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I. Introduction
The faculty in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching has developed the following promotion and tenure guidelines, including:

- Clear criteria for promotion and tenure
- Clear evaluation standards for the criteria
- Consistent evaluation procedures so that probationary faculty members receive direct and helpful feedback in their annual reviews, third-year reviews, and during the departmental evaluation phase of the promotion and tenure process

The Annual Faculty Assessment system described in the following pages is part of an ongoing departmental process that occurs across the academic year. Professional development opportunities (such as departmental mentoring committees and the peer review of teaching), individual faculty meetings with the department head at least once a year, and an annual review of untenured faculty by tenured faculty are essential components of this process. All procedures within the Department of Curriculum and Teaching are intended to comply fully with Auburn University policies and guidelines as stipulated in the Faculty Handbook (http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/facultyHandbook/) and the College of Education Procedures for Faculty Performance Review and Support (Appendix A).

II. Annual Faculty Assessment
According to the Auburn University Faculty Handbook, each faculty member should undergo a formal performance review each year. Teaching, research, outreach, service, and collegiality are addressed as part of the annual assessment of faculty and for promotion and/or tenure applications. The annual assessment process takes into account yearly faculty activity and considers the yearly contribution in the larger context of the faculty member’s body of work. Specific teaching, research, outreach, and service goals are reviewed and revised every year for each faculty member.

Untenured faculty also participate in an annual review by their tenured colleagues in the department. Two weeks prior to the scheduled date of the annual review meeting of tenured faculty, untenured faculty submit their vitae (prepared with the assistance of the mentoring committee in standard Auburn format) and any supporting materials that they wish to include (e.g., copies of publications). See the Auburn University Faculty Handbook for format and content of the dossier.

On the date of the annual review meeting of tenured faculty, each untenured faculty member is offered the opportunity to meet with the tenured faculty to make a personal statement summarizing her/his work in the department and to address any questions concerning her/his vita. The tenured faculty then engage in a confidential discussion of each untenured faculty member’s progress in the areas of teaching, research, service, outreach, and collegiality. For untenured faculty in service in the department two or more years, tenured faculty will also cast a ballot to provide formative feedback on the candidate’s progress (untenured faculty in their first year with the department will receive comments only). Pursuant to this meeting, the department
head will provide each untenured faculty member with a written document summarizing comments from tenured faculty and (if applicable) the results of the formative ballot. The third year of service in the department is a critical landmark in terms of assessing progress toward tenure. Procedures for the third-year review are more exacting and thorough, including a formal ballot, a letter prepared by a faculty representative that reflects the faculty discussion and reports progress and any deficits, and a separate written evaluation prepared by the department head. Both third-year review letters will be sent to the Dean. (See Appendix A: College of Education: Procedures for Faculty Performance Review and Support.)

A. General Guidelines

Phase 1. Submission of Review Materials
Each year, faculty members must provide the following information at least 24 hours before the annual review:

a. The previous calendar year’s professional accomplishments entered into Digital Measures.
b. An electronic copy of the current CV. (See the AU Handbook, Information on the Candidate, for a detailed outline.)
c. An annual report including a summarized list of teaching assignments, research, outreach, and service accomplishments from the assessment period. Distribution of time and effort for the assessment period should be specified.
d. An annual plan for the next assessment period indicating workload and goals anticipated in the next assessment year. The formal conference is the appropriate venue to discuss other goals related to future development.
e. If requested, a copy of the previous annual planning record.

Phase 2. Formal Conference (before April 30)
The department head will review the current and cumulative contributions and progress of each faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, outreach, service, and collegiality. Faculty members are responsible for providing the information to demonstrate significance or impact of their endeavors, level of engagement, and the context for the activities. The annual review of performance in each area to which a faculty member is assigned (teaching, research, outreach, and service) will be assessed according to the Auburn University performance descriptor scale: Exemplary (characterizing performance of high merit), Exceeds Expectations (characterizing performance of merit), Meets Expectations (characterizing sufficient performance), Marginal (performance is insufficient), or Unacceptable (performance that requires a comprehensive development plan, can trigger post-tenure review, as per the Post Tenure Review Policy or requires a letter of non-continuance). An overall assessment will establish an overall performance descriptor of the faculty member’s performance for the evaluation period using the same scale.

The department head and faculty member will meet to discuss the faculty performance over the review period and to discuss the faculty member’s assignment for the coming year.

Phase 3. Written Faculty Annual Review Report (before May 30)
The department head will prepare a written report within a month of the conference (no later than May 30) covering the major points of the meeting in relation to the faculty assignment for the assessment period. The report should indicate the faculty member’s overall performance level and include evaluative comments according to the performance descriptors Exemplary, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Marginal, or Unacceptable. The report should detail the faculty member’s assignment for the next calendar year.
Phase 4. Report Receipt Confirmation by Signature (due back by June 15)
The faculty member receives a copy of the report, which must be signed by both the department head and the faculty member and returned to the Dean’s Office. Each faculty member is responsible for signing a copy of the report in order to indicate that it was received. If the faculty member disagrees with information in the report, then she or he may write a response to be appended to the report. One copy of the signed report and response, if applicable, is to be retained for the faculty member’s departmental personnel file. The faculty member should receive a final copy also. This report is to remain confidential. (See AU Faculty Handbook,.)

B. Allocation of Time and Effort
1. Faculty Workload Allocation
C&T faculty workloads are established each year during the annual assessment process for faculty. The allocation percentage is agreed upon between each faculty member and the department head and ratified by the Dean’s Office. Appointments are reevaluated each year during the faculty annual review. Workload percentages may be allocated in the areas of teaching, research, outreach, and service. Appointments will vary given responsibilities. A full teaching appointment requires a faculty member to teach 24 credit hours per academic year, according to Auburn University standards. A 60% teaching load equates to 15 credit hours per academic year. Credit equivalency value for teaching activities that do not produce credit-hours, for the teaching of courses with no credit hours, or for the teaching of courses that do not meet minimum enrollment guidelines (Directed Studies, for example) should be determined during the annual assessment process, prior to the initiation of the upcoming academic year. A research appointment of minimum 25% is required for tenure-track assistant professors. Teaching activities and other variations not directly related to credit hours may account for a portion of the teaching percentage allocation if agreed upon in the process of the annual review. Teaching loads are further addressed in AU Faculty Handbook.

2. Service
Service to the university is an expected and integral component of a tenured or tenure-track appointment. See the AU Faculty Handbook for further information. The minimum service appointment in C&T is 5%, and it should be appropriately adjusted within the context of the overall appointment. In C&T, service is included in the workload appointment assignment. Service activities and responsibilities are listed in detail in the annual review. However, service shall not ordinarily be reflected as more than 5% in the appointment percentage, except in extraordinary cases. Many service activities are related to teaching and may be factored into the teaching appointment percentage (e.g., curriculum development, student advising). Tenure-track faculty should not bear the burden of excessive committee assignments. Faculty members confirm their service activities with the department head in the annual review process. The AU Faculty Handbook addresses Service in Chapter 3.

3. Administrative Appointment
Administrative appointments may be factored into the appointment percentage to accommodate different circumstances related to administrative duties and other assignments that exceed the normal expected service contribution. Administrative appointments are determined by the department head and the Dean.
4. Summer Teaching
Summer teaching is not included in the normal workload allocation for faculty on 9-month contract. The C&T standard full-time teaching load (1 FTE) in the summer semester is 9 credit hours teaching courses that meet minimum enrollment, and it is compensated at 1/3 of the 9-month base salary. The Dean must approve variations from this standard.

5. Graduate Faculty
Faculty may be appointed to the Graduate Faculty at Levels 0 or 1 by application. Level 2 appointment requires faculty to meet membership criteria and requires a vote of all Level 2 Graduate Faculty. The Graduate School approves all graduate faculty appointments. See Graduate Faculty Appointment and Reappointment Criteria and Standards.

III. Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure
A. General Criteria and Considerations
1. General Criteria
According to the AU Faculty Handbook, faculty scholarly contribution is evaluated in the areas of teaching, research/creative work, outreach, and service. Section III of this document provides the guidelines for promotion and tenure within Curriculum and Teaching. Section IV explains some general criteria for understanding teaching in C&T. Section V details criteria for research/creative work. Section VI presents expectations in outreach, and Section VII details service contributions.

2. Promotion
Promotion is based on meritorious performance and scholarly activity in the areas of teaching, research/creative work, outreach, and service. C&T evaluation levels of Highest Distinction, Distinction, and Acceptable are explained in Sections IV through VII of this document. In Appendix B, C, D, and E are examples of these significance evaluations.

An Acceptable level indicates general productivity. A candidate going up for promotion and tenure from assistant professor to associate professor would typically be expected to achieve an acceptable level of productivity across all categories.

Distinction demonstrates the faculty member’s potential for building a national/international reputation. A candidate for promotion and tenure from assistant professor to associate professor should demonstrate Distinctive productivity (typically, in at least two of the categories). A candidate for promotion from associate professor to full professor should demonstrate substantial Distinction (typically, in at least three of the categories).

Candidates for promotion from assistant to associate professor in C&T are expected to develop a body of work that demonstrates consistent growth and progress toward achievement of Distinction related to one or more areas of a candidate’s appointment (teaching, research/creative work, or outreach) along with an appropriate level of service to the Department and/or the University. The candidate must also demonstrate evidence of an emerging national/international reputation in her/his discipline and of the potential to ultimately advance to full professor rank. This level of accomplishment must be substantiated through both internal and external review and recognition.

Candidates for promotion from associate to full professor at C&T must demonstrate a
respected national/international reputation in their discipline as evidenced by a sustained body
of scholarly activities of Distinction and Highest Distinction in her/his discipline. This level of
accomplishment must be substantiated through internal and external review and recognition. In
addition, candidates for promotion from associate to full professor rank must demonstrate active
involvement and leadership in departmental, college, and university affairs. Academic Ranks
and promotion are addressed in AU Faculty Handbook.

3. Tenure
Academic tenure is a principle that affords the individual faculty member’s academic freedom
in the university environment. (See AU Faculty Handbook).

4. Collegiality
In C&T, collegiality is understood to include participation in shared governance of the unit and
professional interaction with faculty, staff, and students. Examples may include but are not
limited to regular and constructive participation in faculty meetings, participation in activities
related to peer review and faculty recruitment, and professional interaction with external
constituencies. Consistent records will be kept and documented so that there will be a level of
consistency between faculty members relative to this criterion. The AU Faculty Handbook
contains additional expectations that should be considered in decisions regarding collegiality and
in communicating concerns regarding a candidate’s collegiality at the annual review and third-
year review.

B. Review Processes
In addition to the annual assessment process (outlined in Section A.2 above), as described
in the AU Faculty Handbook, candidates on tenure-track appointments must be reviewed by
their tenured faculty peers in the third year of their fulltime appointment and again when the
candidate initiates the process of application for tenure and promotion. See the AU Faculty
Handbook for a detailed explanation of eligibility for Promotion and Tenure.

1. Third-Year Review
The focus of the third-year review is to assess the candidate’s progress towards tenure.
The review must be completed before April 30 of the candidate’s third academic year
(based upon years of full-time service and may include years toward tenure agreed
upon at the time of hire). The candidate’s department head is responsible for
scheduling the candidate’s third-year review at the appropriate time.

Two weeks prior to the third-year review, the candidate should turn in a current dossier
following the format specified by the AU Faculty Handbook for review by the tenured
faculty in the department. The review process may include a presentation by the
candidate followed by a discussion by the tenured faculty only. If a tenured faculty
member cannot attend the third-year review meeting and would like to vote on the
candidate’s progress, the vote must be sent in writing in advance of the meeting to the
department head or to the unit’s tenure and promotion committee chair. Vote counting
should not begin until all ballots of those in attendance are turned into the meeting
chair. The result of the vote must be announced at the meeting. Third-year review
voting records will be retained by the department and reported to the Office of the
Provost upon request. After the faculty vote is complete, the faculty representative
prepares a letter that reflects the discussion and reports progress and any deficits. The
department head prepares a separate written report summarizing the results of the
review for the candidate. These written reports will be made available to the candidate, all tenured and higher ranking faculty in the department, and the Dean. (See Appendix A: College of Education: Procedures for Faculty Performance Review and Support, Section B.2. Third-year Review, for a detailed description of procedures).

2. Review for Tenure and Promotion, and for Promotion
Curriculum and Teaching requires both an internal review at the departmental level and an external review for all candidates petitioning for tenure and/or promotion. The department head is to inform the Dean’s office in writing by July 1 of faculty intending to apply for promotion and tenure.

a. Promotion and Tenure Dossier and Supporting Materials
After initiating the process, the candidate prepares the dossier for promotion and tenure following the format described in the AU Faculty Handbook and Appendix A, Procedures for the College of Education Faculty Performance Review and Support. The candidate may also prepare supplemental materials designed to illustrate her/his accomplishments in greater depth for use in the internal and external reviews. These supplemental materials do not go to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

All materials prepared for the promotion and tenure process are confidential and should only be used by C&T administrators, by tenured faculty in the department, and by external reviewers. In accordance with Auburn University Faculty Handbook guidelines, the candidate will have access to all written letters with the exception of the external reviews. Dossier materials should not be copied and/or distributed to anyone beyond those faculty members who are eligible to vote on the candidate.

b. External Review
C&T requires external review by evaluators for all faculty members going up for promotion and tenure regardless of rank. See Appendix A: College of Education: Procedures for Faculty Performance Review and Support, section 2; and the AU Faculty Handbook for a detailed description of procedures for selection of external evaluators.

C. Internal Review by Departmental Faculty
The department head will work with the candidate to establish deadlines for the submission of required materials, to schedule the candidate’s presentation to the departmental faculty when applicable, and to schedule a meeting of the voting faculty. See the AU Faculty Handbook for a complete description of the procedure for promotion and tenure. An overview of the procedure for internal review follows:

c.1. Departmental Dossier Review
The candidate will provide the department head with electronic copies of the dossier in the required format (see AU Faculty Handbook) and with any supplemental materials. The head will make this material available to the eligible voting faculty after October 1 for a minimum of two weeks. The supplemental materials will not be included in the package that is forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate’s dossier is a confidential document that is to be maintained in a secure location. The AU Faculty Handbook, College of Education Procedures for Faculty Performance Review and Support (Appendix A), and this document, C&T Guidelines for Annual Assessment and Promotion and Tenure, should be the points of reference for the process of internal review.
c.2. Departmental Meeting and Faculty Vote
The department head will schedule a meeting of all eligible voting faculty to discuss and vote upon the candidate’s credentials related to promotion and/or tenure. The candidate will present his/her dossier and respond to questions for the first part of the meeting. The department head will conduct the departmental meeting procedures, including a secret faculty ballot, as outlined in the College of Education Procedures for Faculty Performance Review and Support (see Appendix A).

Except in highly unusual circumstances, a candidate for associate professor should not be granted tenure without promotion. However, recommendation for promotion at this level does not necessarily entail recommendation for tenure since the criteria for tenure, which include collegiality, are more exacting than the criteria for promotion. If a candidate is under consideration for tenure and promotion, then separate votes for each issue must be taken and recorded. In such a case the promotion vote shall come first. If an eligible voting faculty member cannot attend the meeting, but intends to vote on the candidate’s application, that faculty member is responsible for sending the vote in a sealed envelope in advance of the meeting to the department head. Vote counting should not begin until the ballots of all faculty members in attendance and all votes from absent and voting faculty are submitted to the meeting chair. If the department head holds the appropriate rank, then the Head should vote by secret ballot at the meeting. According to the College of Education Procedures for Faculty Performance Review and Support, “Any faculty who has a vote on the candidate at a higher level (e.g., University Promotion and Tenure Committee) shall not vote at the departmental meeting.”

c.3. Department Letters
A designated faculty member will prepare a draft letter that summarizes the department’s discussion and reports the final vote. The voting faculty will sign that they have reviewed this letter. The department head will also provide a letter with a written evaluation of the candidate’s qualifications for tenure and/or promotion to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee via the Dean. The letter should provide additional information relative to workload and other relevant conditions of the faculty member’s appointment. Most importantly, the letter should clearly indicate the department head’s recommendation with regard to the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion. Individual faculty members may also submit letters to the department head explaining their support or lack of support for the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure. All departmental letters will be made available to the candidate, who has the right to submit a rebuttal.

The candidate’s dossier is due to the Dean’s office by the date designated by the Dean, typically in November. Once the department head submits the candidate’s complete dossier (including all letters and any rebuttals from the candidate) to the Dean’s office, no additional documents from the departmental level may be added.

c.4. Dean Recommendation
The Dean will review all available materials after the process of faculty deliberation, the external reviews, and the department head’s recommendation. The Dean will provide a letter with a written evaluation of the candidate’s qualifications for tenure and/or promotion to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The letter should indicate clearly a recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion and is placed in the candidate’s dossier prior to forwarding to the Provost’s office.
c.5. Communication to Candidate
“The department head shall communicate the department's vote to the candidate and also make available to the candidate all letters submitted by the committee, the department head, and individual faculty members. After reviewing the letters, the candidate has five working days to write a rebuttal if desired. The candidate can also make an informed decision about whether or not to continue with the process of seeking promotion and/or tenure. If the candidate wishes to continue the process despite a negative recommendation, the department head and Dean shall honor the candidate's request.” (AU Faculty Handbook)

c.6. Submission to the Office of the Provost
The Dean will collect all materials including the information to be submitted by the candidate, the information submitted by the head, and all relevant letters. The full dossier will be submitted to the Office of the Provost by the designated deadline, typically the first week in December.

D. Promotion and Tenure Schedule
According to the Faculty Handbook (Chapter 3), nominations for promotion and tenure shall be transmitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The specific date shall be announced in the annual call for nominations from the Provost. The candidate's Dean and/or college committee shall request material early enough to allow for recommendations from the faculty, the department head, and the Dean, along with any rebuttals from the candidate, to be forwarded with the candidate's dossier.

IV. Teaching
Teaching typically represents the highest percentage of a faculty member’s workload allocation in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching. Demonstrated excellence in teaching is essential to our mission “to enable all teacher candidates and teachers to understand, utilize, communicate, and appreciate the teaching profession in the world today and view themselves as part of that global community. It is the mission of the department to provide teachers with the knowledge and skills to enhance learning among student populations characterized by diversity of individual learning needs, gender, ethnicity, culture, language, and socio-economic status.” (See complete Mission and Vision statements for the Department of Curriculum and Teaching.)

Evaluating Teaching
Research-based best practice in curriculum and instruction is central to the mission of the Department of Curriculum and Teaching (C&T). As Teacher Educators, our faculty are called upon to demonstrate meaningful integration of pedagogy, applied content knowledge, and scholarship through excellence in classroom instruction, advising graduate students’ research, faculty research, productive partnerships with K-12 schools, and related professional activities.

A. Categories
Artifacts for evaluation of teaching include:
- Teaching effectiveness
  - Teaching Awards
  - Student evaluations
  - Peer evaluations
  - Evidence of student success
- Curriculum and course development
  - New academic programs
Distance courses and programs
Program evaluation and assessment
- Teaching contracts and grants
- Instruction beyond the classroom
  - Field experiences
  - Professional development
- Teaching Publications
- Professional Teaching Presentations
- Supervising Graduate Student Research
  - Supervising graduate dissertations, theses, or field projects
  - Publications with students
  - Presentations with students

See Appendix B for detailed examples of professional activities related to teaching.

V. Research/Creative Work
A culture of faculty scholarship in the form of research and/or creative work is essential to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching faculty’s continued success in the promotion and tenure process at Auburn. All non-tenured faculty are expected to have at 25% of their faculty workload allocated for research. Productivity in research and creative practice is important evidence of scholarship because it demonstrates our significance to external audiences, enhances educational opportunities for our students, and advances the respective C&T disciplines. Each faculty member must describe an individual research/creative work agenda in section B.9 of the dossier. A review of each untenured faculty member’s developing research/creative work agenda should be a vital component of the third-year review.

Each faculty member must obtain Level II Graduate Faculty status before submitting the dossier for promotion and tenure. See Graduate Faculty Appointment and Reappointment Criteria and Standards.

For the tenure and/or promotion process, peer-reviewed or refereed work is valued more highly than non-peer-reviewed endeavors. Research/creative work valued by C&T includes traditional peer-reviewed publications and other forms of scholarship. Individual disciplines (e.g., math, science, language arts, social studies, reading, foreign language, early childhood, and English language learning) within the department play an important role in actively defining and determining discipline-specific standards within the larger context of the Department and Auburn University requirements. In all C&T disciplines, it is imperative for faculty members to develop a sustained body of high quality work from the time of hire. While productivity at Auburn is expected, the total body of work submitted as part of the tenure and/or promotion process may also include scholarship completed prior to the Auburn University appointment.

Evaluating Research/Creative Work
The Department of Curriculum and Teaching disciplines are varied and encompass different types of scholarship in research/creative work. A detailed list with examples and assessment criteria is found in Appendix D: Department of C & T Research/Creative Work and Evaluation of Significance and Productivity. Faculty members’ work will be evaluated regarding the significance of their work and their productivity for areas within each of the following Categories.
A. Categories
Artifacts for evaluation of research/creative work include:
- Peer-reviewed publications
- Professional presentations
- Other scholarly work
- Funded activities
- Intellectual Property

See Appendix C for detailed examples of professional activities related to research/creative work.

VI. Outreach
The Department of Curriculum and Teaching (C&T) has a strong history of outreach. As identified in the AU Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3.8.C. All outreach activities must be documented with regard to contributing factors to the significance of the endeavor. AU Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3.8.C details the requirements that are mentioned in an abbreviated form in this document. Outreach is not required of all C&T faculty, but is required of faculty who have a portion of their faculty workload allocated to outreach efforts. Also see Appendix 1 of Faculty Participation in Outreach Scholarship: An Assessment Model, which is available along with other publications on the assessment of outreach under "Outreach Publications" on the Auburn University website.

Evaluating Faculty Productivity in Outreach
Evidence of outreach activities include but are not limited to the following activities:

A. Categories
Artifacts for evaluation of outreach/extension include:
- Outreach/extension scholarship (i.e., professional publications)
  - Peer reviewed practitioner journal
  - Invited practitioner journal
  - Professional presentation at state, regional, national, and international conference
  - Pamphlets, brochures, newspaper articles, etc.
- Outreach/extension products (i.e., computer programs, web sites, videos, patents, copyrights)
- Outreach/extension instructional activities
  - Professional clientele (i.e., presentations, workshops, sustained professional development programs, video conferencing, web-based modules)
  - Lay clientele (i.e., presentations, workshops)
  - Continuing education workshops
- Outreach/extension consultancies and technical assistance (i.e., school systems, State Departments of Education, educational agencies)
- Outreach/extension grants
  - Contracts submitted
  - Contracts awarded
- Outreach projects
  - Project development and or management
  - Project implementation and/or evaluation
See Appendix D for detailed examples of professional activities related to outreach. Considerations for Evaluating Evidence of Outreach Quality include:

- Outreach/extension impact (demonstrated “changes in practice”)
- Outreach/extension awards (state, regional national, and international levels)
- Other forms of recognition for outreach/extension

VII. Service
In the Department of Curriculum and Teaching (C & T), service contributions relate to the shared governance within the Department, College, and the University, as well as external educational and professional organizations. Typically, all faculty in C & T have some percentage of their workload allocated to service. All service activities must be documented with regard to significance and contribution. Faculty are expected to engage in activities that contribute to the needs of the department, the College, the University, the local community and state, and the profession.

Evaluating Service
A. Categories
Artifacts for evaluation of service include:

I. Departmental service
   a. Committees
   b. Student recruitment
   c. Faculty recruitment
   d. Program coordination
   e. Graduate program officer
   f. Peer review of teaching
   g. Mentoring faculty/ students

II. College Service
   a. Committees
   b. Advisor to student organization
   c. Work on accreditation documentation (e.g. SACS, NCATE, etc.)

III. University Service
   a. Committees
   b. Other university-level service

IV. Service to Professional Organizations
   a. Holding office
   b. Committee work
   c. Scholarly reviewer (e.g., manuscripts, textbooks, grants, and conference proposals)
   d. Editorships and/or editorial board
   e. External reviewer of candidates for promotion and tenure
   f. Member of advisory boards

See Appendix E for detailed examples of professional activities related to service.
Appendix A: College of Education: Procedures for Faculty Performance Review and Support
Appendix B: Criteria for Evaluating C&T Teaching -- Evaluation of Significance and Productivity

Faculty members and their discipline-specific colleagues will be responsible for making the case for evaluation of significance of teaching contributions for review by the Department and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. This appendix details artifacts useful for the evaluation of teaching, suggesting achievements at three levels:

- **Highest distinction** in teaching demonstrates national/international reputation.
- **Distinction** in teaching demonstrates the faculty member’s potential for building a national reputation.
- **Acceptable** teaching indicates general productivity.

**Teaching effectiveness**

**A. Teaching awards.** Teaching awards from AU student organizations and recognition of teaching excellence by the College or University represent distinction in teaching. Other less prominent award placement such as honorable mention or merit award at the international/national level would typically be considered distinctive scholarship. First place or placement in finalist honors in a regional teaching award program should be evaluated based on disciplinary valuation of sponsoring organization. Teaching awards from national/international professional organizations represent highest distinction.

**B. Student evaluations.** Student evaluations with numerical ratings that are generally average for the department along with comments that generally indicate that the instructor is adhering to best practice in classroom instruction represent acceptable performance. Numerical ratings that are generally above average for the department along with comments indicating that the instructor is adhering to best practice in classroom instruction represent distinction.

**C. Peer evaluations.** Formal peer evaluations indicating that the instructor is generally adhering to best practice in classroom instruction represent acceptable performance and/or is actively engaging in professional development to improve teaching quality is acceptable. Formal peer evaluations indicating that the instructor is consistently adhering to best practice in classroom instruction and/or is engaging in innovation represents distinction.

**D. Evidence of student success.** Student publications and professional presentations, accomplishments, awards, completed degrees, employment data may indicate distinctive teaching when a faculty member has provided special mentoring.

**Curriculum and course development**

**A. New academic programs, including distance programs.** Development and active maintenance of distance courses and programs, or converting an existing course to a distance format would be an example of acceptable productivity. Creating a new, high quality distance course could be distinctive, and developing an approved high quality distance program would be an example of highest distinction.

**B. Program evaluation and assessment.** Documentation of formal program evaluation and assessment procedures would be an example of acceptable productivity.

**Teaching Contracts and Grants.** University and college grant awards count as acceptable. The amount of funding should be considered when assessing the merit of the achievement. Also, the prestige of the award may be taken into consideration. If the funding is from a regional, state, or local source, other contributing factors to the significance of the endeavor should be assessed.
Instruction beyond the classroom.

A. Field experiences. Documented success in supervising field experiences represents acceptable teaching. Documented success in working with K-12 partners and community agencies to develop, organize, and supervise field experiences represents distinction, and documented success in developing innovative programs (e.g., national awards or recognition, peer reviewed publications based upon the program, etc.) represents highest distinction.

B. Professional development. Providing professional development at the local or state level represents acceptable teaching. Professional development at the regional level represents distinction, and professional development at the national / international level represents highest distinction.

Teaching Publications. Authoring or co-authoring an article in a college or state journal or regional journal represents acceptable teaching scholarship. Being sole author, lead author, or equal co-author of an article in national or international publications may represent distinction to highest distinction. Peer reviewed publications and publications in reputable refereed journals with national editorial boards in a field are valued more than publications in lower-level journals.

Professional Teaching Presentations. Poster sessions and presentations on teaching at state conferences or meetings are acceptable teaching scholarship. Regional conference poster sessions and presentations on teaching represent a higher level of acceptable scholarship, and highest distinction scholarship includes poster sessions and presentations on teaching at national and international conferences for teachers, teacher educators, and educational researchers. The duration and intensity of the professional development may be considered in recognizing distinction or highest distinction.

Supervising Graduate Student Research

A. Supervising graduate dissertations, theses, or field projects. Acceptable productivity includes having a minimum of three years experience in the graduate program of the department or at another institution, serving on the advisory committee of at least three graduate students who have successfully completed their degree programs, and making substantial and positive contributions to the thesis, field project, or dissertation of at least one current or graduated student. Serving as committee chair for at least two graduate students who have completed their degree programs and produced high quality theses, field project papers, or dissertations counts as a distinctive level of teaching scholarship. Serving as committee chair for many graduate students who have completed their degree programs and produced high quality theses, field project papers, or dissertations is highest distinction scholarship.

B. Publications with students. Author or co-author of a peer reviewed article in a college or state journal represents Acceptable teaching scholarship, whereas peer reviewed publications in regional journals represent Distinction in teaching scholarship. Being equal co-author on peer-reviewed article in high level national or international publications is Highest Distinction scholarship.

C. Presentations with students. Poster sessions and presentations on teaching at state conferences or meetings count as acceptable teaching scholarship. Regional conference poster sessions and presentations on teaching represent distinction, and highest distinction includes refereed poster sessions and presentations on teaching at national and international conferences for teachers, teacher educators, and educational researchers.
Appendix C: Department of C&T Research/Creative Work and Evaluation of Significance and Productivity

A faculty member is encouraged to develop a focused and integrated body of work in the course of the Promotion and Tenure process. Faculty must document a high quality sustained body of work from the time of hire. The total body of work submitted as part of the tenure and/or promotion process may include scholarship completed prior to the Auburn University appointment. Faculty must obtain Level II Graduate Faculty status before submitting their dossier.

- **Highest Distinction** scholarship demonstrates national/international reputation
- **Distinction** in scholarship demonstrates the faculty member’s potential for building a national reputation.
- **Acceptable** scholarship indicates general productivity.

The faculty member and their discipline-specific colleagues will be responsible for making the case for evaluation of significance of scholarly contributions for review by the Department and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Categories of Activities
- Peer-reviewed publication
- Invited publications
- Professional presentation
- Other scholarly work
- Creative work
- Funded activities

**Peer Reviewed Publication** (more traditional scholarship including electronic publications, authored or co-authored)

- **A. Book.** A disciplinary book on a research subject is a major accomplishment in scholarship. If a quality publisher is present, this type of endeavor is Highest Distinction. A textbook or practitioner book may be Highest Distinction Scholarship depending upon the discipline and scope of readership. Traditional publisher is currently more valued than a web publisher.

- **B. Journal Article.** Potential peer review journal venues vary by discipline. A candidate may publish in a journal of a related discipline and/or have an interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary focus. International and national journals are valued more than regional and local journals. Top-tier journals in a field are valued more than non-premier ones. Sole author or equal co-author (or lead author) is valued more than subsequent author among multiple authors. Peer review research journals are valued more than peer review practitioner journals, unless the candidate can demonstrate additional significance.

- **C. Chapters in a Book or Monograph.** Book and monograph chapters are typically invited by the lead author(s), editor(s), or publisher. Editing a book or monograph is valued over individual chapters. A chapter in a disciplinary book on research is valued over a chapter in a textbook or monograph. Chapters in practitioner books are valued depending upon the scope of the audience and quality of publisher or organization. Sole author or equal co-author is valued more than multiple authors. International and national publications are valued over regional and local ones.

- **D. Conference Proceedings (peer reviewed).** Potential conference venues vary by discipline. Conference RFP should indicate if the conference is peer reviewed. Acceptance rates may
indicate difficulty of endeavor. Acceptance rates may indicate that a regional venue is equally valued to an international or national venue.

E. Technical Report (peer reviewed). The broader the external audience and impact, the higher the potential for Distinction or Highest Distinction. Published reports are valued over unpublished ones. International and national reports are valued over regional and local reports. Sole author or equal co-author is valued more than multiple authors.

Professional Presentations
A. International or National Conference. Potential conference venues vary by discipline. Conference RFP should indicate if the conference is peer reviewed. Acceptance rates may indicate difficulty of endeavor. Peer reviewed conference presentations at venues with low acceptance rates are valued over ones with high acceptance rates.

B. Regional or State Conference. Potential conference venues vary by discipline. Conference RFP should indicate if the conference is peer reviewed. Acceptance rates may indicate difficulty of endeavor. Acceptance rates may indicate that a regional venue is equally valued to an international or national venue.

C. Invited Presentation or Speaker. Invitation to speak or present can indicate level of expertise in the discipline. International or national venues are valued over regional and state venues.

D. Workshop Presenter. Invitation to lead a workshop for colleagues or teachers can indicate level of expertise in the discipline. Impact depends upon the external audience and venue.

Other Scholarly Work
A. Invited publications. Invited publications can indicate a level of expertise in the discipline. International or national venues are valued over regional and state venues.

B. Journal Editor, Book Reviewer, Professional Newsletter Editor, Grant Reviewer, etc. The broader the external audience and impact the higher the potential for Distinction or Highest Distinction.

C. Newsletter Contributor, Editorials, Journal Reviewer, Web-Site Maintenance, etc. The broader the external audience and impact the higher the potential for Distinction.

Funded Activities
A. External Grants and Contracts. Quality of granting agency as valued by the candidate’s discipline or by other disciplines if the work is inter-disciplinary. Faculty status as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator adds to the significance, and is valued over project team member. Amount of funding adds to the significance. Evidence of attainment of intellectual property rights including patents, copyright, licenses, or inventions is also considered evidence of external support.

B. External Fellowships or Awards. Quality of granting agency as valued by the candidate’s discipline or by other disciplines if the work is inter-disciplinary. The level of competition adds to the significance.

C. Internal Grants and Contracts. Faculty status as Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator adds to the significance, and is valued over project team member. Merit-based funding is valued over non-merit based funding. University or Institute-sponsored funding is valued over College-sponsored funding. Amount of funding adds to the significance.

Creative Work. Non-print media such as web site, DVD, CD, computer software, etc. The broader the external audience and impact, the higher the potential for Distinction or Highest Distinction. Placement in a competition indicates level of distinction.
Appendix D: Criteria for Evaluating C&T Outreach

This appendix details artifacts useful for the evaluation of outreach, suggesting achievement at three levels:

- **Highest Distinction** outreach demonstrates national/international reputation
- **Distinction** in outreach demonstrates the faculty member’s potential for building a national reputation.
- **Acceptable** outreach indicates general productivity.

**Outreach/extension scholarship (i.e., professional publications)**

A. **Peer reviewed practitioner journal.** Author or co-author of a peer reviewed article in a college or state journal, or regional journal represent acceptable outreach scholarship. Being sole author or equal co-author of an article in national or international publications may represent distinction to highest distinction. Peer reviewed publications and publications in reputable refereed journals with national editorial boards in a field are valued more than publications in lower-level journals.

B. **Invited practitioner journal.** Publications in reputable refereed journals with national editorial boards in a field are valued more than publications in lower-level journals. Sole author or equal co-author (or lead author) is valued more than subsequent author among multiple authors. The significance of invited publications will be determined by the level of the journal.

C. **Professional presentation at state, regional, national, and international conference.** Potential conference venues vary by discipline. Conference RFP should indicate if the conference is peer reviewed. Acceptance rates may indicate difficulty of endeavor. Peer reviewed conference presentations at venues with low acceptance rates are valued over ones with high acceptance rates. Acceptance rates may indicate that a regional venue is equally valued to an international or national venue.

D. **Pamphlets, brochures, newspaper articles, etc.** The broader the external audience and impact the higher the potential for Distinction.

**Outreach/extension products (i.e., computer programs, web sites, videos, patents, copyrights)** The broader the external audience and impact the higher the potential for Distinction.

**Outreach/extension instructional activities**

A. **Professional clientele (i.e., presentations, workshops, sustained professional development programs, video conferencing, web-based modules).** The duration and intensity of the PD and the value that outside constituencies ascribe to it, including peers at other institutions and funding agencies will determine the level of distinction the outreach merits.

B. **Lay clientele (i.e., presentations, workshops).** The duration and intensity of the PD and the value that outside constituencies ascribe to it, including peers at other institutions and funding agencies will determine the level of distinction the outreach merits.

C. **Continuing education workshops.** The duration and intensity of the PD and the value that outside constituencies ascribe to it, including peers at other institutions and funding agencies will determine the level of distinction the outreach merits.

**Outreach/extension consultancies and technical assistance (i.e., school systems, State Departments of Education, educational agencies)** The broader the external audience and
impact the higher the potential for Distinction.

Outreach/extension grants
A. **Contracts submitted.** Documented submission of contracts and grants may represent an Acceptable level of outreach scholarship. Distinction may be recognized in some situations that demonstrate an unusually high level of scholarship in developing the proposal.

B. **Contracts awarded.** University and college grant awards count as acceptable. The amount of funding should be considered when assessing the merit of the achievement. Also, the prestige of the award may be taken into consideration. If the funding is from a regional, state, or local source, other contributing factors to the significance of the endeavor should be assessed.

Outreach projects
A. **Project development and or management.** Development and/or active maintenance of Outreach projects and programs may represent Acceptable to Highest Distinction productivity. The broader the external audience and impact the higher the potential for Distinction.

D. **Project implementation and/or evaluation.** Implementation and/or formal evaluation of Outreach projects and programs may represent Acceptable to Highest Distinction productivity. The broader the external audience and impact the higher the potential for Distinction. The duration and intensity of the PD and the value that outside constituencies ascribe to it, including peers at other institutions and funding agencies will also help to determine the level of distinction the outreach merits.
Appendix E: Department of C & T Service -- Evaluation of Significance and Productivity

In the Department of Curriculum and Teaching (C & T), service contributions relate to the shared governance within the Department, College, and the University, as well as external educational and professional organizations. Typically, all faculty in C & T have some percentage of their workload allocated to service. All service activities must be documented with regard to significance and contribution. Faculty are expected to engage in activities that contribute to the needs of the department, the College, the University, the local community and state, and the profession.

**Highest Distinction** service demonstrates national/international reputation

**Distinction** in service demonstrates the faculty member’s potential for building a national reputation.

**Acceptable** service indicates general productivity.

The faculty member and their discipline-specific colleagues will be responsible for making the case for evaluation of significance of service contributions for review by the Department and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

**Departmental service**

A. **Committees.** Documented active contributions to committees represents acceptable service. Serving in a leadership role (e.g., committee chair) or other documented evidence of outstanding contributions to the committee may represent Distinction.

B. **Student recruitment.** Documented contributions to student recruitment represents acceptable service. Documented evidence of outstanding and/ or innovative contributions to recruiting may represent Distinction or Highest Distinction.

C. **Faculty recruitment.** Documented contributions to faculty recruitment represents acceptable service. Documented evidence of outstanding and/ or innovative contributions to recruiting may represent Distinction or Highest Distinction.

D. **Program coordination.** Successful service as Program Coordinator represents an Acceptable level of service. Documented evidence of outstanding and/ or innovative contributions as Program Coordinator may represent Distinction or Highest Distinction.

E. **Graduate program officer.** Successful service as Graduate Program Officer represents an Acceptable level of service. Documented evidence of outstanding and/ or innovative contributions as Graduate Program Officer may represent Distinction or Highest Distinction.

F. **Peer review of teaching committee.** Successful service on a Peer Review committee represents an Acceptable level. Successful service as chair represents distinction.

G. **Mentoring faculty/ students.** Successful service on a Mentoring committee represents an acceptable level. Successful service as chair represents distinction.

**College service**

A. **Committees.** Documented active contributions to committees represents acceptable service. Serving in a leadership role (e.g., committee chair) or other documented evidence of outstanding contributions to the committee may represent Distinction.

B. **Advisor to student organization.** Documented contributions as advisor to student organizations represents acceptable service. Documented evidence of outstanding and/ or innovative contributions may represent Distinction or Highest Distinction.

C. **Work on accreditation documentation (e.g., SACS, NCATE, etc.).** Documented contributions on accreditation documentation represents acceptable service. Documented evidence of outstanding and/ or innovative contributions may represent Distinction or Highest Distinction.
University service
A. Committees. Documented active contributions to committees represents acceptable service. Serving in a leadership role (e.g., committee chair) or other documented evidence of outstanding contributions to the committee may represent Distinction.
B. Other university-level service. Documented active contributions to the university represent acceptable service. Impact depends extent and significance of the work.

C. Service to Professional Organizations
A. Holding office. Holding office in local or state professional organizations represents acceptable service. Holding office in regional organizations may represent distinction, and holding office in national and/or international professional organization may represent distinction to highest distinction contingent upon the national prominence of the organization within the candidate’s field.
B. Committee work. Committee work for local or state professional organizations represents acceptable service. Committee work for regional organizations may represent distinction, and committee work for national and/or international professional organization may represent distinction to highest distinction contingent upon the national prominence of the organization within the candidate’s field and/ or other documented evidence of outstanding contributions to the committee.
C. Scholarly reviewer (e.g., manuscripts, textbooks, grants, and conference proposals). Reviewing for international and national venues is valued more than regional and local venues. Reviewing for national or international conferences is valued more than regional and local conferences. Reviewing for reputable refereed journals with national editorial boards in a field is valued more than reviewing for lower-level journals. Peer review research journals are valued more than peer review practitioner journals, unless the candidate can demonstrate additional significance.
D. Editorships and/ or editorial boards. Serving on the editorial board of international and national journals is valued more than regional and local journals. Reputable refereed journals with national editorial boards in a field are valued more than publications in lower-level journals. Peer review research journals are valued more than peer review practitioner journals, unless the candidate can demonstrate additional significance.
E. External reviewer of candidates for promotion and tenure. Serving as a formal external reviewer for a candidate for promotion and tenure at another institution represents distinction.
F. Member of advisory boards. The broader the external audience and impact the higher the potential for Distinction.
G. Leading peers in research. Assisting peers in research and publication may merit distinction.