotion, or tenure.

Example of a typical timeline in previous years:

Task	Approx. Date	Days prior to the dateline set by the provost to report to the department head
Submission of ARE PTR form to ARE PTR committee and department head	May 15	123
Request for external letters (due date set for Aug 1)	June 1	106
Reminders and package updates sent, if necessary, to letter writers.	Aug 1	45
ARE PTR form with external letters submitted to ARE PTR committee	Aug 15	31
ARE PTR recommendation submitted to department head	Sept 15	0

E. Workload Policies (approved by faculty December 16, 2022)

As specified in the CAHNR PM 16-1 document (February 14, 2018; updated December 1, 2022), workload for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty members varies widely across the College of Agriculture, Health and Natural Resources. As noted in the UConn Faculty Workload Guidelines, “faculty members have an obligation to contribute in a substantive way to the tri-fold mission of the university through effective teaching, research, and service to the community.” In CAHNR, this might also include contributions to Cooperative Extension, which is distinct and separate from faculty service. Any substantive change to a faculty member’s workload, mainly as it differs from the offer letter or other prior paperwork on file, should be documented. This document provides additional guidance on faculty workload expectations and documentation that can be used for workload assignment, merit, or promotion purposes.

Teaching

For workload, teaching includes class instruction, independent study students, undergraduate, graduate student advising, intern supervision, and other factors. A complete teaching load is defined as 18 credits for an academic year.

Research

All tenure track faculty members and most non-tenure track faculty are expected to engage in research that leads to scholarship based on the expectations defined in the original letter of appointment and the faculty member's professional interests. Any request to apply recuperated salaries from faculty time buy-out, including those from grants and contracts, are subject to the CAHNR Salary Savings and Course Buyout Policy (rev. December 2, 2020) and subject to approval by the department head and the dean.

Extension

Several tenure track and non-tenure track faculty have a specific workload allocation for non-credit instruction and outreach through Cooperative Extension. The workload assignment should be based on the faculty’s specific Extension appointment weight and on specific program development needs defined by the department head in consultation with the faculty member.

Service

Faculty members must participate in various service activities supporting the department, college, and university. Some faculty members may have significant service obligations that go well above the normal faculty expectations, such as journal editorship, serving as chair or officer of a major regional or national organization, serving as a grant panel manager, or chairing or serving on a major university or college committee with significant time commitments. These obligations should be documented, and an appropriate adjustment can be made to their workload with the approval of the department head. See section G for faculty departmental administrative roles and details.

Overload

Overload is determined by evaluating the workload assigned to a faculty member in a particular year relative to the standard workload configured for that faculty member’s appointment. It is reasonable to expect some deviation in the number of credit hours or perhaps one course from

the standard assignment. Faculty members requested to teach overload course assignments have the right to refuse such assignments. Still, if they accept an overload assignment, they will be permitted to renegotiate established workload weights for teaching, research, extension, or service, and the outcome should be documented in writing.

Process

The faculty member should meet with the department head annually to define workload expectations for the year ahead.

F. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness Beyond SET

This brief suggests four different formative assessments, which faculty members may decide to submit as evidence of teaching effectiveness:

A. Teaching statement

- Reflect on the performance of courses (what worked, what actions to change/improve, etc.).
- Address achievements, including engagement with students beyond the classroom and any new curricular initiatives).

B. Self-assessment of pedagogical activities

- Annotated syllabus: describe your design and innovation, especially new courses and revisions.
- Professional development related to teaching, including the attendance of CETL events.
- Examples of feedback to students such as comments on their work.
- Written self-evaluation of teaching outside the classroom.

C. Peer (faculty) assessment of teaching

- Peer classroom observation and follow-up conversation, at least twice before each promotion review: Reviewers from inside or outside the teaching unit, selected by the department head in consultation with the faculty member. Faculty member writes reflection in response (half-page maximum).
- Peer observation of classroom video by one or more colleagues and follow-up conversation, at least twice before each major promotion review. Reviewers and response as above. Video need not be submitted.
- Course material review and report by ad hoc committee at the department level designated by the department head. Materials to include syllabi, course assignments, lecture notes, or other materials chosen by the faculty member to convey pedagogical approach and quality.

D. Additional student assessment of teaching

- Narrative portions of SETs. If any narratives are submitted for a course, all narratives from that course must be included. Reviewers are encouraged to weigh numerical scores considering any expressions of bias related to physical characteristics and the like. Faculty are encouraged to respond constructively to issues raised in the narrative comments with ideas or steps for addressing valid student concerns.

G. Departmental Administrative Positions (approved by faculty December 16, 2022)

Departmental administrative positions, including graduate and undergraduate directors, shall be discussed at faculty meetings, and be proposed by the department head according to the needs of the department. The faculty shall vote to approve these appointments. Accommodation for the workload of administrative positions and any related merit will be adjusted by the department head depending on the time commitment of such positions after workload accommodation.

Appendix: AAUP ARTICLE 30, FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DEPARTMENT GOVERNANCE. Note that the [text below is as accessed on January 12, 2023](#).

30.1 Statement of Principle

1. By virtue of their command of their disciplines, University faculty shall participate in the governance of the departments in which they will exercise their judgments. Governance shall take the form of selection and evaluation of faculty members, department heads and other departmental administrative positions, curriculum development and oversight, research directions, and utilization of financial resources. The sections that follow ensure meaningful participation by department faculties, including the assurance of procedural regularity and fair play.
2. In this Article, references to “department” shall also include interdisciplinary academic units similar to a department.

30.2 Contractual Governance

Each Department, or School where a Department does not exist, shall maintain Department governance documents that shall be consistent with the collective bargaining agreement and the governance documents of the relevant School/College and the University. Each department or school/college faculty shall develop Department/School governance documents for the governance of their units. The following Department governance documents shall be required for each Department/School:

1. By-laws
2. Performance Review
3. Merit Criteria
4. Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment (PTR)/Promotion and Reappointment (P&R)
5. Workload Policies
6. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness Beyond SET
7. Departmental Administrative Positions

These documents shall be drafted by faculty-elected department committees and shall require approval by a majority of eligible Department voters. The documents will be forwarded by the department to the appropriate Dean and to UConn-AAUP by January 1, 2023. Subsequent revisions will be forwarded by the department to the appropriate Dean and to UConn-AAUP, as those revisions become available.

30.4 Deans shall review these Departmentally approved documents to ensure they are consistent with the By-Laws, governance documents, and policies of the School/College and the University.

30.5 Departments shall adhere to these practices when drafting or updating the aforementioned documents.

1. By-Laws – the By-Laws of each Department/School shall include *inter alia* determination of criteria for eligible voters
2. Performance Review
3. The parties agree that the purpose of the Performance Review is to promote, maintain, and enhance excellence in job performance and to foster informed communication between bargaining unit members and their supervisor(s).
 1. The Performance Review shall be based upon each bargaining unit member's assigned duties in teaching, service, research, and/or clinical work including duties associated with extension and any administrative appointment held by the member.
 2. The Performance Review should clarify or establish the faculty member's assigned duties in teaching, service, research, clinical work, and/or extension for the next year.
 3. The Performance Review is an opportunity for faculty members and their academic unit heads to discuss a faculty member's ambitions and aspirations within the University and the profession, including teaching preferences and progress toward promotion.
4. Each department or equivalent unit is responsible for developing procedures and criteria to conduct a Performance Review of faculty members appropriate to their disciplines. The procedures and criteria must address review of jointly appointed faculty.
5. Each year, the academic unit head shall provide a written summary to the faculty member. At a minimum, the summary shall:
 1. State the faculty member's anticipated workload for the next academic year;
 2. Provide formative feedback in the performance review commenting upon their performance in each area of assigned duties (research, teaching, service, extension, and/or clinical work).
 3. Conclude whether the faculty member's performance is satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
6. Unsatisfactory Performance Review

Department Heads or equivalent officials shall give a faculty member at least four (4) months' warning before issuing an unsatisfactory Performance Review.

1. The warning shall trigger a meeting among the member, department head or equivalent official, and appropriate representative of the UConn-AAUP, if requested, to develop a plan to achieve a satisfactory Performance Review.
2. Failure to meet the standards enunciated in the plan shall be considered just cause for an unsatisfactory Performance Review.
3. The member shall have the right to appeal any unsatisfactory Performance Review through the grievance procedure. Discipline for just cause under Articles 13 or 27 shall not be subject to this requirement.
4. Merit Policies –must be consistent with Article 25 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement
5. Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment (PTR) and Promotion and Reappointment (P&R)
6. Each Department shall have a Departmental PTR Advisory Committee for tenured and tenure-track members of the bargaining unit selected according to a method approved by a majority of the Departmentally determined eligible faculty voting members. This Committee:
7. Shall advise the Department Head on promotion, tenure, and reappointment;
8. Shall review the bargaining unit member's PTR file and appraise the performance and potential for teaching, scholarship and/or creative accomplishments, extension work, and service of the individual under consideration, basing its evaluations on the criteria listed in the relevant articles of the By-Laws of the University of Connecticut (as set forth in Article 8.3). This evaluation should take into account the assignments of the individual;
9. Shall advise the Department Head by making a formal recommendation by vote and summarizing its evaluation and vote in a written report;
10. Shall follow prescribed procedures outlined in the Provost's Guidelines on Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment.
11. A separate P&R Advisory Committee may be established by the department for reviewing non-tenure-track members of the bargaining unit for promotion and reappointment, or that responsibility may be delegated to the PTR Advisory Committee. This committee:
12. Shall advise the Department Head on promotion and reappointment;
13. Shall review the bargaining unit member's P&R file and appraise the performance and potential for teaching, scholarship and/or creative accomplishments, clinical extension work and service of the individual under

consideration, basing its evaluations on the criteria listed in the relevant articles of the By-Laws of the University of Connecticut (as set forth in Article 8.3). This evaluation should take into account the assignments of the individual;

14. Shall advise the Department Head by making a formal recommendation by vote and summarizing its evaluation and vote in a written report;
15. Shall follow prescribed procedures outlined by the Provost's Office as well as those of the School/College in which the bargaining unit member is employed.
16. Workload Policies – Workload policies shall be consistent with other articles contained in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Each department shall develop criteria for measuring workload and shall develop baseline workload expectations that bargaining unit members must perform each academic year (*e.g.*, through teaching, research, service, outreach, clinical work and/or extension).
 1. The criteria should permit both individual bargaining unit members and department heads and equivalent officials to reasonably determine if a member has satisfied the criteria.
 2. For members of the bargaining unit, any significant departure from documented effort allocation or expectations shall be made only after discussion with the member.
 3. The department will publish its workload policies, including the criteria for measuring workload, at least 120 calendar days prior to the effective date of the policy or any change thereto, and in a location accessible to members of the bargaining unit in the department.
 4. Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness Beyond SET – Each department shall develop guidelines that provide effective teaching assessment beyond SET for those who have teaching duties.
 5. Departmental Administrative Positions – Each department shall develop processes for the selection and review of departmental administrative positions held by members of the bargaining unit (including, but not limited to, associate department head(s), graduate or undergraduate director/coordinator) on an ongoing basis, if any.