

Workload for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

College of Education

Approved by faculty vote 9/25/15

Policy Statement

Professional expectations of all faculty members include teaching, scholarship, and service. While advising is generally integrated into all of these activities, any workload assigned for specific advising duties, such as undergraduate advising coordinator, shall be placed in the category of service.

The distribution of effort among teaching, research/creative activity (hereafter referred to simply as scholarship), and service may vary among faculty members and from fall to spring semesters. However, the distribution of effort should always balance the scholarly and service interests of individual faculty members with their responsibility to deliver academic programs of high quality. This variation in the distribution of faculty effort is desirable because it allows optimization of faculty contributions to deliver high quality academic programs.

General Distribution Requirements

The College of Education faculty workload policy is premised on the assumption that all faculty activities in teaching, scholarship, and service constitute the equivalent of 100% effort. This is based on the notion that a faculty member who is expected to do research and to perform university service should allocate 60% of their time to teaching, 20% of their time to scholarship, and 20% of their time to service (i.e., in credit hours this would look like a 9-3-3). However, for tenure-track faculty in the College of Education the norms of distribution of workload effort may be represented in patterns other than “9-3-3.” In other words, a tenure-track faculty member begins with a 60% teaching allocation and this can vary depending on the amount of one’s service and scholarship activity that has been negotiated with the chair and approved by the dean.

Departments must have a statement in their dean and provost-approved department workload policies regarding expected annual scholarly activity for faculty. That policy shall also contain guidelines for any variance from the standard teaching assignment outlined above. Finally, any year-to-year variances in the workload of an individual faculty member may be justified through a variety of activities including, but not limited to, work with graduate students and administrative assignments, provided they are consistent with the department policy and are approved by the chair and dean.

Workload Value of Teaching, Scholarship and Service Activities

The course load for an individual full-time faculty member may vary from the fall to the spring semester of an academic year based on scholarly activity, service, and other needs of the department. The department chair and college dean must approve the annual distribution of course loads for faculty who deviate from the departmental standard teaching responsibility.

Below are guidelines for assigning workload to teaching, scholarship, and service activity. The percentage of workload assigned to teaching, service and scholarship must sum to 100%.

1. Teaching

(a) **Lecture Courses:** A lecture course is an established on-campus course that consists entirely of class meetings devoted to the presentation and discussion of course content and student assignments. A three-credit undergraduate or graduate course is normally identical to one of the three courses assigned each semester. An adjustment (increase or decrease in units) may be used by a department to take into account additional factors that significantly impact effort, such as large enrollment, service learning requirements, hybrid or online delivery, or help from graduate assistants, provided such adjustments are outlined in department-specific workload policies.

(b) **Laboratory and Clinical Courses:** A laboratory course generally has more contact hours than credit hours. Those values will vary with the number of contact hours and other factors. If a specialized accrediting body places limits on the teaching of laboratory and clinical courses in a particular program, then these limits must be respected by college and department policies.

(c) **Other Courses:** The University offers a large number of many undergraduate and graduate courses that are not easily classified as lecture, laboratory or clinical courses. The course load value assigned to each of these types of courses is determined by each department subject to constraints imposed by the policies of the department and college.

(d) **Graduate Culminating Activities:** Effort expended by a faculty member on graduate culminating activities (e.g., thesis, project, portfolio, capstone, comprehensive exam, dissertation) is included as part of the annual teaching assignment, but only to the extent that the culminating activities are represented by registered academic credits. The course load value assigned to a graduate culminating activity shall be outlined in the department workload policy.

2. Scholarship

A minimum requirement for scholarly activity shall be determined within departmental policies and should be congruent with the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Policy.

3. Service

A minimum requirement for service activity shall be determined within departmental policies and should be congruent with the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Policy

4. Exceptions

(a) **Departmental Administrative Assignments:** Departmental administrative assignments (e.g., chair, director, and coordinator) during the academic year are included in the service activities. The reduction of teaching assignments based on administrative assignments is determined by each department with the dean's approval and subject to constraints imposed by the policies of the department and college.

(b) **New faculty,** defined as first year in the professoriate, will be required to meet the workload requirement. However, they will receive a reduction in teaching load in order to devote more percentage of their effort to scholarship endeavors.

Development of Workload Policies and Procedures within the Departments

1. Each department is responsible for developing and maintaining a written workload policy that defines annual professional expectations and outlines the process for any variance from the standard teaching assignment defined in Section III. Department-specific workload policies must be approved by the college Dean and Provost, so too must any changes to such policies over time be approved. There must be consistency within the hierarchy of policies and procedures; that is, the department policies and procedures must be consistent with (and in some cases identical to) the college policies and procedures.
2. At a minimum, the policies and procedures developed by a department must require the following: (1) uniform application to all faculty members of the department; (2) for each faculty member, joint development (by the faculty member and department chair) of an annual written professional expectation document that is approved by the department chair and subject to review by the college Dean; (3) linkage of the annual workload description to the annual faculty evaluation; and (4) definition of a mechanism for implementing workload modifications during the academic year as the need arises.
3. If the annual professional activities of an individual faculty member and/or collective faculty within a department/unit are inconsistent with this policy, then the appropriate chair, dean, or provost will reexamine the professional expectations and bring them into conformity with this policy. Following this review, if necessity demands, adjustments will be made in resources to the department, in faculty compensation and/or in workload balance.
4. The faculty workload for a given academic year must be documented according to the guidelines in Section VIII and filed with the office of the dean prior to the start of the fall semester.

Workload Assignment in the Case of a Salary Buyout

As described in university policy #6100, a faculty member can be paid (in whole or in part) by a sponsored project during an academic year under an arrangement known as “salary buyout.” In the case of a salary buyout, the professional expectations of the faculty member will remain in place for the academic year, but the workload distribution shall include a redistribution of professional activity based on the terms of sponsored project, and it may not be possible to meet the distribution requirements among teaching, scholarship, and service stated in Section III. The total academic-year salary of the faculty member paid by the sponsor must be consistent with the effort assigned to the sponsored project.

Exceptions

This policy does not apply to faculty members on sabbatical leave, military leave, family medical leave, or sick leave.

Guidelines for Documentation of Faculty Workload

Documentation of faculty workload assignments for the upcoming academic year must be submitted to the dean prior to the start of the fall semester. Such documentation shall include the following items:

1. The percent of total workload assigned to teaching, scholarship, and service.
2. An explanation for any teaching assignments that are lower than the standard assignment of three 3-credit courses per semester.
3. The course designation and course load value assigned for each course taught, if available. If specific course assignments for the following year have not been made, this information should be submitted to the dean when it is available.
4. An indication if the course is team taught with another member of the faculty.

Any subsequent adjustments to a faculty member's assigned workload are subject to approval by the department chair and dean.

FACULTY EVALUATION POLICY

College of Education

Approved by faculty vote 9/25/15

Purpose

This policy is designed to address three purposes. First, it establishes College of Education policies for the annual evaluations of all faculty members. Second, it provides faculty members, department chairs, promotion and tenure committees, and the dean of the college with guidance in decisions regarding faculty development, faculty evaluation, salary determination, and promotion and/or tenure. Third, it facilitates consistency in evaluation procedures across all departments. These guidelines are companion to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures, the College of Education Faculty Workload Policy, and university policy 4290 Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation.

Faculty Evaluation

Every tenure track faculty member in the college is to be evaluated annually. The faculty evaluation process should be initiated by the individual faculty member early in the spring semester through a written self-evaluation that provides evidence of contributions in teaching, scholarly activity and service during the preceding calendar year. Faculty roles and expectations should be established annually and documented individually at the departmental level. The department chair will consider the faculty member's self-evaluation and negotiated role within the department, as well as other information relevant to faculty performance, to prepare the annual faculty evaluation in compliance with BSU Policy 4290.

Faculty members are expected to build on their strengths and contribute constructively to the welfare of the college. Given the complexity of programs in the college, differentiated faculty loads, limited resources, and the diversity of interests and talents among the faculty members, each evaluation of a faculty member must be individualized. The specific criteria used in faculty evaluation should be tailored to personal talents as well as to campus, community, and professional needs. Contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service should be shaped by both the needs of the institution and the talents and interest of the individual.

The specific role the individual has negotiated and/or been assigned within the department, the college, and the institution must be considered in evaluation. These negotiated roles shall inform the annual evaluation process, and should be incorporated in promotion and tenure determinations.

To standardize the review of faculty evaluations across departments within the College of Education, all faculty members will be evaluated annually in the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. An overall summary of the faculty member's contributions in each area should be based on the four-point scale described below. In addition, a single overall concluding summary evaluation of the faculty member synthesizing the contributions in each of the three areas should be based on the same four-point scale (With Distinction, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement).

The Four Level Scale

Departmental interpretations of the performance levels described below should reflect differences among various disciplines and provide for multiple ways to achieve at each level.

Teaching.

- With Distinction (4) – Extraordinary teaching at a level not expected to be sustained on an annual basis.
- Exceeds Expectations (3) – Exemplary teaching at a level sustainable on an annual basis.
- Meets Expectations (2) – Competent teaching that fulfills department needs and is sustainable on an annual basis.
- Needs Improvement (1) – Teaching that falls short of the expectations for teaching effectiveness.

Scholarly Activity.

- With Distinction (4) – Extraordinary scholarly accomplishment and recognition, including high visibility within the profession, at a level not expected to be sustained on an annual basis.
- Exceeds Expectations (3) – Exemplary scholarly accomplishment, including high visibility within the profession, at a level sustainable on an annual basis.
- Meets Expectations (2) – Competent scholarly productivity that brings recognition to the individual and university at a level that could be sustained on an annual basis (e.g., one publication per year).
- Need Improvement (1) – Service to the profession or university that falls short of the expectations for professional service.

A rubric defining the criteria for evaluation in teaching, scholarship, and service is provided in Appendix F. The criteria were developed for the college as a whole; however, individual departments will provide guidance to further define the criteria for scholarship. For example, departments will identify those journals to be considered “top tier” and “second tier” and provide a rationale for the determination, which includes factors used in making the determination (e.g., impact factor, reject rate, readership, citation information). Departments should submit this information to the dean for approval during the fall semester.

Teaching, Scholarly Activity, and Service

Teaching. Teaching is a critical role for faculty members, especially in the College of Education. Faculty members should provide evidence of sustained instructional effectiveness and a commitment to effective teaching. Examples of acceptable evidence of this include, but are not limited to, those delineated in the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures.

Scholarly Activity. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate a systematic and sustained level of achievement through scholarly, creative, or research activities. This work includes a critical review process and/or professional recognition by scholars in the field. Examples of acceptable scholarly activity include, but are not limited to, those delineated in COE Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures.

Service. Service includes intellectual work based on the individual faculty member’s field of expertise that results in professional contributions of substance to the department, college, and/or university; to the profession; and to the community. Examples of acceptable service include, but are not limited to, those delineated in the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures.

Course and Faculty Evaluation

Every department in the College of Education shall standardize its course evaluation forms as follows:

1. The course evaluation form should be titled *Course and Faculty Evaluation Form*.

2. The last item on the *Course and Faculty Evaluation Form* should be consistent for every department within the College of Education. That item should be as follows:

Overall, the professor of this course merits a rating of

5 (Excellent)

4 (Good)

3 (Acceptable)

2 (Needs Improvement)

1 (Unacceptable)

3. Additional Course and Faculty Evaluation Form components, including additional five-point Likert scale items as well as any narrative items, should be developed specific to and consistent with each department's unique needs.

Timeline for Performance Evaluation

- **February 1**

Faculty member submits complete written evidence to department chair.

- **March 15**

Prior to this date the department chair will schedule a meeting with each faculty member to discuss the member's annual report of activities and the chair's written evaluation of such activities. If the faculty member does not agree with the chair's evaluation, he/she has the prerogative to write an addendum. The finalized document shall be signed by the faculty member and department chair and placed in the official personnel file of the faculty member.

- **April 15**

Chair sends copy of the finalized document to the faculty member and dean. The dean shall forward the evaluation to the Provost and Executive Vice-President.

**PROMOTION AND TENURE
POLICY AND PROCEDURES
College of Education**

Approved by faculty vote 9/25/15

Purpose

This policy is designed to systematize the College of Education's promotion and tenure procedures, and supplements the College of Education Faculty Evaluation Guidelines policy. These promotion and tenure guidelines interpret and clarify university policies for promotion and tenure (BSU 4340) specific to the role and mission of the College of Education.

Preamble

Tenure and promotion in the College of Education is the natural consequence of faculty members contributing productive and valued work for the good of the university, profession, and community. Faculty members are held to high standards in

teaching, scholarly activity and service. The three areas are connected in integral ways by a broad, encompassing vision of the nature of intellectual work. The scholar is one who steps back from his/her investigations, looks for connections, builds bridges between theory and practice, and communicates his/her knowledge effectively to students and to the larger community. Knowledge may be acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice, and through teaching (Boyer, 1990).

When a faculty member seeks promotion and/or tenure, college administrators and the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee should consider the complexity of programs in the college, differentiated teaching loads, limited resources, and the diversity of interests and abilities among the faculty members in reaching recommendations concerning that candidate. Faculty members should build on their strengths as they develop professional agendas, the recommendations of college administrators and the college's Promotion and Tenure Committee on candidates should acknowledge both the candidate's personal talents as well as the needs of the university, profession, and community.

The following guidelines describe a process that, when fairly and consistently administered, holds faculty members accountable and rewards them for their professional contributions.

1. Purposes of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee

- 1.1. To represent the interests of the faculty of the college in promotion and tenure recommendations.
- 1.2. To review faculty applications for promotion and tenure and make subsequent recommendations to the dean of the college.
- 1.3. To facilitate fairness, equity and consistency across the college in promotion and tenure decisions.
- 1.4. To review each non-tenured faculty member during the second and fourth year of full employment at the university, and provide the faculty member with informed judgment and guidance concerning progress toward tenure.
- 1.5. To conduct a thorough review of this policy every five years (or as needed).

2. Structure and Procedures of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee

- 2.1. By September 15 of each year, each department shall elect from its ranks potential members for the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee. Whenever possible, departments shall seek potential committee members who represent each of three categories: (a) faculty members who are non-tenured from those departments that have no candidates for promotion and tenure, (b) faculty members who are tenured, and (c) faculty members holding the rank of Professor. The names of these department nominees are submitted to the dean, who will then appoint a College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee from the names submitted no later than October 1.
- 2.2. The final composition of the committee shall consist of one (1) faculty member from each department. The committee must include tenured faculty. It may also include non-tenured faculty; student representation *(see section 2.4); and one (1) or more representatives from outside the candidate's department. Divergence from this composition must be approved by the Faculty Senate. Each member of the committee has one (1) equal vote on all matters.

After the official college committee had been appointed and before the first meeting convened by the dean, each department chair may nominate to the Dean one (1) non-tenured faculty member to serve in an ex-officio capacity

to the COE P&T committee. Ex-officio members are not voting members and are bound by the rules of confidentiality.

2.3. Tenured faculty members shall serve staggered two (2) year terms. To maintain continuity within the committee, each year at least two (2) tenured members of the committee shall be serving their second year. Non-tenured faculty members shall serve one (1) year terms. No faculty member shall serve consecutive terms.

2.4. The dean should request the name of a student representative for the college committee from the Associated Students of Boise State University. This student member will serve a one (1) year term.

2.5. The dean should convene the first meeting of the committee and define its charge.

2.6. The College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee should base its recommendation about a candidate on a variety of sources of information. These should include the following:

2.6.1. The candidate's Promotion and Tenure Portfolio (as described below).

2.6.2. The written report of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee (or its equivalent). (This department level report is to be submitted directly to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee and added to the candidate's portfolio.)

2.6.3. The written recommendation for tenure and/or promotion from the department chair. (This department level report is to be submitted directly to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and added to the portfolio).

2.6.4. The external review results.

2.7. No additional materials may be added to a candidate's portfolio without the consent of the candidate.

2.8. All votes of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be by secret ballot. The specific vote count will be recorded by the committee chair, and supplemented by a written rationale for the committee's recommendation.

2.9. The College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will prepare and submit a letter to the dean noting the committee vote and rationale. This letter will accompany the candidate's portfolio to the dean.

3. Criteria for Recommendations

3.1. The recommendations of the college of Education promotion and Tenure Committee must be based on the professional judgment of the committee members regarding the significance and achievement of the candidate's contributions in teaching, scholarly activity, and service. To be recommended for tenure and/or to be promoted, each faculty member is expected to demonstrate contributions of substance in each area. Contributions in each area are shaped by both the needs of the institution and the talents and interests of the faculty member. Therefore, the tenure individual has negotiated and/or been assigned within the department, the college, and the institution. To this end, candidates should provide documentation of annually negotiated departmental roles for the time under review in the Promotion and Tenure portfolio. (See college of Education Work Load Policy).

3.2. Tenure. The outcomes of tenure decisions substantially impact the long-term quality of the college and university. Tenure recommendations are based on both the candidate's past performance in teaching, scholarly activity, and service, as well as on an assessment of the candidate's potential for continued excellence and contribution in

these areas. Successful candidates for tenure will provide evidence of an established record of success as an excellent teacher, an ongoing agenda of scholarly activity, and a commitment to productive service to the university, the profession, and the community.

It is anticipated that for faculty members at the rank of Assistant Professor, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor typically would occur simultaneously.

3.2.1. Criteria for tenure.

- 3.2.1.1. Earned doctorate (nationally recognized excellence in the field may be substituted for the terminal degree).
- 3.2.1.2. Sustained effectiveness and a continuing commitment to teaching (see Appendix A, *Teaching Activity Worksheet*).
- 3.2.1.3. A record of scholarly activity, including peer-reviewed publications (see Appendix B, *Scholarly Activity Worksheet*).
- 3.2.1.4. A record of service contributions, both locally and nationally (see Appendix C, *Service Activity Worksheet*).
- 3.2.1.5. Five years of full-time experience in an academic rank at an institution of higher learning. Faculty members become eligible to apply for tenure during the fifth year of service on the Official Faculty; however, unless they are extraordinarily productive in teaching, scholarship, and service, *faculty are expected to apply for promotion and tenure during the sixth year of service*. A faculty member who is given credit for prior service at the time of initial employment may be considered for tenure no earlier than during his or her third full year of employment at Boise State University except under extraordinary circumstance.

3.3. Promotion

Successful candidates for promotion must demonstrate excellence in teaching, scholarly activity, and service.

3.3.1. Criteria for the rank of Assistant Professor (BSU Policy 4340).

3.3.2. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

- 3.3.2.1. Earned doctorate (nationally recognized excellence in the field may be substituted for the terminal degree).
- 3.3.2.2. Sustained effectiveness and a continuing commitment to teaching (see Appendix A, *Teaching Activity Worksheet*).
- 3.3.2.3. A record of scholarly activity, including peer-reviewed journals (see Appendix B, *Scholarly Activity Worksheet*).

- 3.3.2.4. A record of service contributions, both locally and nationally (see Appendix C, *Service Activity Worksheet*).
- 3.3.2.5. Five years of full-time experience at an accredited institution of higher education but no earlier than during his or her third full year of employment at Boise State except under extraordinary circumstance. Faculty members are expected to apply for promotion during their sixth year at Boise State.
- 3.3.3. Criteria for promotion to Professor. University guidelines emphasize promotion to Professor should be reserved for individuals who are “truly and demonstrably outstanding among their peers” and who have “achieved additional distinction clearly above that of an Associate Professor” (BSU Policy 4340-II.C). In the College of Education, promotion to Professor recognizes individuals who have made substantive contributions to their fields through consistently excellent teaching, a sustained agenda of prominent scholarly activity, and productive service of high visibility and significance.
 - 3.3.3.1. Earned doctorate (nationally recognized excellence in the field may be substituted for the terminal degree).
 - 3.3.3.2. Sustained effectiveness and a continuing commitment to teaching (see Appendix A, *Teaching Activity Worksheet*). .
 - 3.3.3.3. Scholarly activities that result in significant contributions to their field (see Appendix B, *Scholarly Activity Worksheet*).
 - 3.3.3.4. Significant service to the profession, both locally and nationally, related to professional interests and expertise (see Appendix C, *Service Activity Worksheet*). .

Excellence in teaching and service are expected in the College of Education; however, promotion to full professor is based largely on evidence of a significant contribution in scholarship. Evidence of a significant contribution in scholarship includes exceeding expectations on annual faculty evaluations the majority of time serving as associate professor.

- 3.3.3.5. Ten years of full-time experience in an academic rank at an accredited institution but no earlier than during his or her third full year of employment at Boise State except under extraordinary circumstance. Faculty members are expected to apply for promotion during their sixth year at the rank of associate professor.

4. External Reviews

- 4.1. All candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor will participate in an external review as follows.
- 4.2. The candidate's department will obtain a minimum of three and a maximum of five external letters of evaluation from a list of impartial experts who are held with respect in academe, and are either recently or at present working in the candidate's field at other universities (or the equivalent).
- 4.3. This list of potential external reviewers will specifically exclude (a) former and current co-workers, (b) co-authors, (c) major academic professors and/or advisors, (d) individuals who had/have financial or contractual

obligations with the candidate, and/or (e) other persons with whom the candidate has or has had an established working or personal relationship.

- 4.4. Candidates may submit qualifications of outside reviewers and suggest names of potential external reviewers to the department. However, the department chair, or a tenured department member designated by the chair, will ultimately solicit the external reviewers.
- 4.5. The names of the external reviewers will be identified only to members of the department and college Promotion and Tenure Committees, the dean, and the provost.
- 4.6. Each external evaluator should be tenured and at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor (or the equivalent) at his/her institution.
- 4.7. The department will send to at least three external reviewers a letter requesting external review of the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. This letter should provide the following information.
 - 4.7.1. An introductory statement about the candidate and the tenure and/or promotion process at Boise State, and a request for the external reviewer to participate in the candidate's tenure and/or promotion process.
 - 4.7.2. A statement about who is not eligible to serve as a reviewer: (a) former and current co-workers, (b) co-authors, (c) major academic professors and/or advisors, (d) individuals who had/have financial or contractual obligations with the candidate, and/or (e) other persons with whom the candidate has or has had an established working or personal relationship.
 - 4.7.3. A statement to indicate that all letters from external reviewers will be treated as confidential.
 - 4.7.4. The requested deadline for receipt of the letter from the external reviewer.
 - 4.7.5. A copy of the candidate's letter of application for tenure and/or promotion from the Promotion and Tenure portfolio.
 - 4.7.6. A copy of the candidate's vita and other pertinent information from the candidate's file (e.g, reprints, articles).
 - 4.7.7. A request that the external reviewer (a) note the nature of his/her acquaintance with the candidate, (b) comment on the candidate's recognition or standing among her/his peers, and (c) provide detailed assessments of the significance and contribution to the profession of the candidate's scholarly activity and professional contributions within the context of the candidate's defined workload obligations in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, and service.
 - 4.7.8. A request that the external reviewer submit a copy of his/her vita along with the review.
- 4.8. Upon Request, an external reviewer may be provided with a copy of any materials in the candidate's Promotion and Tenure Portfolio vita, as well as any other supporting materials.
- 4.9. The department chair, or a tenured department member designated by the chair, is to insert the following documents into the candidate's portfolio binder: (a) three to five letters from external reviewers, (b) each

reviewer's current vita, (c) the department's letter sent to the reviewers requesting the review (as detailed in Section 4.7), and (d) a detailed description of the procedure used to solicit the candidate's reviewers. These documents will be included in the candidate's Promotion and Tenure Portfolio until the review process is complete, at which time they will be removed from the portfolio before it is returned to the candidate. These external letters of review are to be incorporated in the evaluation of the candidate by the department Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the dean of the college.

5. The Promotion and Tenure Portfolio

5.1. The basic structure of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio and should include the following sections.

5.1.1. *College of Education Eligibility and Summary Recommendations Form.*

5.1.2. Letter of Request. This letter (two page maximum) shall note the specific nature of the candidate's request (tenure, promotion, rank). The letter should also highlight the applicant's productivity and major contributions in Teaching, Scholarly Activity and Service. Each of these three areas should be clearly identified and addressed within this Letter of Request.

5.1.3. The Promotion and Tenure Vita (see Section 6)

5.1.4. The annual statements of the role(s) that the faculty member has negotiated and/or been assigned within the department, college, and the institution.

5.1.5. All annual department chair evaluations, along with all annual Tenure Progress Review evaluations from the department Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the second and fourth year Tenure Progress Review from the college Promotion and Tenure Committee.

5.1.6. Evidence of teaching effectiveness. In this section of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio the candidate should include evidence of effectiveness in Teaching. The Teaching section of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio should include the following information.

5.1.6.1. A listing of all courses taught within the last three years, including the student enrollment in and credit hours of each.

5.1.6.2. The complete statistical analyses of all courses taught within the last three years.

5.1.6.3. At least two complete sets of course evaluation student narrative comments from within the past academic year.

5.1.6.4. Additional documentation of teaching effectiveness.

5.1.6.5. 1-2 page narrative introduction, written by the candidate, to "teaching effectiveness," placed at the beginning of Section 5.1.6. Possible topics for the introduction might include the candidate's philosophy of teaching, reflections on teaching at Boise State, innovating in the classroom, curriculum development, relationship with partner schools, etc. this introduction is also to include a detailed description of any teaching activity associated with a negotiated workload different from a 60%

allocation for teaching.

5.1.7. Evidence of scholarly activity. In this section of the portfolio the candidate should include a summary compilation of all scholarly contributions to date in reverse chronological order, prepared in APA format. Representative hard copy samples of publications should accompany the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio in a separate binder. The Scholarly Activity section of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio should be organized as follows.

5.1.7.1. Publications.

5.1.7.1.1. Journals: refereed.

5.1.7.1.1.1. National and international.

5.1.7.1.1.2. Regional and local.

5.1.7.1.1.3. Invited.

5.1.7.1.2. Journals: non-refereed.

5.1.7.1.2.1. National and international.

5.1.7.1.2.2. Regional and local.

5.1.7.1.2.3. Invited.

5.1.7.1.3. Books.

5.1.7.1.3.1. Authored.

5.1.7.1.3.2. Edited.

5.1.7.1.3.3. Chapters.

5.1.7.1.4. Other publications.

5.1.7.2. Scholarly presentations.

5.1.7.2.1. National and international.

5.1.7.2.2. Regional, state or local.

5.1.7.2.3. Invited.

5.1.7.2.4. Other scholarly presentations.

5.1.7.3. Grants.

5.1.7.3.1. Funded.

5.1.7.3.2. Not funded.

5.1.7.4. Other scholarly activity.

5.1.7.5. A 1-2 page narrative introduction, written by the candidate, to “scholarly activity,” placed at the beginning of Section 5.1.7. Possible topics for introduction might include the candidate’s area(s) of scholarly focus and nature of research, reflections on scholarly activities, determination of first authorship in collaborative publications, nature of collaborative authorship (including writing responsibilities when candidate is not first author), the quality of publications (such as acceptance rates,

impact factors, and/or circulation rates for journals), justification of interpreting a specific non-refereed journal as “equivalent” in value to a peer-reviewed journal, etc. This introduction is also to include a detailed description of any scholarly activity associated with a negotiated workload different from a 20% allocation for research.

5.1.8. Evidence of service contributions. In this section of the portfolio the candidate should include a compilation of all service contributions to date in reverse chronological order. The Service section of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio should be organized as follows:

5.1.8.1. Service to the university.

5.1.8.1.1. University service (noting committees chaired, committee memberships, and committee outcomes).

5.1.8.1.2. College service (noting committees chaired, committee memberships, and committee outcomes).

5.1.8.1.3. Department service (noting committees chaired, committee memberships, and committee outcomes).

5.1.8.2. Service to the profession.

5.1.8.2.1. National and international.

5.1.8.2.2. Regional and state.

5.1.8.2.3. Local.

5.1.8.3. Service to the community (professionally relevant).

5.1.8.4. A 1-2 page narrative introduction, written by the candidate, to “service contributions,” placed at the beginning of section 5.1.8. Possible topics for the introduction might include the candidate’s philosophy of service, reflections on service contributions, developing key service activities, etc. This introduction is also to include a detailed description of any service activity associated with a negotiated workload different from a 20% allocation for service.

5.2. Additional supporting documentation may be included in the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio at the discretion of the candidate. Candidates should be judicious in including additional documentation, as voluminous materials may inadvertently obfuscate other documentation materials of greater significance.

6. The Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Vita

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should include in the portfolio a vita standardized for this purpose. This Promotion and Tenure Vita serves as an overview of the complete Promotion and Tenure Portfolio.

6.1. The Promotion and Tenure Vita should include the following components.

6.1.1. Demographic information (name, professional address, contact information etc.)

6.1.2. Current and former professional positions and ranks, in reverse chronological order.

6.1.3. Teaching assignments. This should include in reverse chronological a semester-by-semester listing of all courses taught over the previous three years, including (a) the student enrollment in each and (b) the “overall” instructor and course statistical summary evaluation for each course.

6.1.4. Scholarly activity. This should include a reverse chronological listing of scholarly achievements.

6.1.5. Service. This section should be organized in reverse chronological order, and by type of service (university, profession, community).

6.2. Each candidate is to submit a secured and un-editable electronic copy (e.g., a .pdf file) of the P&T Vita to the department chair.

7. The Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Process and Timelines in the College of Education

7.1. By September 1, each candidate for promotion and/or tenure will submit to the department of Promotion and Tenure Committee the names of at least five impartial external reviewers from the same or related discipline as the candidate.

7.2. By September 15 each candidate will submit the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio to the department chair, or a tenured department member designated by the chair, who will then forward the materials to the department Promotion and Tenure Committee. Each candidate is also to submit a secured and un-editable electronic copy of the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio Vita to the department chair.

7.3. By October 1 the department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall review each candidate’s portfolio, provide a written recommendation to the department chair and to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee, and in writing notify each candidate of the committee’s decision, accompanied by a rationale for this decision. The specific vote count of the department committee for each candidate will be recorded and reported to the department chair and to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee. These written documents will be included in each candidate’s portfolio. The candidate will acknowledge the committee recommendation by signing the Eligibility and Summary Recommendations Form. The candidate may attach a response to the committee’s recommendation if desired.

7.4. By October 15 the department chair will review the portfolio and the recommendation of the department committee for each candidate, provide a written recommendation to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, including a rationale for that recommendation, and provide each candidate with the written recommendation. The candidate will acknowledge the chair’s recommendation by signing the Eligibility and Summary Recommendations Form. The candidate may attach a response if desired.

7.5. By December 1 the College Promotion and Tenure Committee will review the portfolio and recommendations from (a) the department Promotion and Tenure Committee and (b) the department chair for each candidate, and will notify each candidate in writing of the committee’s recommendation, including a rationale for that recommendation. The committee will provide a written recommendation for each candidate to the dean, accompanied by a rationale for that recommendation. The specific college committee vote count on each candidate will be recorded and reported to the dean.

7.6. By December 15 the College of education Promotion and Tenure Committee will forward all promotion and tenure materials to the dean of the college.

7.7. By January 15 the dean of the college will review each candidate's portfolio and all recommendations, and make a recommendation to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The dean will notify each candidate in writing of their recommendation, including specific areas of strength and weakness.

7.8. If a mandatory tenure decision is not required, a candidate may withdraw an application for promotion and/or tenure at any stage of the promotion and/or tenure process. However, faculty members are required to seek tenure no later than their sixth year of service at Boise State University. If continuous appointment is not awarded by that time the University has the option to issue a terminal contract.

8. Appeals of Recommendations

8.1. Recommendation of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. If the college committee's recommendation is that tenure and/or promotion should be denied, within five days of the notification the candidate may request a meeting with the committee. If requested, the committee must schedule a meeting within five working days of the request. The candidate must base any appeal on the established criteria for promotion or tenure. The candidate may present additional evidence. Following the meeting with the candidate, the committee may decide to revote on the recommendation for that candidate. Only committee members who are present at this appeal meeting may participate in any committee decision to revote. This vote requires a quorum of the committee to be in attendance.

8.2. Recommendation of the Dean. If the dean's recommendation is that tenure and/or promotion should be denied, within five days of the notification the candidate may request a meeting with the dean. The dean must schedule the meeting within five working days of receiving the request. The candidate must base any appeal on the established criteria for promotion or tenure. The candidate may present additional evidence.

9. Tenure Status Review for Tenured Faculty

9.1. Every Five years each tenured faculty member will be reviewed.

9.1.1. Each year the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs notifies department administrators, in writing, as to the members of their units whose performance is to be reviewed during the year and as to the dates by which review procedures are to be completed. Each administrator communicates the names of these individuals to the unit's faculty members and asks each faculty member to indicate whether the performance of the faculty member who is under review should be questioned (BSU Policy 4380).

9.1.2. To facilitate the evaluation of tenured faculty under review, upon request those tenured faculty members under review shall provide to the department chair a current curriculum vita and a description of negotiated faculty roles for distribution to department members.

9.1.3. If during the periodic review the performance of a tenured faculty member is not questioned in writing by a majority of members of the department, the department chairperson will prepare a written review stating that the performance review has been conducted and that a full and complete review is not required.

9.1.4. If during the periodic review, the performance of a tenured faculty member is questioned in writing by a majority of members of the department or unit, or if the appropriate dean, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, or the President questions the faculty member's performance, then the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs must decide whether a full and complete review must be conducted in accordance with the procedures established for the initial evaluation for a tenure at the institution (BSU Policy 4380).

TENURE PROGRESS REVIEW POLICY
College of Education
Approved by faculty vote 9/25/15

Purpose

An annual department level Tenure Progress Review will be conducted for each non-tenured tenure track faculty member in the College of Education. The purpose of the review is to assist non-tenured faculty members by monitoring their professional progress, and providing advice and guidance. This Tenure Progress Review will be conducted annually by each department's Promotion and Tenure Committee (or the equivalent), and may include a personal conference with the faculty member.

The faculty member being reviewed should provide the committee with the vita materials, department chair's annual evaluation(s), work in progress, future plans, and any other materials that will assist the review process. These materials should be structured consistent with the guidelines for the Promotion and Tenure Portfolio.

Following the annual department level Tenure Progress Review, the chair of the department committee will prepare a written assessment which will be submitted to the faculty member, with a copy forwarded to the department chair for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file. As appropriate, the department chair should assist the faculty member develop and implement professional adjustments.

During the second and fourth year of tenure track employment at the university, each non-tenured faculty member will submit a developmental Promotion and Tenure Portfolio to the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee. The purpose of this college level Tenure Progress Review by the college committee is to provide each non-tenured faculty member with additional informed judgment about progress toward tenure.

Timeline

March 1 - Each year each non-tenured faculty member will submit a developing promotion and tenure portfolio to the department chair, who will review and then forward the portfolio to the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee (or equivalent) for review and analysis.

March 15 - The chair of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee (or equivalent) will provide to each non-tenured faculty member a written analysis of the developing promotion and tenure portfolio, including recommendations regarding progress toward promotion and tenure.

March 20 - The department chair will forward the developing promotion and tenure portfolio of each second and fourth year non-tenured faculty member to the College of education Promotion and Tenure Committee.

April 10 - The College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide to each second and fourth year non-tenured faculty member a written analysis of and recommendations regarding progress toward tenure.

April 15 - The chair of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee will forward a copy of that committee analysis to the dean of the College of Education and the appropriate department chair. As appropriate, the chair of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or the dean will meet individually with any second and fourth year non-tenured faculty member to discuss strategies to address identified areas of concern.

CLINICAL FACULTY PROMOTION POLICY

College of Education

Approved by faculty vote 9/25/15

Purpose

This policy is designed to systematize the College of Education's promotion procedures for clinical faculty. These promotion guidelines interpret and clarify university policies for promotion of clinical faculty (BSU 4490) specific to the role and mission of the College of Education.

Preamble

Promotion in the College of Education is the natural consequence of faculty members contributing productive and valued work for the good of the university, profession, and community. Clinical faculty play an integral part in developing educators candidates by working with candidates and mentors to create a rich learning experience in the field. Thus, promotion of clinical faculty is based largely on their performance in clinical field experiences and teaching in their respective programs.

The process for evaluating clinical faculty is the same as that for evaluating tenure-track faculty (BSU 4340); however, the process for evaluating clinical faculty differs as described below.

1. Composition of the College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee must include one (1) clinical faculty member for the evaluation of clinical faculty.
2. The promotion folder for clinical faculty does not require external reviews—which speak to the quality of scholarship of tenure-track faculty. As noted in the university policy, the promotion folder must contain at least the following documents: a letter from the applicant requesting promotion, a comprehensive vita, a concise summary of activities that address the promotion criteria, all student/course evaluations, all annual evaluations, a copy of the position description for the position held by the applicant, and letters of support from at least two colleagues holding clinical or tenure-track faculty appointments at the university.

Annual review of clinical faculty is based on the criteria described in the College of Education's faculty evaluation rubric. Therefore, clinical faculty who consistently meet expectations on their annual review should be on track for promotion to clinical associate professor, and clinical associate professors whom consistently exceed expectations should be on track to promotion to clinical professor.

Reference

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Appendix A

Teaching Activity Worksheet ^[1]

	2nd Year Review	4 th Year Review	Associate Professor/Tenure
Teaching Assignment	Faculty applying for promotion and tenure should identify activities in the following productivity areas.		
Assigned/Jointly Determined Teaching Load			
No. of Preps			
Student Enrollment			
Course Delivery System (i.e., on/off campus online)			
New Course /Program Design			
Supervisor/School Liaison			
Graduate Level Courses			
UG/G Student Advisor	Advising loads may vary based on department needs.		
UG Advisor/Supervising/Mentoring ^[2]			
Graduate Student Advisor- Masters/Doctorate			
Chair – Thesis/Projects			
Chair – Dissertation			
Chair – Comprehensive Exam			
Committee Member – Thesis/Projects			
Committee Member - Dissertation			
Committee Member – Doctoral Comprehensive Exam			
Committee Member – Master’s Comprehensive Exam			
Other	Faculty may submit other teaching activities as evidence to support or that further reflects upon their academic expertise.		
Evaluations ^[3]	Faculty will submit a summary of evaluations for courses taught during semesters under review.		
Course Evaluations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations

Peer Evaluation(s) – (Optional)			
Chair Evaluations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations

[1] Expectations are based on assigned workloads of 18 units of teaching (60% effort); 6 units of scholarship (20% effort); and 6 units of service (20%). Faculty workloads adjusted from an 18 unit teaching assignment will result in higher/lower expectations in scholarship/service activities and must be documented in annual faculty evaluations, as well as supported by evidence from Department Chair.

[2] UG student advising that is associated with a faculty member's assigned workload shall be counted as service activity.

[3] If necessary, Department Chair should assist faculty to establish a plan for improvement.

Appendix B

Scholarly Activity Worksheet ^[4]

Numerical criteria are recommendations. Each department and the disciplines represented within departments may require different emphases that better reflect scholarship in those fields.

	2nd Year Review	4th Year Review	Associate Professor Tenure
Publications^[5]	3 recommended	6 recommended	8 recommended
Articles, Peer-reviewed	2 recommended, with 1 first author	4 recommended, with 2 first author	6 recommended, with 3 first author
Articles, Non-peer reviewed			
Books - Edited			
Books – Authored			
Book Chapter			
Monographs			
Abstracts			
Curriculum Development			
Web authoring, multi-media			
Research Reports			
Conference Proceedings			
Established line of enquiry		Supportive External Review	Recognized as scholar by External Review
Presentations	2 recommended	4 recommended	6 recommended
Professional Meetings (Peer-reviewed)	1 recommended	2 recommended	3 recommended
Local			
State			
Regional			
National	1 recommended at this level	2 recommended at this level	3 recommended at this level
International			
Panel member/discussant			
Session/Section Chair			
Invited			
Keynote			
Speeches, Workshops			

Non-peer reviewed			
Local			
State			
Regional			
National/International			
Invited			
Grants^[6]	Recommended 0	Recommended 1	Recommended 1
Internal - Funded		Recommended 1	
Internal – Not Funded			
External - Funded			
External – Not Funded			Recommended 1
Other	Faculty may submit other scholarly activities (see Boyer, 1990) as evidence to support of that further reflects academic expertise.		

[4] Faculty hired with prior experience will have expectations for Promotion and/or Tenure stated clearly in their Letter of Appointment from the Dean.

[5] Expectations are based on assigned workloads of 18 units of teaching (60% effort); 6 units of scholarship (20% effort); and 6 units of service (20%). Faculty workloads adjusted from an 18 unit teaching assignment will result in higher/lower expectations in scholarship/service activities and must be documented in annual faculty evaluations, as well as supported by evidence from the Department Chair.

[6] Although seeking external funding is strongly encouraged, at times, funding is limited in some disciplines. Other scholarly activities can supplant grants submitted for external funding.

Appendix C
Service Activity Worksheet [7]

	2nd Year Review	4th Year Review	Tenure/Associate Professor
Department Committees			
Chair			
Member			
Chair of Department			
Assigned Administrative Duties (e.g., Program Director; Student			
College Committees			
Chair			
Member			
Assigned Administrative Duties (e.g., Program Director; Student			
University Committees			
Chair			
Member			
Assigned Administrative Duties (e.g., Program Director; Student			
Student			
Chair			
Member			
Assigned Administrative Duties (e.g., Program Director; Student			
Scholarly/Professional Organizations/State Committees or Educational Agencies			
Editorial Board Membership/Reviewer			
Conference Activities (e.g., Role)			
Organization/Committee/Agency			
State			
Regional			
National			
International			
Community Engagement			

Presentations			
Workshops/Seminars			
Consulting			
Service Grants			
Board: Office/Members			
Volunteer Service (not as an official member of board or committee)			
Other	Faculty may submit other service activities as evidence to support or that further reflects their academic expertise.		

[7] Expectations are based on an assigned workload of 18 units of teaching (60% effort); 6 units of scholarship (20%effort); and 6 units of service (20%). Faculty workloads adjusted from an 18 unit teaching assignment will result in higher/lower expectations in scholarship/service activities and must be documented in annual faculty evaluations, as well as supported by evidence from the Department Chair

Appendix D
College of Education
Eligibility and Summary Recommendations Form
Promotion and/or Tenure

Candidate completes Items 1-3; Candidate and Department Chair Complete Item 4

1. Name: _____
(Last)
(First)
(Middle)

2. The individual named above is applying for: _____promotion _____tenure
 (check either or both)

3. Proposed Rank and Title: _____
 (e.g., Associate Professor of Elementary Ed.)

Present Rank and Title: _____ Year Awarded: _____

4. Eligibility: (See BSU Policy 4340; College of Education Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures)

Yes No Faculty member meets eligibility criteria for Tenure Review

Yes No Faculty member meets eligibility criteria for Promotion Review

Candidate Signature: _____ Date: _____

Department Chair Signature: _____ Date: _____

Recommendations									
	Department P&T		Department Chair		COE P&T		Dean		
Recommendation	Tenure Promotion		Tenure Promotion		Tenure Promotion		Tenure Promotion		
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Candidate Notified	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Chair Signature									
Date									

Candidate Signature	
Date	

Appendix E
College of Education
Promotion & Tenure Materials Checklist and Timeline

September 15 – The following materials should be submitted to the Department Chair:

_____ Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form (Candidate completes Items 1-3;
Candidate and Department Chair complete: Item 4)

_____ Letter of application (statement of role)

_____ Completed portfolio (see #4 of the Promotion/Tenure Portfolio of the College of
Education Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures Manual)

_____ Vita

_____ Evidence of teaching effectiveness

_____ Evidence of scholarly activities

_____ Evidence of service

_____ Department requirements for Promotion and Tenure which augment the University of
College policy have been acknowledged and addressed in this file

September 30 – Department Promotion and Tenure review completed and candidate notified of
recommendation

October 5 – Candidate responds by signing Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form
(attach response to recommendation if desired.)

October 10 – Department chair review completed; candidate notified of recommendation.

October 15 – Candidate responds by signing Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form
(attach Response to recommendation if desired.)

October 15 – Department chair forwards the portfolio and recommendation to the College of
Education Promotion and Tenure Committee.

December 1 – College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee review completed;
candidate notified of recommendation.

December 6 – Candidate responds by signing Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form
(attach response to recommendation if desired.) Candidate appeal due/request meeting
with the College of Education Promotion & Tenure Committee, if desired. (See College
of Education Promotion & Tenure Appeal procedures (pg. D6, Item 6.2).)

December 15 – College of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee forwards portfolio and
recommendation to the Dean.

January 15 – College of Education Dean notifies each candidate of recommendation to be
forwarded to the Provost and Academic Vice-President.

January 20 – Candidate responds by signing Eligibility and Summary Recommendation Form (attach response to recommendation if desired.) Candidate appeal due/request meeting with the Dean, if desired (see College of Education Promotion & Tenure Appeal procedures (pg. D6 Item 6.2).)

January 31 – Dean forwards all promotion and tenure recommendations to the Provost and Academic Vice-President.

April 15 (or within 15 days after the State Board of Education meeting) – President informs candidates of the action of the Board.

Appendix F
College of Education
Annual Faculty Evaluation Rubric

Annual Faculty Evaluation Checklist

Evaluation of Teaching

To meet expectations, you must have done ALL of the following:

- Earned average course evaluations of 3.5 or higher across all courses.
- Aligned course to standards and included standards in syllabus as required by department.
- Completed rubrics, key assessments, and submitted student learning outcome data at the end of the semester as required by department.
- Made minor adjustments to courses.
- Completed advising activities and associated paperwork.

To exceed expectations, you must have (A) satisfied all the criteria to meet expectations, and (B) done at least four of the following:

- Earned average course evaluations of 4.5 or higher on all courses.
- Provided documentation from a respected teaching peer outlining distinguished teaching skills.
- Developed or substantially revised a course.
- Participated substantively in program revision/development.
- Provided documentation from liaison school or agency colleagues outlining distinguished work with K-12 colleagues and/or pre-service teachers and/or school or community counselors.
- Developed new school or community partnerships leading to student placements.
- Worked extensively with students on graduate or undergraduate research beyond assigned workload.
- Provided evidence of excellence in advising.
- Included evidence of positive impact on P-12 student learning.
- Included service-learning in at least one course.
- Received an award for teaching excellence.
- Worked with a student to create a candidate development plan.

To earn distinction, you must have (A) satisfied all the criteria to meet and exceed expectations, and (B) done an additional three of the following:

- Earned average course evaluations of 4.7 or higher on all courses.
- Provided documentation from a respected teaching peer outlining distinguished teaching skills.
- Developed or substantially revised a course.
- Participated substantively in program revision/development.
- Provided documentation from liaison school or agency colleagues outlining distinguished work with K-12 colleagues and/or pre-service teachers and/or school or community counselors.

- Developed new school or community partnerships.
- Worked extensively with students on graduate or undergraduate research beyond assigned workload.
- Provided evidence of excellence in advising.
- Included evidence of positive impact on P-12 student learning.
- Included service-learning in at least one course.
- Received an award for teaching excellence.
- Worked with a student to create a candidate development plan.

Evaluation of Scholarship

To meet expectations, you must have done at least two of the following:

- Published a sole- or first-author article in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Published a second-author article, with a student as first author, in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Authored or co-authored book.
- Published any combination of two (a) co-authored articles in top-tier or second-tier journals or (b) book chapters.
- Submitted an external grant funding, contract funding, or internal grant funding.
- Presented at a conference.

*Note. Faculty are expected to publish 1.5 articles per year; therefore, 1 publication only meets expectations following a year with at least two publications. Although one could meet expectations on a given year without publishing, faculty are required to publish research to earn promotion and tenure.

To exceed expectations, you must have (A) satisfied all the criteria to meet expectations, and (B) done at least three of the following:

- Received internal or external grant or contract funding, including continued funding.
- Submitted a large external grant.
- Keynote speaker at major conference.
- Received an external award or recognition for distinguished scholarly activity.
- Published a sole- or first-author article in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Published a second-author article, with a student as first author, in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Authored or co-authored book.
- Published any combination of two (a) co-authored articles in top-tier or second-tier journals or (b) book chapters.

To earn distinction, you must have (A) satisfied all the criteria to meet and exceed expectations, and (B) done an additional three of the following:

- Received internal or external grant or contract funding, including continued funding.
- Submitted a large external grant.
- Keynote speaker at major conference.
- Received an external award or recognition for distinguished scholarly activity.

- Published a sole- or first-author article in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Published a second-author article, with a student as first author, in a top-tier and/or second-tier journal.
- Authored or co-authored book.
- Published any combination of two (a) co-authored articles in top-tier or second-tier journals or (b) book chapters.

Evaluation of Service

To meet expectations, you must have done ALL of the following:

- Served on a university, college or department committee or task force.
- Provided some service to a national, state, or local organization.
- Completed all tasks as assigned in service or administrative roles.

To exceed expectations, you must have (A) satisfied all the criteria to meet expectations, and (B) done at least three of the following:

- Led a university, college or department committee or task force that produced a substantial product.
- Received a Service Award.
- Served on multiple committees or task forces that produce a substantial product.
- Provided leadership to a national, state, or local organization.
- Mentored pre-tenured faculty members.
- Served on a university, college or department committee or task force, which produce a substantial product.
- Served on governing or advisory board of a national, state, or local organization.
- Served as an Editor or Editorial Board Member of an academic journal.
- Served on a grant review panel.
- Provided development time to CTL or K12 schools or agency.
- Reviewed several manuscripts for a journal or conference.
- Provided trainings to community (e.g. continuing ed., professional development workshops).

To earn distinction, you must have (A) satisfied all the criteria to meet and exceed expectations, and (B) done an additional three of the following:

- Led a university, college or department committee or task force that produced a substantial product.
- Received a Service Award.
- Served on multiple committees or task forces that produce a substantial product.
- Provided leadership to a national, state, or local organization.
- Mentored pre-tenured faculty members.
- Served on a university, college or department committee or task force, which produce a substantial product.
- Served on governing or advisory board of a national, state, or local organization.
- Served as an Editor or Editorial Board Member of an academic journal.

- Served on a grant review panel.
- Provided development time to CTL or K12 school or agency.
- Reviewed several manuscripts for a journal or conference.
- Provided trainings to community (e.g. continuing ed., professional development workshops).