

**Department of Curriculum and Teaching**

**Guidelines for Annual Assessment and Promotion and Tenure**

**College of Education**

**Approved by the faculty of the  
Department of Curriculum and Teaching  
November 4, 2011**

**Approved by the Provost on January 31, 2012**

**Revisions approved by the faculty of the  
Department of Curriculum and Teaching  
September 18, 2015 and November 11,  
2016**

**Department of Curriculum and Teaching  
College of Education Guidelines for  
Annual Assessment and Promotion and Tenure**

- I. Introduction**
- II. Annual Faculty Assessment**
- III. Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure**
- IV. Teaching**
- V. Research/Creative Work**
- VI. Outreach**
- VII. Service**

**Appendix A: Outside Reviewer Invitation Template**

**Appendix B: Ballot Templates for Promotion and Tenure Votes**

**Appendix C: Criteria for Evaluating C&T Teaching Evaluation of Significance and Productivity**

**Appendix D: Department of C&T Research/Creative Work and Evaluation of Significance and Productivity**

**Appendix E: Criteria for Evaluating C& T Outreach**

**Appendix F: Department of C & T Service – Evaluation of Significance and Productivity**

**Appendix G: Department of Curriculum and Teaching Graduate Faculty Appointment and Reappointment Criteria and Standards**

**Appendix H: Department of Curriculum and Teaching Faculty Annual Review Information Provided by the Reviewee**

**Approved by the faculty of the Department of Curriculum and Teaching  
November 4, 2011**

**Approved by the Provost on January 31, 2012  
Revisions approved by the faculty of the Department of  
Curriculum and Teaching  
September 18, 2015 and November 11, 2016**

**Department of Curriculum and Teaching  
College of Education  
Guidelines for Annual Assessment and Promotion and Tenure**

**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 probationary 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/) (<http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/facultyHandbook/>) and the College of Education Procedures for Faculty Performance Review and Support (Appendix A).

These general guidelines also apply to clinical faculty, but should reflect their assigned workload and job description. As necessary, the following sections include clarifications about how the guidelines apply to clinical faculty.

**II. Annual Faculty Assessment (revised and approved 11.11.2016)**

According to the Auburn University Faculty Handbook, “All department heads/chairs or unit heads shall conduct at least one annual review before April 30 with each faculty member to evaluate his or her performance and to discuss his or her future development.” 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.

## **A. General Guidelines**

### **Phase 1. Submission of Review Materials**

By the last Friday in January, each faculty member submits to the department head an electronic dossier that includes:

- a. Standard Biographical Data sheet.
- b. Percent breakdown of the allocation of time and effort for teaching, research/creative work, outreach, and service for the past three years.
- c. List of honors and awards. Include academic honors, teaching awards, fellowships (such as NEH, NEA), internal support (including professional improvement leave), election to professional societies, etc.
- d. List of scholarly contributions that follows the outline in the *AU Faculty Handbook*, sec. 3.6.5.
- e. A personal statement (not to exceed 1000 words) that includes a self-assessment of the extent to which the reviewee fulfilled his/her duties and achieved goals for the review period and an annual plan indicating workload and professional goals for the next academic year.
- f. Any supporting materials the reviewee wishes to include (e.g, copies of publications).

All probationary faculty, clinical lecturers, and assistant clinical professors prepare their materials with the assistance of the mentoring committee in standard Auburn format.

### **Phase 2. Tenured Faculty Review of Probationary Faculty, Clinical Lecturers, Assistant Clinical Professors, and Faculty Seeking Promotion (target—Feb. 15)**

Probationary faculty, Clinical Lecturers, and Assistant Clinical Professors also participate in an annual review by their tenured colleagues in the department. Associate professors who intend to apply for promotion to professor may also choose to have their dossiers reviewed by the full professors in the department.

At least two weeks prior to the scheduled date of the annual review meeting of tenured faculty, the department head makes available to tenured faculty the dossiers for each faculty member who is to be reviewed.

On the date of the annual review meeting of tenured faculty, each reviewee 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 reviewee's progress in the areas of teaching, research, service, outreach, and collegiality. In the case of unpromoted clinical faculty, the discussion should focus on the areas of teaching, research, service, and outreach in accordance with their workload assignment and job description, along with collegiality. For probationary faculty and unpromoted clinical 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 (faculty in their first year with the department will receive comments only).

Pursuant to this meeting and before the faculty annual review (FAR) conference, the department head will provide each reviewee with a written document summarizing comments from tenured faculty and (if applicable) the results of the formative ballot.

Note: 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.)

### **Phase 3. Formal FAR Conference (before April 1)**

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

Before the conference, the department head reviews the current and cumulative contributions and progress of each faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, outreach, service, and collegiality based on the faculty member's specific responsibilities and workload assignment. 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 department head assesses each faculty member's performance in relation to departmental criteria using 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). In addition to providing an assessment of performance in each area, the department head also provides an overall assessment of the faculty member's performance using one of the same descriptors.

During the conference, the department head and faculty member will discuss the department head's assessment of the faculty member's performance and the faculty member's professional goals and workload allocation for the next academic year.

### **Phase 4. Written Faculty Annual Review Report (by April 15)**

Within two weeks of the FAR conference, the department head prepares a written report covering the major points of the conference. The report indicates the faculty member's overall performance level and includes evaluative comments according to the performance descriptors Exemplary, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Marginal, or Unacceptable. The report specifies the faculty member's assignment for the next academic year and may include feedback from the department head regarding the faculty member's professional goals.

### **Phase 5. Report Receipt Confirmation by Signature (due back by April 30)**

The faculty member receives a copy of the report, which must be signed by both the department head and the faculty member and submitted to the Dean's Office. Each faculty member is responsible for signing a copy of the report to indicate that it was received. If the faculty member disagrees with information in the report, then she or he may write a response and append it to the report. One copy of the signed report and response, if

applicable, is retained for the faculty member's departmental personnel file and the faculty member also receives a final copy. 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.

Loads for clinical faculty typically include a higher percentage in the area of teaching and may include limited or no time for research, outreach, or service.

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 faculty member's appointment. Service to the university may or may not be required for clinical appointments, depending on the established workload. See the AU Faculty Handbook for further information.

In C&T, service is included in the workload appointment assignment. Many service activities are related to teaching and may be factored into the teaching appointment percentage (e.g., curriculum development, student advising). The minimum service appointment for tenured faculty in C&T is 5%. This percentage should be appropriately adjusted within the context of the overall service activities and responsibilities listed in detail in the annual review. Tenure-track faculty should not bear the burden of excessive committee assignments. Service shall not ordinarily be reflected as more than 5% in the appointment percentage for tenure-track faculty, except in extraordinary cases.

Faculty members confirm their service activities with the department head in the annual review process. Clinical faculty should not be required to participate in service activities unless specifically included in their workload. 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. Certain limitations may be imposed on the roles that clinical faculty members can play. See Graduate Faculty Appointment and Reappointment Criteria and Standards in the AU Faculty Handbook and the Department of Curriculum and Teaching *Graduate Faculty Appointment and Reappointment Criteria and Standards* (See Appendix G).

## **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. Note that these areas only apply to clinical faculty members as specified in their workload and job descriptions.

An **Acceptable** level indicates general productivity. A tenure-track 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 tenure-track candidate for promotion and tenure



from assistant professor to associate professor should demonstrate Distinctive productivity (typically, in at least two of the categories). A tenure-track candidate for promotion from associate professor to full professor should demonstrate Distinction (typically, in at least three of the categories).

**Highest Distinction** demonstrates the faculty member has fully established a national/international reputation in her/his field.

After a clinical lecturer completes the doctoral degree, the C&T faculty shall vote on whether to promote the **clinical lecturer** to **clinical assistant professor**.

Tenure-track 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.

Clinical candidates for promotion from **assistant clinical** to **associate clinical professor** in C&T are expected to demonstrate a level of Distinction in the area of teaching, and at least an acceptable rating in all other areas reflected in their workload. They also need to demonstrate collegiality as defined in this document. 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 clinical 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.

Clinical candidates for promotion from **associate clinical** to **full clinical professor** in C&T are expected to demonstrate a rating of Highest Distinction in the area of teaching and a rating of at least Distinction in all areas relevant to their workload. The candidate must also demonstrate evidence of a national/international reputation in her/his discipline. This level of accomplishment must be substantiated through internal and external review and recognition.

### 3. Tenure

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

Note that **clinical faculty members are not eligible** for tenure or de facto tenure.

### 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 and clinical 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 in the case of tenure-track faculty or application for promotion in the case of clinical faculty. 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 or towards promotion in the case of clinical faculty. 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, a 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. Dossier and Supporting Materials for Promotion and Tenure, and for Promotion**

After initiating the process, the candidate prepares the dossier for promotion and tenure or for promotion 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 or for promotion 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 or for promotion 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:

### **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.

### **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 tenure-track 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."

### **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.

#### **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.

#### **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](#))

#### **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. Schedule for Promotion and Tenure, or for Promotion**

According to the [Faculty Handbook](#) (Chapter 3), nominations for promotion and tenure or for promotion 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.)

### **A. 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.

### **B. 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.

Note that the category of "Teaching contracts and grants" for clinical faculty members seeking promotion by Auburn University guidelines should include the ability to initiate and maintain a program of clinical practice support by contracts, grants, or

generated income. Additionally, publications and presentations related to teaching may be necessary to develop the national/international stature needed for promotion by a clinical faculty member. Peer-reviewed or refereed work is valued more highly than non-peer-reviewed endeavors.

## **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 least 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 probationary faculty member's developing research/creative work agenda should be a vital component of the third-year review.

### **A. Graduate faculty status**

**Each tenure-track faculty member must obtain Level II Graduate Faculty status before submitting the dossier for promotion and tenure. This requirement does not apply to clinical faculty members seeking promotion.** See Department of Curriculum and Teaching Graduate Faculty Appointment and Reappointment Criteria and Standards (See Appendix G).

For the tenure and/or promotion process for tenure-track faculty, 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.

The expectation for clinical faculty members seeking promotion is that their scholarly output will largely be tied to the teaching area, as described above. However, if their workload includes time for research, then they should be held to the same requirements as tenure-track faculty.

### **B. 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.

### **C. 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. Typically, clinical faculty members will not have workload specifically assigned to outreach, although they may engage in outreach-related activities as a part of their teaching assignment.

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 web site.

### **A. Evaluating Faculty Productivity in Outreach**

Evidence of outreach activities include but are not limited to the activities described in the following section. They should reflect a program of activity.

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

### **B. 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.

## **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. However, clinical faculty should not be evaluated on service activities unless specifically included in their workload.

### **A. Evaluating Service**

All service activities must be documented with regard to significance and contribution. Service activities should contribute to the needs of the department, the College, the University, the local community and state, and the profession.

### **B. Categories**

Artifacts for evaluation of service include:

1. 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
2. College Service
  - a. Committees
  - b. Advisor to student organization
  - c. Work on accreditation documentation (e.g. SACS, NCATE, etc.)

3. University Service
  - a. Committees
  - b. Other university-level service
  
4. 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  
Member of advisory boards
  - f. See Appendix E for detailed examples of professional activities related to service

**Appendix A: College of Education: Procedures for  
Faculty Performance Review and Support  
July, 2011\***

*Approved by College of Education Faculty and Governance Committee August 1, 2011 and by the College of Education Leadership Council on September 13, 2011. Revisions suggested by the Provost's Office during a subsequent review were approved by the College of Education Faculty and Governance Committee on December 9, 2011. Provost granted approval on January 31, 2012.*

**This document was developed by the Faculty and Governance Committee of the College of Education in consultation with the Leadership Council (Dean, Associate Dean, and the four Department Heads) during 2010-11. It provides guidance for departments and individual faculty by:**

**Explicating College-wide, consistent procedures for providing faculty members with performance evaluations by which progress toward tenure and/or promotion can be assessed; and**

**Describing supportive assistance for colleagues to advance their academic careers.**

**This document is intended as a supplement to Chapter 3: Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures in Auburn University's Faculty Handbook, a revision of which was approved June 17, 2011. A searchable version of the handbook is available on the provost's webpage at this link: <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/facultyHandbook/>**

**These are the general College of Education guidelines and procedures. Department specific requirements, expectations, and norms for tenure and promotion are explicated by each department. A copy of these documents is available on the College of Education's G drive and from each Department Head.**

**A. Newly-Hired, Tenure-Seeking Faculty**

- 1. Offer letters for prospective faculty members shall specify work load distributions as a percentage of time to be allocated to teaching, research, outreach, and service. The possible distribution is 60% teaching and 25% research with the remaining allocated to 10% outreach and 5% service. The College of Education defines a 3-credit course as 12%; thus, 60% teaching constitutes five 3-credit courses during an academic year. The University requires that at least 25% is designated towards research. The offer letters also address expectations related to research, outreach, and/or service.**
- 2. Department Heads meet with newly hired faculty members to review and discuss the expectations included in the offer letter and provide additional details about job performance expectations, including the following:**

- a. **Specifics of teaching load, including but not limited to course assignments for the initial year (which typically include one course reduction advising, expectations for distance courses, and likelihood of summer teaching;**
  - b. **Research expectations related to journal publication and applying for external funding;**
  - c. **Activities that constitute outreach, including performance expectations for outreach;**
  - d. **Service, including performance expectations for service;**
  - e. **Conditions for negotiating changes in the distribution of effort across teaching, research, service, and outreach.**
3. **Faculty members are individually responsible for collecting and maintaining on-going evidence of job performance as it relates to teaching, research, outreach, and service, to develop a dossier using the specified format, and annually enter appropriate information into Digital Measures.**

#### **B. Pre-tenure Reviews (Annual and Third-Year)**

1. **During annual reviews, Department Heads provide tenure-seeking faculty with typical departmental markers of annual progress in teaching, research, service, and outreach. The process identifies accomplishments, areas for improvement, and/or goals for the following year. (Note: All faculty are reviewed annually by Department Heads. This process is described in the University's Faculty Handbook.)**
2. **Third-Year Review**
  - a. **The purpose of the Third-Year Review is three-fold. It provides tenure-seeking faculty with (1) an assessment of progress toward meeting criteria for tenure and promotion, (2) guidance on evidence that could be included in a promotion and tenure dossier in order to document accomplishments, and (3) identification of resources and other sources of support for performance enhancement.**
  - b. **The review is conducted by the tenured members of the department who write a letter to the candidate, noting accomplishments and deficits, if any.**
  - c. **The faculty member being reviewed prepares a dossier, using the standard format that provides evidence of accomplishments and progress using the department's promotion and tenure criteria.**
  - d. **Since at least three peer reviews of teaching are to be included in the promotion and tenure dossier, it is strongly recommended that at least one peer review be**

completed prior to the Third-Year Review. These reviews could be conducted by the Biggio Center or by faculty in the candidate's department.

- e. Since student course evaluations are included in promotion and tenure dossiers, it is strongly recommended that evaluations from multiple courses be included in the Third-Year Review dossier.
- f. The Department Head convenes a meeting of tenured faculty at which the candidate presents the dossier, followed by a Q&A. The meeting is run by the Department Head who insures that discussions remain focused on the candidate's credentials in relation to promotion and tenure criteria.
- g. After the presentation and questions, the candidate leaves the meeting, and the faculty discuss the candidate's credentials. The Department Head participates by facilitating the discussion, insuring that notes are taken, and conducting and recording the vote which is by secret ballot. The Department Head votes by secret ballot at the same time as faculty. The vote is tabulated at the meeting, verified by at least two voting faculty members, and announced at the meeting.
- h. A letter is prepared by a faculty representative that reflects the discussion and reports progress and any deficits based on department criteria for promotion and tenure. A draft of this letter is provided to all participating faculty for review and revision. This revised letter is submitted to the candidate and Department Head by the faculty representative. After delivery of the letter, the representative meets with the candidate to respond to questions about perceptions regarding particular strengths or weaknesses in progress toward tenure and promotion.
- i. The Department Head provides a separate evaluation. After delivery of the letter to the candidate, the Department Head meets with the candidate to discuss any particular strengths or weakness in his or her progress toward tenure and promotion. The Department Head's evaluation will be available to all tenured and higher ranking faculty in a secure location.
- j. If deficits are identified, the Department Head should insure that the candidate develops a plan for addressing the deficits that includes specific activities and timeline for each activity. The Department Head may appoint one or more faculty mentors to assist the candidate with development of the plan. The plan should be reviewed and approved by the Department Head.
- k. Third-Year Review letters are sent to the Dean at the time they are sent to the candidate. They are included in the Promotion and Tenure dossier.
- l. Candidates hired with prior service credit towards tenure must schedule a midterm review (similar to 3rd year review evaluation) before to submitting their materials for tenure and/or promotion review. Procedures are the same as with Third-Year Review.

## C. Promotion and Tenure Procedures

### 1. Timeline

Department Heads are expected to identify faculty who will be applying for promotion and/or tenure by the beginning of summer prior to the fall when faculty are required to submit dossiers. The Department Head shall meet with the faculty member to review the COE Promotion and Tenure Policies, AU policies, the content of the dossier, and timeline for submission. The Department Head shall inform the COE Dean's Office in writing by July 1st of any faculty intending to go up for promotion and/or tenure.

According to the Faculty Handbook,

“There is no fixed requirement for years of service at a given rank before a faculty member can be promoted or tenured. However, the qualifications for tenure or for each professorial rank generally cannot be demonstrated fully in less than four complete years of service. Only in exceptional and well-documented cases, in which a faculty member has met all requirements for promotion and/or tenure in a shorter time, should he or she be recommended for promotion and/or tenure before completing four years in rank.”

In accordance with Auburn University Senate guidelines, the candidate will have access to all internally written letters. Internal letters must be submitted through the Department Head.

Specific dates are announced annually but generally follow this timeline:

#### October

Dossiers are due to the department. No new information, including external letters, shall be added to the dossier after submission deadline, including external letters. Only letters from the Department Committee, Department Head, and departmental faculty may be added after this date.

#### November

Department recommendations and dossiers are due in the Dean's office.

#### December

All recommendations and dossier are due in Provost's Office.

### 2. Timeline for 2011-2012:

[http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/announcements/20110421\\_PromotionandTenure2012.html](http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/announcements/20110421_PromotionandTenure2012.html)

### 3. External Letters

External review letters shall be required of all faculty going up for promotion and tenure regardless of rank. A minimum of four letters shall be requested from faculty

**at peer institutions and a minimum of three external evaluation letters shall be included in the dossier by October 1st. All letters received must be included in the dossier.**

**The faculty member going up for promotion shall provide a list of potential external reviewers, their institutional affiliations, contact information and a brief description of why each is qualified to provide an external review to the Department Head by August 1st. The applicant must identify any potential conflict of interest in the list of potential external reviewers.**

**The Department Head, in consultation with departmental faculty, may add potential reviewers to the list. Once the final list of potential reviewers is established, the Department Head shall submit the list to the candidate to give the candidate an opportunity to request removal of any potential reviewers who may have a conflict of interest.**

**Once the final list is approved by the Department Head, the Faculty Handbook requires that a minimum of three people will be contacted by the Department Head and requested to serve as an outside reviewer. Department Heads are encouraged to contact more individuals to increase the odds of receiving three letters. The candidate shall not know which outside reviewers were chosen from the list of potential reviewers and are not allowed to contact potential reviewers.**

**In some instances a potential reviewer may be someone who is not from a peer institution (e.g., non-research university or the private sector) when there is a compelling reason. In such cases, the Department Head must provide a written justification which shall be approved by the Dean prior to their inclusion on the potential reviewer list.**

**Department Heads shall request the letter of review from external reviewers using either the COE template (Appendix A) or the format suggested on the Provost's webpage: <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/guidelines.html>**

**All letters shall be addressed and sent to the Department Head. All letters received by the Department Head by October 1 shall be included in the Dossier. In cases where AU policies allow, candidates may request support letters from people inside and outside Auburn University to include in the dossier but these letters shall not be considered external reviews.**

**All letters received from external reviewers must go forward to the Dean and Tenure and Promotion committee.**

#### **4. Departmental Dossier Review**

**The Dossier shall be made available for faculty review by October 1 for a minimum of two weeks. The Dossier is considered a confidential document and shall be kept in a secure place in the Departmental Office and made available for faculty review. A list of eligible voting faculty members shall be kept by the Department. Department Heads shall ensure that only those faculty members eligible to vote are allowed access to the completed Dossiers.**

#### **5. Departmental Meeting**

**The Department Head is responsible for insuring proper procedures are followed. The candidate presents the dossier and responds to questions for the first part of the meeting. The Department Head will be present in the meeting as a non-voting member.**

**It is the responsibility of the Department Head to insure that discussions remain focused on the candidate's credentials in relation to promotion and tenure criteria. After the presentation and questions, the candidate leaves the meeting, and the faculty discuss the candidate's credentials as represented by the Dossier in relation to promotion and/or tenure criteria. The Department Head shall participate by facilitating the discussion, insuring that notes are taken.**

**Once a thorough discussion of candidate's credentials is complete, the Department Head shall conduct the vote of eligible faculty. A separate vote shall be taken for tenure and for promotion by secret ballot by indicating on ballots provided by the Department Head (Appendix B) whether each faculty member supports the candidate for promotion and tenure. Any faculty member who has a vote on the candidate at a higher level (e.g., University Promotion and Tenure Committee) has a choice of whether to vote either at the department meeting or at the higher level.**

**Once ballots have been cast and submitted to the Department Head during the meeting, two faculty members shall count the votes in the meeting and the Department Head shall confirm the count in presence of all faculty who voted during the meeting. The vote shall be announced prior to conclusion of the meeting.**

**The Department Head will communicate the department's vote and recommendation to the candidate so that the candidate may make an informed decision about whether or not to continue with the process of seeking promotion and/or tenure.**

**Candidates have the right to submit rebuttal letters. See Chapter Three of the Faculty Handbook for details at this link:**

**[http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/facultyHandbook/chapter%203-personnel\\_policies.html](http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/facultyHandbook/chapter%203-personnel_policies.html)**



**Faculty who are not able to attend the voting meeting shall have the right to vote prior to the meeting by submitting a sealed, written ballot to the Department Head prior to the departmental meeting. Any vote submitted after the departmental meeting shall not count as a vote.**

#### **6. Documentation after Departmental Meeting**

**A designated faculty member prepares a draft letter to the candidate that summarizes the department's discussion and reports the final vote. To insure accuracy, the draft letter shall be made available for review by voting faculty. All voting faculty are expected to review the letter prior to its inclusion in the dossier. Emailing of this document to faculty is prohibited to ensure its confidentiality.**

**The Department Head shall write a separate letter that records the vote as outlined in Auburn University policies and provides his or her own evaluation of the candidate. The Department Head shall make a clear recommendation either for or against promotion and/or tenure.**

**The Department Head's letter shall provide information regarding the candidate's workload assignment during the period under review in relation to productivity, benchmarks, norms and/or expectations, and an indication of how the candidate's record compares with previous successful candidates. This letter must provide the rationale for the decision that is evident to people outside the discipline and outside the department.**

**According to AU policy, faculty members may submit letters explaining support or lack of support for the candidate's promotion and/or tenure. These letters are shared with the candidate who has the right to submit a rebuttal. The letters shall be placed in the dossier prior to its submission to the Dean's office. (See Chapter 3, Faculty Handbook for information on these letters.)**

#### **7. Submission of Dossier to Dean and Provost**

**The dossier is due in the Dean's Office by a deadline in November that is specified annually. Once the dossier is forwarded to the Dean's office, no additional documents from the department level shall be added.**

**The Dean reviews the dossier and writes an evaluative letter that clearly states whether the Dean recommends or does not recommend the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. This letter is placed into the dossier prior to forwarding to the Provost's office.**

**The dossier is due to the Provost's office in December by a specific date announced annually.**

## Appendix A: Outside Reviewer Invitation Template

Date\_\_\_\_\_, Year

Dear Dr. \_\_\_\_\_:

On behalf of my colleagues, I write to ask your assistance in assessing the work of Dr. Name, a candidate for promotion to rank / tenure at Auburn University. Attached you will find a copy of Dr. Name's current *vitae* and supporting materials.

We seek your assessment of the quality and significance of Dr. Name's scholarly accomplishments, especially the work she/he discusses in her dossier. It would be most helpful if you could comment on:

1. The quality and quantity of scholarly productivity.
2. The extent to which Dr. Name has gained a national and/or international reputation in the field
3. The potential for continued scholarly productivity and impact in the field.
4. Whether in your estimate Dr. Name meets the threshold for tenure as outlined in the Auburn University policy below.

Your letter will become part of Dr. Name's confidential file as a candidate for promotion. This file is evaluated by the appropriate faculty in our department, the Dean of the College of Education, the Provost and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the President.

Auburn University's Faculty Handbook (Section 3.8) states: "Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of 1) teaching and/or outreach and 2) research/creative work. He or she is further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years. In addition, he or she is expected to have contributed some service to the University."

To help assess the quality and reputation of the candidate's research/creative work, confidential external letters are requested from outside evaluators. The Auburn University faculty Handbook (Section 3.11.C.3.D.1) states: "These evaluators shall be people outside of Auburn University who are nationally acknowledged experts in the candidate's field and can comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate's work. If the evaluator is from an academic institution, he or she shall be of higher academic rank than the candidate. Letters from the candidate's major professor for a graduate degree, from former graduate students, and from ongoing research partners are unacceptable. Evaluators may be associated with industry, government agencies, foundations, etc."

Please begin your review by identifying your current rank and institutional affiliation and the relationship, if any, that you have with Dr. Name (e.g., current or past collaborator, or former colleague). Your review will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law.

We hope that you will agree to help us. I know that writing reviews is time-consuming and I thank you for your assistance with this important professional process. We must receive your evaluation of Dr. Name's scholarly achievements by September 1st. You may send the review to me by USPS to the address on this letterhead. A postage-paid, business reply envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

If you are unable to provide an evaluation of Dr. Name's work, please contact me immediately at 334 phone number or by email at \_\_\_\_\_.

We request your assistance by destroying the enclosed materials after you have completed your review.

With Sincere Appreciation,

Dept. Head Signature

Contact Information

**Appendix B: Ballot Templates for Promotion and Tenure Votes**

**1. Promotion and Tenure of an Assistant Professor**

**Department Name**

**Date**

**Please check the box that indicates your vote.**

**Promotion:**

\_\_\_\_\_ **YES, I support (Candidates Name) for promotion to Associate Professor.**

\_\_\_\_\_ **NO, I do not support (Candidates Name) for promotion to Associate Professor**

\_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN**

**Faculty Number:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Present** \_\_\_\_\_ **In Absentia** \_\_\_\_\_

**2. Tenure:**

\_\_\_\_\_ **YES, I support (Candidate's Name) for Tenure.**

\_\_\_\_\_ **NO I do not support (Candidate's Name) for Tenure.**

\_\_\_\_\_ **ABSTAIN**

**Faculty Number:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Present** \_\_\_\_\_ **In Absentia** \_\_\_\_\_

**Promotion of an Associate Professor**

**Department Name**

**Date**

**Please check the box that indicates your vote.**

\_\_\_\_\_ **Yes, I support (Candidate's Name) for promotion to Professor.**

\_\_\_\_\_ **No, I do not support (Candidates Name) for promotion to Professor.**

**Faculty Number:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Present** \_\_\_\_\_ **In Absentia** \_\_\_\_\_

## **Appendix C: 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 at AU or another institution. 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 D: 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 E: 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.
- B. 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 F: 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.

#### **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.

**Appendix G: Department of Curriculum and Teaching  
Graduate Faculty Appointment and Reappointment Criteria and Standards**

**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHING**

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**

**Approved 12/15/2010**

**I. LEVELS OF MEMBERSHIP**

*Identify and define each level of graduate faculty membership.*

The Department/College of Curriculum and Teaching recognizes four levels[s] of membership on the Graduate Faculty:

- Level 0: The graduate faculty member may teach at the graduate level (6000 and 7000 level courses) and serve, but not direct master's committees. Faculty may not serve on specialist or doctoral committees.
- Level 1: The graduate faculty member may teach at the graduate level (6000 - 7000) level courses), may serve on graduate students' advisory committee, and chair advisory committees for master's or specialist in education degree students. Exceptions to allow teaching of 8000 level courses are permitted upon approval of the Department Head and the Dean of the Graduate School. Exceptions will not apply to the supervision of doctoral dissertations.
- Level 2: The graduate faculty may participate in the activities delineated for Level 1 and may also teach at the 8000-level and chair advisory committees for doctoral students.
- Level 2a: The graduate faculty may participate in all of the activities delineated for Level 2, except for the direction of doctoral dissertations. Exceptions are permitted upon approval of the Dean of Graduate School

**II. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS**

*For each level of membership, include the criteria and standards for initial appointment and reappointment. The criteria and standards must meet the minimum standards established by the Graduate School and described in "Graduate Faculty Appointment and Reappointment Policy."*

**LEVEL: 0**

**A. Initial Appointment**

1. Candidates must have an earned doctorate/terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline.



## **B. Reappointment**

1. Prior service at Level 0.
2. Candidates must have documentation for the previous year as evidenced by relevant student, peer, or administrative evaluations of performance at or above a level that satisfies standards for the department and be recommended for reappointment by the tenured faculty in the program area and the Department Head. Level 0 appointment may be renewed annually upon recommendation of the tenured program faculty for a maximum of five years. Reappointment beyond that five-year period will require a 2/3 vote of the Graduate Level 2 faculty in the department.

## **LEVEL: 1**

### **A. Initial Appointment**

1. Candidates must have an earned doctorate/terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline and hold the rank of Assistant Professor or above.
2. Faculty members can maintain Level 1 membership for up to seven academic years. However, faculty must have attained Level 2 membership prior to promotion and tenure.

### **B. Reappointment**

1. Faculty members will not be reappointed to Level 1 membership immediately following their initial appointment. However, under unusual circumstances, the Department Head may reappoint faculty members to Level 1 membership after they have served as Level 2 members.

## **LEVEL: 2**

### **A. Initial Appointment**

1. Candidates must have an earned doctorate/terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline, rank of Assistant Professor or above, and hold tenure or a tenure-track appointment.
2. Candidates must have at least three years experience participating regularly in the graduate program in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching or at another institution of higher education. Participation must include effective teaching of courses at the 7000 or 8000 level and serving on graduate student advisory committees and may also include participating in graduate seminars and directing the research of graduate students.
3. Candidates must have served on the advisory committee of at least three graduate

students who have graduated, either at Auburn or at another institution of higher education, and must have made substantial and positive contributions to the field project, thesis, or dissertation of at least one current or graduated student, either at Auburn or at another institution of higher education.

4. Candidates can demonstrate their scholarship in many kinds of professional publications related to research, theory, and practice. However, prior to initial appointment or reappointment to Level 2 membership, candidates must provide the following evidence of the range and quality of their scholarship:
  - a. Candidates must be authors or co-authors of at least two research articles published in or accepted for publication in reputable refereed journals. Typically, such journals will have national editorial boards, although articles that do not meet this criterion may be submitted for peer evaluation. Research articles must demonstrate the candidates' abilities to use research paradigms appropriate to their research questions (e.g., quantitative, qualitative, philosophical, or historical paradigms). Candidates must be the major author of at least one these articles. Candidates who submit atypical manifestations of research to satisfy this requirement (e.g., books, monographs, or multimedia products) must explain to Level 2 members how their products demonstrate their research competence.
  - b. Candidates must also be authors or co-authors of a third scholarly contribution (either already published or accepted for publication) which can be a third article meeting the criteria listed in 4A above or one of the following:
    - an article related to theory or practice in a refereed journal
    - an article in a refereed proceedings publication
    - an externally funded grant with a substantial research component
    - other significant scholarly work (e.g., books, book chapters, monographs)
    - multimedia productions

In evaluating publications of all types, member of the Level 2 Graduate Faculty must consider issues such as (a) the originality and distinctiveness of the publications, (b) the relevance of the publications to the candidates' respective areas of specialization, (c) the contributions that candidates made to multi-authored publications, and (d) per-page fees and journal acceptance rates.

Candidates must realize that, typically, additional scholarly publications, including research articles, will be required for promotion to associate professor rank in the department.

5. Candidates should submit evidence of other significant professional scholarly commitment involving any one, or any combination, of such activities as (a) making presentations before learned and professional organizations; (b) writing non-research professional articles, book reviews, scientific and industrial reports, popular articles, or similar materials; (c) rendering any type of consulting services that provide evidence of

the candidates' professional standing and competence in their respective fields; (d) participating in the activities of appropriate professional organizations by holding offices or serving in other responsible capacities; (e) performing significant administrative duties connected with the graduate program of the department, the college, or the university; and (f) attaining extramural support that is evidence of professional standing

## **B. Reappointment**

1. Candidates must seek reappointment before or during the last six months of each seven-year term. (Credentials should be made available to faculty two weeks prior to the November or the April meeting of Level 2 members.)
2. Candidates must meet Level 2 initial appointment criteria.
3. Candidates must have completed the department's peer review at least once during the past seven years.

## **LEVEL: 2A**

### **A. Initial Appointment**

1. Candidate must desire Level 2A and occupy a full-time administrative position. Initial application should be made at the time of appointment to the administrative position. Appointment is available only to administrators who held Level 2 membership or a comparable appointment at another institution prior to administrative appointment.

### **B. Reappointment**

1. Upon initial appointment to Level 2A, the full-time administrator may maintain Level 2A until up to four years after stepping down from the full-time administrative position and returning to departmental faculty

## **III. TERMS OF APPOINTMENT**

*For each level of membership, describe the terms of appointment, indicating when faculty may apply for appointment.*

**LEVEL 0:** The term of appointment is one year. Application should be made prior to assuming teaching responsibilities.

**LEVEL 1:** The term of appointment is seven years. Faculty appointed to Level 1 may apply for Level 2 any time Level 2 criteria have been met.

**LEVEL 2:** The term of appointment is seven years. Faculty serving at Level 2 must seek reappointment during the last six months of each seven-year term.

**LEVEL 2A:** The term of appointment is up to four years after the candidate has stepped down from a full-time administrative position and returned to departmental faculty.

#### **IV. PROCEDURES FOR NOMINATION: INITIAL APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT**

*For each level of membership, describe the nomination process for both initial appointment and reappointment.*

##### **LEVEL 0:**

###### **A. Initial Appointment**

1. The Department Head will notify candidates to apply for initial appointment. Information to be supplied by the candidate includes current curriculum vitae. The Department Head, upon recommendation by the tenured faculty in the program area, will submit application materials to the Graduate School for action by the Dean of the Graduate School. Application should be made prior to assuming teaching responsibilities.

###### **B. Reappointment**

1. The Department Head will notify candidates to apply for reappointment. Information of performance at or above a level that satisfies standards for the department. The Department Head, upon recommendation by the tenured faculty in the program area, will submit application materials to the Graduate School for action by the Dean of the Graduate School. Level 0 appointment may be renewed annually upon recommendation of the tenured program faculty for a maximum of five years. Reappointment beyond that five-year period will require a 2/3 vote of the Graduate Level2 faculty in the department.

##### **LEVEL 1**

###### **A. Initial Appointment**

1. The Department Head will notify candidates to apply for initial appointment. Application should be made via the Graduate Faculty Approval System (GFAST) on the Graduate School website. Information to be supplied by the candidate includes current curriculum vitae in compliance with that described in the Faculty Handbook. The Department Head will be notified of the application. Application should be made prior to assuming teaching responsibilities. The Department Head will recommend to the Graduate School appointment of new faculty members at the Assistant Professor rank or above to Level 2 membership upon their appointment to the faculty.

## **B. Reappointment**

1. Faculty members will not be reappointed to Level 1 membership immediately following their initial appointment. However, under unusual circumstances, the Department Head may reappoint faculty members to Level 1 membership after having served as Level 2 members.

## **LEVEL 2**

### **A. Initial Appointment**

1. The Department Head will notify candidates to apply for initial appointment. Application should be made via the Graduate Faculty Approval System (GFAST) on the Graduate School website. Candidate will obtain a password for the Graduate Faculty Approval System (GFAST) and log in to the system to Apply for Appointment. Candidates will upload their Vita as an Adobe Acrobat file, type in answers for Department Criteria, and submit their application on GFAST. The system will send an email message to the Department Head, who will schedule a meeting of Level 2 faculty to vote on the candidate's eligibility. Information to be supplied by the candidate includes current curriculum vitae in compliance with that describe in the Faculty Handbook.
2. As soon as Level 1 faculty meet the requirements for Level 2 membership, but no later than six months before the end of their seventh year of Level 1 membership, candidates must submit to the Department Head their credentials for Level 2 membership. (Credentials should be made be available to faculty two weeks prior to the November or the April meeting of Level 2 members.)
3. The Department Head will conduct the meetings of Level 2 members at which candidates' credentials are discussed. At those meetings candidates will make statements concerning their credentials and answer colleagues' questions about their qualification for Level 2 membership. After candidates leave the meeting, Level 2 members will discuss the candidates' qualifications and then vote (Yes, No, Abstain). The Department Head will appoint two faculty members to count the ballots and to announce the results before the end of the meeting.
4. If at least two-thirds of the Level 2 members eligible to vote cast Yes votes for a candidate, that candidate will be recommended for Level 2 membership for a seven-year term. After notifying the candidate of the results, the Department Head will approve the application on GFAST, reporting the faculty's recommendation and assuring the Dean that the department has followed the process described in this document.
5. If fewer than two-thirds of the Level 2 members eligible to vote cast Yes votes for a candidate, the candidate will not be recommended for Level 2 membership. The Department Head will report the vote to the candidate as soon as possible and will

review with the candidate the process for appealing the department faculty's decision or send credentials forward with the department's vote or choose to discontinue the process and reapply late.

6. Level 2 members unable to vote at a called meeting should obtain ballots from the Department Head and leave their marked ballots with the Department Head prior to the meeting.

## **B. Reappointment**

1. Candidates must seek reappointment before or during the last six months of each seven-year term. (Credentials should be made available to faculty two weeks prior to the November or the April meeting of Level 2 members.)
2. The Department Head must verify that candidates have completed the department's peer review of teaching effectiveness at least once during the past seven years.
3. Procedures for reappointment will be the same as those for original appointment to Level 2 membership.

## **LEVEL: 2A**

### **A. Initial Appointment**

1. Appointment is automatic based on a request from the candidate. The candidate must notify the Dean of the Graduate School.

### **B. Reappointment**

1. Reappointment is automatic based on a request from the candidate. The candidate must notify the Dean of the Graduate School.

### **C. Reappointment from Level 2A to Level 2**

1. The candidate may serve for a maximum of four years at Level 2A after stepping down from an administrative appointment. Candidates applying for reappointment to Level 2 will show evidence of contributions to the graduate program and a record of scholarly publication. Candidate should meet all criteria and standards for Level 2 reappointment (See section II).

## **V. APPEALS PROCESS**

*Describe the process for appealing a decision to deny initial appointment or reappointment.*

1. If the Dean of the Graduate School judges that candidates for original appointment or reappointment to Level 2 membership have not met approved criteria or that the

department has not followed approved procedures, the Dean of the Graduate School must notify the candidates and the Department Head.

2. Candidates denied appointment or reappointment to Level 2 may appeal by letter to the Dean of the Graduate School. The letter shall have the approval of the Department Head and the Academic Dean. The letter will detail the reasons for appeal.
3. Appeals, based on procedural irregularity, will be reviewed by the Credentials Committee.

**Appendix H: Department of Curriculum and Teaching Faculty Annual Review  
Information to Be Supplied by the Reviewee  
(Adapted from the *Faculty Handbook*, sec. 3.6.5)**

**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHING  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**

**Approved by Faculty Vote on November 11, 2016**

- Standard Biographical Data sheet ([PDF Form](#)).
- Percent breakdown of the allocation of time and effort for teaching, research/creative work, outreach, and service for the past three years.
- List of honors and awards. Include academic honors, teaching awards, fellowships (such as NEH, NEA), internal support (including professional improvement leave), election to professional societies, etc.
- List of scholarly contributions that follows the outline below.
- A personal statement (not to exceed 1000 words) that includes a contextual statement addressing a) the reviewee's scholarly work and how it aligns with the mission of the institution and unit, b) a self-assessment of the extent to which the reviewee fulfilled his/her duties and achieved goals for the review period, and c) an annual plan proposing workload and professional goals for the next review period. (Parts of the personal statement may duplicate sections of the list of scholarly contributions – see A.8., B.9., and C.1. below)
- Any supporting materials the reviewee wishes to include (e.g, copies of publications).

**Outline for Scholarly Contributions by the Reviewee**

*(Reviewees should highlight scholarly activities for the current review period.)*

**A. Teaching**

1. Actual courses taught for each semester of the past three years. Indicate lecture/lab hours per week and enrollment.
2. Graduate students whose work has been completed. Indicate degree awarded to the student, year, and, if known, position now held by the student; indicate whether the reviewee was the major professor or a committee member.
3. Graduate students on whose committee the reviewee is presently serving. Indicate whether the reviewee is the major professor or a committee member. Indicate the degree the student is working for and the work that the reviewee has done.
4. Courses and curricula developed.
5. Grants received related to teaching.



6. Publications pertaining to teaching. Include textbooks, manuals, articles on pedagogy.
7. Other contributions to teaching.
8. Statement of reviewee's teaching philosophy and self-evaluation in terms of his or her stated values. This should be no longer than one page.

B. Research/Creative Work

For publications, provide complete publication data. In cases of multiple authorship, list names of all authors in correct order. Inform the committee of the significance of author order on publications in the reviewee's disciplines. Indicate percentage of the reviewee's contribution or describe the nature of the reviewee's contribution; indicate, by means of an asterisk, student contributions. Provide, in an appendix, proof of acceptance of publications in press and proof of publications of which acceptance is conditional. Do not submit manuscripts that have not been accepted for publication. For exhibitions and performances, provide dates and locations.

1. Books.
2. Article-length publications. Distinguish by type: book chapters, articles in refereed journals and invited articles, bulletins, proceedings, transactions, abstracts, book reviews, non-refereed articles, etc.
3. Papers or lectures. Distinguish by type: papers at professional meetings, invited lectures, etc.
4. Exhibitions. Distinguish between juried or invitational shows; identify work(s) and juror (juries); indicate regional, national, or international exhibitions.
5. Performances. Distinguish between local performances, out-of-town invitationals, concert series, etc. List musical compositions here.
6. Patents and inventions.
7. Other research/creative contributions.
8. Grants and contracts. Note all co-authors, identifying the principal investigator and the involvement of the reviewee; indicate funding source and amount. Distinguish between grants received and grants applied for but not funded. (Note: Internal support and NEH and NEA fellowships should be listed under honors and awards.)
9. Description of reviewee's scholarly program. Work in progress and work anticipated should be described in no more than one page.

C. Outreach

The purpose of this section is to document achievement in outreach scholarship. It is divided into two parts. Part 1 is a reflective commentary on the reviewee's outreach

program or programs. It is intended to highlight and explain the reviewee's most significant contributions. Part 2 is a list of all of the reviewee's outreach activities and products.

1. **Commentary:** The commentary should describe and explain the scholarship involved in one or more outreach programs that you consider the major achievements of your efforts. A program is a set of activities that share a common focus and depend upon a particular expertise. The entire commentary is limited to five pages, single spaced. Each program should include the following:
  - a. *Description.* Provide a brief overview of the needs addressed, the objectives, methods, and target audience. Describe selected activities and/or products from Part B that are most illustrative of the reviewee's contribution to this program. Include example in the portfolio.
  - b. *Mission.* Indicate how the program was compatible with university and unit missions.
  - c. *Scholarship.* Describe the role of the reviewee's professional expertise in the design and execution of the program. Describe how the activities applied the reviewee's discipline to the needs of society, required integration with other disciplines, and/or generated new knowledge for the discipline and/or audience. Explain how this knowledge was communicated to broader audiences. Indicate how the program led to increased recognition of the reviewee's professional expertise by external audiences. Indicators would include requests for information; invitations to make presentations; service on review panels; receipt of contracts, grants, and professional awards, etc. **Impact.** Describe observed impacts and/or explain any unobserved impacts that are to be expected according to the discipline(s) applied. Identify the direct and indirect beneficiaries. Evidence of impact can include both quantitative results (e.g., changes in test scores, increased crop production, or widespread adoption of a product or technique) and qualitative results (e.g., testimonials from clients, reviews by knowledgeable scholars/critics).
2. **Activities and Products:** List activities and products using the categories outlined below. There is no page limit on Part B, but reviewees are encouraged to be concise in order to focus reviewers' attention on the most important contributions. In particular, numerous activities or products of the same type should be summarized to the extent possible. Brief descriptions accompanied by examples and totals will suffice.
  - a. *Instructional activities.* List the title or subject of each distinct course or presentation, the type (curriculum, course, workshop, exhibit, etc.), the duration (usually in hours), the reviewee's role in creating (developer, presenter), the target audience, the method of reaching the audience (conference presentation, telecommunications, site visit, etc.), and the number of presentations given.
  - b. *Technical assistance.* List each type of assistance (e.g., job classification), the

clientele, the contribution, and the number of times provided.

- c. *Outreach publications*. Distinguish by type as indicated in items B1–B3 (“Research/Creative Work”) above: books (including published manuals and reports), article-length publications, papers, and lectures. Provide complete publication data, including number of pages, names of all authors in correct order, and percentage of reviewee’s contributions. Indicate all refereed or peer-reviewed publications.
- d. *Electronic products*. List computer programs, websites, etc.
- e. *Other outreach products*. List videos, job aids, etc.
- f. Copyrights, patents, and inventions.
- g. Contracts, grants, and gifts.

#### D. Service

- 1. **University Service:** Distinguish among service to the University, to the college/school, and to the department. University service as part of a previously held position may be listed here. Administrative work that reduces the reviewee’s teaching or research assignment should be listed here.
- 2. **Professional Service:** Service to professional associations and learned societies such as offices held, committees served on, etc.