Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

School of Intervention Services

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of NTTF in Years One-Six

Criteria used for APR and EPR of NTTF evaluate teaching and service. Though 80% teaching and 20% service are the customary expectations for NTTF positions, an NTTF member may be assigned a different workload allocation. If the assigned workload includes program coordination, or other expectations, evidence of productivity in the assigned area must be included in the portfolio.

All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how school expectations, evaluative criteria, performance indicators, and weightings will be used in assessing their performance. Modification of the allocation of effort for a faculty member who receives assigned time for administrative responsibilities, research, service, or special projects needs to be specified and agreed upon at the time of assignment.

The School's standard allocation of effort applies to all faculty members in the School unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary. All individual variations must be made in writing, signed by both the faculty member and the School Director, and endorsed in writing by the Dean of the college.

The School of Intervention Services places great emphasis on consistency of performance. That is, consistent high quality performance and/or significant improvement in performance in the major evaluation domains of teaching and service are fundamental criteria for all NTTF faculty evaluations.

Teaching
High quality instruction is a principal component of a faculty member's record of teaching. Indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are specified below. **Indicators a - c are** required for the APR at a minimum; indicators d - i are optional. For the EPR, faculty **must include indicators a - d** and **at least one (1) from e - i.**

   (a) A compelling teaching narrative that explains how successful performance on the indicators (i.e., artifacts) demonstrates that the candidate has met the standard for teaching effectiveness, as well as describes how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed the candidate's teaching practice and philosophy.

   (b) Student course evaluations from all semesters under review that document quantitative mean scores of at least 3.5 on a 5-point scale.

   (c) **An average of at least two (2) peer observations** per academic year, which are deemed generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of

significant concerns), for the period under review. At least one peer observation per academic year will be from a faculty member of higher rank than the candidate assigned by the School Director and one from a faculty member of higher rank than the candidate selected by the candidate. In both cases, it is the responsibility of the candidate to arrange the specific observation sessions.

(d) Improvements to teaching practice in response to evaluations and/or professional development documented through sample assignments, course syllabi, feedback delivered to students, and/or creation/revision of a course.

(e) Generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) student course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught during the review period. For the APR, all sections of one course taught during the academic year being reviewed must be included. For EPR, all sections of one course taught during the entire period under review must be included.

(f) Teaching awards and distinctions from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(g) Effective undergraduate/graduate academic advising documented by generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) advisee evaluations or letters of support from advisees, program coordinators, and/or the School Director.

(h) Contributions to the graduate program via course/seminar instruction; recruitment, retention, advising, and/or placement of graduate students; membership on thesis/project committees as required by student demand.

(i) Other evidence of achievement in teaching as appropriate and explained in the Teaching narrative.

Service
The School defines service as performance of School, College, University, and professional (i.e., "levels") activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance, professional expertise shared with the external community, and contributions to a faculty member's profession. Generally, effective service will be described by the candidate and verified through brief acknowledgment of the faculty member's contributions from committee chairs (or their equivalent for non-committee service) or constituents (i.e., students in the organization for which the candidate is the advisor). Other equivalent forms of documentation may also be acceptable.

Given a workload allocation of 20% service, faculty shall document service at a minimum of **two (2) levels** each year for APR. Faculty shall document effective service **across all four (4) levels** for EPR with service at an **average of at least two (2) levels per year** across all years in the period under review. If a workload allocation for service is adjusted above or below 20%, this will be reflected through increased or decreased service expectations. Indicators of service are

specified below.

(a) A compelling service narrative that explains how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness, including descriptions of individual artifacts included to document successful performance of service activities.

(b) Editorial activities (i.e., editing and/or reviewing the work of others) for professional books, journals, newsletters, conferences, or grants.

(c) Workshops and/or speaking engagements related to the profession provided to constituents within or outside the university without remuneration.

(d) Contributions to School, College, University committees (standing or ad hoc), advisory boards, or Faculty Senate as a member or leader.

(e) Contributions to professional associations as a committee member or leader. This may include program reviewer service for accreditation purposes (e.g., CACREP, CAEP, CEC program reviews).

(f) Preparation of accreditation reports (e.g., SPA) for the faculty member's program. This will count as service to the School.

(g) Advisor for student organizations. This will count as service to the University if students from any program may participate, service to the College if only students from EDHD may participate, or service to the School if only students from SIS may participate.

(h) Service awards or citations from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(i) Administrative responsibilities such as program coordinator or center director will be evaluated as Service. If a course release is connected to such responsibilities, then the faculty member's percentage allocation of effort will be reduced by 10% per class and the percentage of service will be increased by 10% per class for purposes of evaluation. In this case, the faculty member will be expected to engage in effective performance of assigned duties, and may include documented contributions consistent with the assignment and/or evaluations by constituents, populations served, or the equivalent.

(j) Other evidence of achievement in service as appropriate and explained in the Service narrative.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF APR and EPR Materials

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Both APR and EPR shall require that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and supporting materials separated into the areas of Teaching and Service. All dossiers should be presented at "collegiate quality" and be error free.

Teaching
Supporting materials in the Teaching section of the dossier shall include at least **indicators a - c** for the APR; indicators d - i are optional. For the EPR, faculty **must include indicators a - d** and **at least one (1) from e - i.**

(a) A teaching narrative (no more than 5 pages) that explains the way that the indicators (i.e., artifacts) document how the candidate has met the standard for teaching effectiveness, as well as describes how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed the candidate's teaching practice and philosophy.

(b) Student course evaluations from all semesters under review. Quantitative evaluations will be presented in a summary table for all courses taught during the period under review with the following headings. Additionally, the faculty member will calculate the mean from all semesters under review.

Year and Term	Course # Name	Enrollment	Mean Rating "x"-point scale	Mean Standard Deviation	Unit Mean Rating	Unit Mean Standard Deviation

(c) **An average of at least two (2) peer observations** per academic year for the period under review; the candidate is required to submit all peer observations completed during the review period. At least one peer observation per academic year will be from a tenured faculty member of higher rank than the candidate assigned by the School Director and one from a faculty member of higher rank than the candidate selected by the candidate. It is the responsibility of the candidate to arrange the specific observation sessions.

(d) Revisions to teaching practice in response to evaluations and/or professional development documented through sample assignments, course syllabi, feedback delivered to students, and/or creation/revision of a course.

(e) Student course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught review period. For the APR, all sections taught during the academic year being reviewed must be included. For EPR, all sections taught during the entire period under review must be included.

(f) Teaching awards and distinctions from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(g) Effective undergraduate/graduate academic advising documented by advisee evaluations

or letters of support from advisees, program coordinators, and/or the School Director.

(h) Contributions to the graduate program via course/seminar instruction; recruitment, retention, advising, and/or placement of graduate students; membership on thesis/project committees as required by student demand.

(i) Other evidence of achievement in teaching as appropriate and explained in the Teaching narrative.

Service

Given a workload allocation of 20% service, faculty shall document service at a minimum of **two (2) levels** each year for APR. Faculty shall document effective service **across all four (4) levels** for EPR with service at an **average of at least two (2) levels per year** across all years in the period under review. If a workload allocation for service is adjusted above or below 20%, this will be reflected through increased or decreased service expectations.

Supporting materials in the Service section of the dossier shall include **indicator a** and at least **two (2) additional indicators** for APR. For the EPR, supporting materials in the Service section of the dossier shall include **indicator a** and at least **four (4) additional indicators**. Indicators of service are specified below.

(a) A service narrative that explains how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness, including descriptions of individual artifacts included to document service activities.

(b) Editorial activities (i.e., editing and/or reviewing the work of others) for professional books, journals, newsletters, conferences, or grants.

(c) Workshops and/or speaking engagements related to the profession provided to constituents within or outside the university without remuneration.

(d) Contributions to School, College, University committees (standing or ad hoc), advisory boards, or Faculty Senate as a member or leader.

(e) Contributions to professional associations as a committee member or leader. This may include program reviewer service for accreditation purposes (e.g., CACREP, CAEP, CEC program reviews).

(f) Preparation of accreditation reports (e.g., SPA) for the faculty member's program. This will count as service to the School.

(g) Advisor for student organizations. This will count as service to the University if students from any program may participate, service to the College if only students from EDHD may participate, or service to the School if only students from SIS may participate.

(h) Service awards or citations from within the university and/or professional associations

outside of the university.

(i) Administrative responsibilities such as program coordinator or center director will be evaluated as Service. If a course release is connected to such responsibilities, then the faculty member's percentage allocation of effort will be reduced by 10% per class and the percentage of service will be increased by 10% per class for purposes of evaluation. In this case, the faculty member will be expected to engage in effective performance of assigned duties, and may include documented contributions consistent with the assignment and/or evaluations by constituents, populations served, or the equivalent.

(j) Other evidence of achievement in service as appropriate and explained in the Service narrative.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

The School of Intervention Services acts as a Committee of the Whole to provide feedback to faculty in annual performance reviews, with the Personnel Committee Chair serving as chair of this feedback process. All eligible voting faculty members participate in the evaluation process by providing feedback on the contents of the portfolio. The Personnel Committee Chair writes a letter to the Director summarizing comments from the SIS Committee of the Whole. The Director reviews the faculty's feedback prior to completing and submitting a written recommendation to the Dean.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

Criteria used for Promotion Review of NTTF evaluate teaching and service. Though 80% teaching and 20% service are the customary expectations for NTTF positions, an NTTF member may be assigned a different workload allocation. If the assigned workload includes program coordination, or other expectations, evidence of productivity in the assigned area must be included in the portfolio.

All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how school expectations, evaluative criteria, performance indicators, and weightings will be used in assessing their performance. Modification of the allocation of effort for a faculty member who receives assigned time for administrative responsibilities, research, service, or special projects needs to be specified and agreed upon at the time of assignment.

The School's standard allocation of effort applies to all faculty members in the School unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary. All individual variations must be made in writing, signed by both the faculty member and the School Director, and endorsed in writing by the Dean of the college.

The School of Intervention Services places great emphasis on consistency of performance. That is, consistent high quality performance and/or significant improvement in performance in the

major evaluation domains of teaching and service are fundamental criteria for all NTTF faculty evaluations.

Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer

Criteria used for promotion to Lecturer include a successful evaluation of all criteria described earlier for EPR of NTTF with the following modifications: (a) documentation at least **two (2) leadership positions in teaching and/or service**; and (b) narrative explicitly addresses any concerns expressed in previous APRs and EPRs, documenting a pattern of improvement over the review period.

Leadership in teaching that will be considered for promotion to Lecturer may include:

(a) Creation/significant revision of a course or program, including obtaining all necessary approvals across University committees.
(b) Leading a Learning Community with an explicit focus on teaching for faculty within the College or across the University.
(c) Publication and/or dissemination (i.e., beyond the faculty member's assigned course) of instructional materials for use by other instructors at the university level.
(d) Other evidence of leadership in teaching as appropriate and explained in the Teaching narrative.

Leadership in service that will be considered for promotion to Lecturer may include:

(a) Chairing a committee at the College or University level.
(b) Chairing a committee or holding an elected office in a local, regional, or state professional association within the faculty member's field of expertise.
(c) Evidence of significant leadership at the school level (e.g., chairing two or more major committees, leading curriculum revisions, mentoring other faculty, etc.)
(d) Other evidence of leadership in service as appropriate and explained in the Service narrative.

Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

Criteria used for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer include a successful evaluation of all criteria described earlier for EPR of NTTF with the following modifications: (a) student course evaluations since promotion to Lecturer document quantitative mean scores of at least 3.75 on a 5-point scale; (b) at least **three (3) peer observations** from Senior Lecturers or tenured faculty within the College of Education and Human Development over the review period, which are deemed generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns); (c) documentation of at least **two (2) leadership positions** in teaching and/or service since promotion to Lecturer, and (d) narrative explicitly addresses any concerns expressed in previous annual evaluations, documenting a pattern of improvement over the review period.

Leadership in teaching that will be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer may include:

(a) Creation/significant revision of a course or program, including obtaining all necessary approvals across University committees.
(b) Leading a Learning Community with an explicit focus on teaching for faculty within the College or across the University.
(c) Publication and/or dissemination (i.e., beyond the faculty member's assigned course) of instructional materials for use by other instructors at the university level.
(d) Other evidence of leadership in teaching as appropriate and explained in the Teaching narrative.

Leadership in service that will be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer may include:

(a) Chairing a committee at the College or University levels.
(b) Chairing a committee or holding an elected office in a state or national professional association within the faculty member's field of expertise.
(c) Evidence of significant leadership at the school level (e.g., chairing two or more major committees, leading curriculum revisions, mentoring other faculty, etc.)
(d) Other evidence of leadership in service as appropriate and explained in the Service narrative.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing promotion reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

The promotion review requires that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and supporting materials separated into the areas of Teaching and Service in the same format as required for EPR. All dossiers should be presented at "collegiate quality" and be error free.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of TTF

APRs and EPRs are the primary means for ensuring that TTF are making sufficient progress toward tenure and promotion; therefore, the criteria and standards used for APRs and EPRs are consistent with criteria for tenure and promotion outlined in the *Academic Unit Criteria Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review* section of this document.

Criteria used for APR and EPR of TTF include teaching, scholarship, and service. Though 60% teaching, 20% scholarship, and 20% service are the customary expectations for TTF positions, a TTF member may be assigned a different workload allocation. If the assigned workload includes additional scholarship, program coordination, or other expectations, evidence of productivity in the assigned area must be included in the portfolio.

All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how school expectations, evaluative criteria, performance indicators, and weightings

will be used in assessing their performance. Modification of the allocation of effort for a faculty member who receives assigned time for administrative responsibilities, research, service, or special projects needs to be specified and agreed upon at the time of assignment.

The School's standard allocation of effort applies to all faculty members in the School unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary. All individual variations must be made in writing, signed by both the faculty member and the School Director, and endorsed in writing by the Dean of the college.

The School of Intervention Services places great emphasis on consistency of performance. That is, consistent high quality performance and/or significant improvement in performance in the major evaluation domains of teaching, scholarship, and service are fundamental criteria for all TTF faculty evaluations.

Teaching
High quality instruction is a principal component of a faculty member's record of teaching. Indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are specified below. **Indicators a - c are** required for the APR; indicators d - i are optional. For the EPR, faculty **must include indicators a - d** and **at least one (1) from e - i.**

(a) A compelling teaching narrative that explains how successful performance on the indicators (i.e., artifacts) demonstrates that the candidate has met the standard for teaching effectiveness, as well as describes how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed the candidate's teaching practice and philosophy.

(b) Student course evaluations from all semesters under review that document quantitative mean scores of at least 3.5 on a 5-point scale.

(c) **An average of at least two (2) peer observations** per academic year for the period under review, which are deemed generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns). At least one peer observation per academic year will be from a faculty member of higher rank than the candidate assigned by the School Director and one from a faculty member of higher rank than the candidate selected by the candidate. In both cases, it is the responsibility of the candidate to arrange the specific observation sessions.

(d) Improvements to teaching practice in response to evaluations and/or professional development documented through sample assignments, course syllabi, feedback delivered to students, and/or creation/revision of a course.

(e) Generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) student course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught during the review period. For the APR, all sections of one course taught during the academic year being reviewed must be included. For EPR, all sections of one course taught during the entire period under review must be included.

(f) Teaching awards and distinctions from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(g) Effective undergraduate/graduate academic advising documented by generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) advisee evaluations or letters of support from advisees, program coordinators, and/or the School Director.

(h) Contributions to the graduate program via course/seminar instruction; recruitment, retention, advising, and/or placement of graduate students; direction of student theses/projects and/or membership on committees of students being directed by other faculty as required by student demand.

(i) Other evidence of achievement in teaching as appropriate and explained in the Teaching narrative.

Scholarship

Making ongoing significant contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline is critical to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Such contributions are important both in their own right, and because they are an essential qualification for instructing others at a university. Thus, achievement in this area is vital to the School's evaluation of tenure-track faculty members who are undergoing review.

Publications, presentations and grants are the primary products of research/creative work and are central to its evaluation. Publications in peer-reviewed journals or symposium volumes or grants in peer-reviewed settings are especially significant in the evaluation of faculty performance. The School of Intervention Services faculty members place emphasis on peer-reviewed publications when reviewing scholarship. Faculty evaluations are based on professional judgment of performance and are compared to the productivity of tenured faculty within the School of Intervention Services, and focus on consistency, quality, and quantity of output by the faculty member.

Indicators of effectiveness in scholarship are specified below. For APR, faculty members must include the Scholarship narrative (i.e., **indicator a**) plus **at least two (2) additional indicators** of research activity. For EPR, faculty members must include the Scholarship narrative **(indicator a)** and **at least four (4) additional indicators** of research activity, **two (2)** of which must be published or in press peer-reviewed articles. Either a publication listed in **indicator d** or an external grant award **(indicator e)** may be substituted for no more than **one (1)** peer-reviewed article for the EPR.

(a) A compelling scholarship narrative that articulates at least one line of inquiry/research/creative work that can be supported by additional indicators (i.e., artifacts) included in the dossier, as well as explains how successful performance on the indicators demonstrates that the faculty member has met the standard for scholarship effectiveness.

(b) Research/scholarly productivity shall be consistent with where faculty members are in the probationary period. Publications in peer-reviewed journals are especially significant. Faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of co-authored publications. Articles "in press" are equivalent to published articles.

(c) Peer-reviewed and invited presentations and/or keynote speeches at international, national, regional, or state conferences are valued and considered a required portion of a faculty member's scholarship. Faculty shall average at least **one (1)** presentation per year at international or national conferences for EPR.

(d) The publication of books, book chapters, monographs, monograph chapters, and other academic publications and presentations resulting from applied scholarship and consulting are valued and will be considered as part of the faculty members' body of work. No more than **one (1)** of the aforementioned publications may be substituted for a publication in a peer-reviewed journal for the EPR.

(e) Securing extramural funding is one method of supporting research/scholarship and can be one indicator of external validation of the quality of scholarship. Faculty members are encouraged but not required to submit external grant proposals to fund research/scholarship. **One (1)** external grant **award** of more than $15,000 may be substituted for a journal article **at EPR**.

(f) Participation in institutionally-initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes, or alliances/partnerships and in applied scholarship and private consulting may be a component of faculty members' scholarship. These activities **may not** substitute for peer-reviewed publications for EPR, but are valued within SIS and may be included in APR and EPR; faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the activities.

(g) Participation in activities to boost research capacity, such as research-oriented learning communities, is valued but not required. These activities **may not** substitute for peer-reviewed publications for EPR, but are valued within SIS and may be included in APR and EPR; faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the activities.

Service
The School defines service as performance of School, College, University, and professional (i.e., "levels") activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance, professional expertise shared with the external community, and contributions to a faculty member's profession. Generally, effective service will be described by the candidate and verified through brief acknowledgment of the faculty member's contributions from committee chairs (or their equivalent for non-committee service) or constituents (i.e., students in the organization for which the candidate is the advisor). Other equivalent forms of documentation may also be acceptable.

Given a workload allocation of 20% service, faculty shall document service at a minimum of **two (2) levels** each year for APR. Faculty shall document service **across all four (4) levels** for EPR

with service at an **average of at least two (2) levels per year** across all years in the period under review. If a workload allocation for service is adjusted above or below 20%, this will be reflected through increased or decreased service expectations. Indicators of service are specified below. **Indicator a** is required for both APR and EPR.

(a) A compelling service narrative that explains how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness, including descriptions of successful performance of service activities.

(b) Editorial activities (i.e., editing and/or reviewing the work of others) for professional books, journals, newsletters, conferences, or grants.

(c) Workshops and/or speaking engagements related to the profession provided to constituents within or outside the university without remuneration.

(d) Contributions to School, College, University committees (standing or ad hoc), advisory boards, or Faculty Senate as a member or leader.

(e) Contributions to professional associations as a committee member or leader. This may include program reviewer service for accreditation purposes (e.g., CACREP, CAEP, CEC program reviews).

(f) Preparation of accreditation reports (e.g., SPA) for the faculty member's program. This will count as service to the School.

(g) Advisor for student organizations. This will count as service to the University if students from any program may participate, service to the College if only students from EDHD may participate, or service to the School if only students from SIS may participate.

(h) Service awards or citations from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(i) Administrative responsibilities such as program coordinator or center director will be evaluated as Service. If a course release is connected to such responsibilities, then the faculty member's percentage allocation of effort will be reduced by 10% per class and the percentage of service will be increased by 10% per class for purposes of evaluation. In this case, the faculty member will be expected to engage in effective performance of assigned duties, and may include documented contributions consistent with the assignment and/or evaluations by constituents, populations served, or the equivalent.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of TTF APR and EPR Materials

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Both APR and EPR shall require that the TTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and supporting materials separated into the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. All dossiers should be presented at "collegiate quality" and be error free.

Teaching
Supporting materials in the Teaching section of the dossier shall include **indicators a - c** for the APR; indicators d - i are optional. For the EPR, faculty **must include indicators a - d** and **at least one (1) from e - i.**

(a) A teaching narrative (no more than 5 pages) that explains the way that the indicators (i.e., artifacts) document how the candidate has met the standard for teaching effectiveness, as well as describes how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed the candidate's teaching practice and philosophy.

(b) Student course evaluations from all semesters under review. Quantitative evaluations will be presented in a summary table for all courses taught during the period under review with the following headings. Additionally, the faculty member will calculate the mean from all semesters under review.

Year and Term	Course # Name	Enrollment	Mean Rating "x"-point scale	Mean Standard Deviation	Unit Mean Rating	Unit Mean Standard Deviation

(c) **An average of at least two (2) peer observations** per academic year for the period under review; the candidate is required to submit all peer observations completed during the review period. At least one peer observation per academic year will be from a tenured faculty member assigned by the School Director and one from a faculty member of higher rank than the candidate selected by the candidate. It is the responsibility of the candidate to arrange the specific observation sessions.

(d) Revisions to teaching practice in response to evaluations and/or professional development documented through sample assignments, course syllabi, feedback delivered to students, and/or creation/revision of a course.

(e) Student course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught review period. For the APR, all sections taught during the academic year being reviewed must be included. For EPR, all sections taught during the entire period under review must be included.

(f) Teaching awards and distinctions from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(g) Effective undergraduate/graduate academic advising documented by letters of support from advisees, program coordinators, and/or the School Director.

(h) Other evidence of achievement in teaching as appropriate and explained in the Teaching narrative.

Scholarship
Supporting materials in the Scholarship section of the dossier shall include **indicator a plus at least two (2) additional indicators** of research activity for the APR. For the EPR, faculty must include **indicator a** and **at least four (4) additional indicators** of research activity, **two (2)** of which must be published or in press peer-reviewed articles. Either a publication listed in **indicator d** or an external grant award (**indicator e**) may be substituted for no more than **one (1)** peer-reviewed article for the EPR.

(h) A scholarship narrative (no more than 5 pages) that articulates at least one line of inquiry/research/creative work that can be supported by additional indicators (i.e., artifacts) included in the dossier, as well as explains how successful performance on the indicators demonstrates that the faculty member has met the standard for scholarship effectiveness.

(i) Research/scholarly productivity shall be consistent with where faculty members are in the probationary period. Publications in peer-reviewed journals are especially significant. Faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of co-authored publications. Articles "in press" are equivalent to published articles.

(j) Peer-reviewed and invited presentations and/or keynote speeches at international, national, regional, or state conferences are valued and considered a required portion of a faculty member's scholarship. Faculty shall average at least **one (1)** presentation per year at international or national conferences for EPR.

(k) The publication of books, book chapters, monographs, monograph chapters, and other academic publications and presentations resulting from applied scholarship and consulting are valued and will be considered as part of the faculty members' body of work. No more than **one (1)** of the aforementioned publications may be substituted for a publication in a peer-reviewed journal for the EPR.

(l) Securing extramural funding is one method of supporting research/scholarship and can be one indicator of external validation of the quality of scholarship. Faculty members are encouraged but not required to submit external grant proposals to fund research/scholarship. **One (1)** external grant **award** of more than $15,000 may be substituted for a journal article **at EPR**.

(m) Participation in institutionally-initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes, or alliances/partnerships and in applied scholarship and private consulting may be a component of faculty members' scholarship. These activities **may not** substitute for

peer-reviewed publications for EPR, but are valued within SIS and may be included in APR and EPR; faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the activities.

(n) Participation in activities to boost research capacity, such as research-oriented learning communities, is valued but not required. These activities **may not** substitute for peer-reviewed publications for EPR, but are valued within SIS and may be included in APR and EPR; faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the activities.

Service

Given a workload allocation of 20% service, faculty shall document service at a minimum of **two (2) levels** each year for APR. Faculty shall document service **across all four (4) levels** for EPR with service at an **average of at least two (2) levels per year** across all years in the period under review. If a workload allocation for service is adjusted above or below 20%, this will be reflected through increased or decreased service expectations.

Supporting materials in the Service section of the dossier shall include **indicator a** and at least two additional indicators for APR. For the EPR, supporting materials in the Service section of the dossier shall include **indicator a** and at least four additional indicators. Indicators of service are specified below.

(a) A service narrative that explains how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness, including descriptions of individual artifacts included to document service activities.

(b) Editorial activities (i.e., editing and/or reviewing the work of others) for professional books, journals, newsletters, conferences, or grants.

(c) Workshops and/or speaking engagements related to the profession provided to constituents within or outside the university without remuneration.

(d) Contributions to School, College, University committees (standing or ad hoc), advisory boards, or Faculty Senate as a member or leader.

(e) Contributions to professional associations as a committee member or leader. This may include program reviewer service for accreditation purposes (e.g., CACREP, CAEP, CEC program reviews).

(f) Preparation of accreditation reports (e.g., SPA) for the faculty member's program. This will count as service to the School.

(g) Advisor for student organizations. This will count as service to the University if students from any program may participate, service to the College if only students from EDHD may participate, or service to the School if only students from SIS may participate.

(h) Service awards or citations from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(i) Administrative responsibilities such as program coordinator or center director will be evaluated as Service. If a course release is connected to such responsibilities, then the faculty member's percentage allocation of effort will be reduced by 10% per class and the percentage of service will be increased by 10% per class for purposes of evaluation. In this case, the faculty member will be expected to engage in effective performance of assigned duties, and may include documented contributions consistent with the assignment and/or evaluations by constituents, populations served, or the equivalent.

(j) Other evidence of achievement in service as appropriate and explained in the Service narrative.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

The School of Intervention Services acts as a Committee of the Whole to provide feedback to faculty in annual performance reviews, with the Personnel Committee Chair serving as chair of this feedback process. All eligible voting faculty members participate in the evaluation process by providing feedback to the Director on the contents of the portfolio. The Personnel Committee Chair writes a letter to the Director summarizing comments from the SIS Committee of the Whole. The Director reviews the faculty's feedback prior to completing and submitting a written recommendation to the Dean.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review

Criteria used for Tenure and Promotion Review of TTF include teaching, scholarship, and service. Though 60% teaching, 20% scholarship, and 20% service are the customary expectations for TTF positions, a TTF member may be assigned a different workload allocation. If the assigned workload includes additional scholarship, program coordination, or other expectations, evidence of productivity in the assigned area must be included in the portfolio.

All faculty members have a right to know what allocations of effort are expected of them and to understand how school expectations, evaluative criteria, performance indicators, and weightings will be used in assessing their performance. Modification of the allocation of effort for a faculty member who receives assigned time for administrative responsibilities, research, service, or special projects needs to be specified and agreed upon at the time of assignment.

The School's standard allocation of effort applies to all faculty members in the School unless specific, formal agreements are made to the contrary. All individual variations must be made in writing, signed by both the faculty member and the School Director, and endorsed in writing by the Dean of the college.

The School of Intervention Services places great emphasis on consistency of performance. That is, consistent high quality performance and/or significant improvement in performance in the major evaluation domains of teaching, scholarship, and service are fundamental criteria for all TTF faculty evaluations.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Teaching. High quality instruction is a principal component of a faculty member's record of teaching. Indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are specified below. For tenure and promotion, faculty **must include indicators a - d** and **at least two (2) from e - i.**

(a) A compelling teaching narrative that explains how successful performance on the indicators (i.e., artifacts) demonstrates that the candidate has met the standard for teaching effectiveness, as well as describes how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed the candidate's teaching practice and philosophy.

(b) Student course evaluations from all semesters under review that document quantitative mean scores of at least 3.5 on a 5-point scale.

(c) **An average of at least two (2) peer observations** per academic year for the period under review, which are deemed generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns). The candidate is required to submit all peer observations completed for the period under review. At least one peer observation per academic year will be from a faculty member of higher rank than the candidate assigned by the School Director and one from a faculty member of higher rank than the candidate selected by the candidate. In both cases, it is the responsibility of the candidate to arrange the specific observation sessions.

(d) Improvements to teaching practice in response to evaluations and/or professional development documented through sample assignments, course syllabi, feedback delivered to students, and/or creation/revision of a course.

(e) Generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) student course evaluation qualitative comments from all sections of at least one course taught during the review period.

(f) Teaching awards and distinctions from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(g) Effective undergraduate/graduate academic advising documented by generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) advisee evaluations or letters of support from advisees, program coordinators, and/or the School Director.

(h) Contributions to the graduate program via course/seminar instruction; recruitment, retention, advising, and/or placement of graduate students; direction of student theses/projects and/or membership on committees of students being directed by other faculty as required by student demand.

(i) Other evidence of achievement in teaching as appropriate and explained in the

Teaching narrative.

Scholarship. Making significant and ongoing contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline is critical to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Thus, achievement in this area is vital to the School's evaluation of tenure-track faculty members who are undergoing review. Publications, presentations, and grants are the primary products of research/creative work and are central to its evaluation. Publications in peer-reviewed journals or grants in peer-reviewed settings are especially significant in the evaluation of faculty performance. The School of Intervention Services faculty members place emphasis on peer-reviewed publications when reviewing scholarship. For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, evaluation of the quality of scholarship shall be done by faculty review and validated by external reviewers.

The primary purpose for external reviews is to evaluate a candidate's scholarly work in terms of quantity, quality, and impact on the discipline. External reviews of scholarly endeavors for all candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion are required. The process for selecting external reviewers will follow procedures outlined by the Provost's office.

Indicators of effectiveness in scholarship are specified below. To be considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, faculty members must include the Scholarship narrative (i.e., indicator a) and evidence of **at least five (5)** peer-reviewed journal articles (indicator b) or their equivalent (i.e., indicators d and e), as well as **at least five (5)** peer-reviewed or invited presentations (indicator c).

  (a) A compelling scholarship narrative articulates at least one line of inquiry/research/creative work that can be supported by additional indicators (i.e., artifacts) included in the dossier, as well as an explanation of the way successful performance on indicators document how the faculty member has met the standard for scholarship effectiveness.

  (b) Publications in peer-reviewed journals are especially significant in the evaluation of faculty performance. **For tenure and promotion, faculty shall be single or first author on at least one (1) article, and no lower than second author on one (1) additional article.** Faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of co-authored publications. Articles "in press" are equivalent to published articles.

  (c) Peer-reviewed and invited presentations and/or keynote speeches at international, national, regional, or state conferences are valued and considered a required portion of a faculty member's scholarship. Faculty shall average at least **one (1)** presentation per year at international or national conferences for tenure.

  (d) The publication of books, book chapters, monographs, monograph chapters, and other academic publications and presentations resulting from applied scholarship and consulting are valued and will be considered as part of the faculty members' body of work. **One (1)** of the aforementioned publications may be substituted for one of the five

peer-reviewed journal articles required for tenure, however the publication cannot be substituted for the required single or first-author article.

(e) Securing extramural funding is one method of supporting research/scholarship and can be one indicator of external validation of the quality of scholarship. Faculty members are encouraged but not required to secure external funding for research/scholarship. **One (1)** external grant **award** of more than $15,000 may be substituted for one of the five peer-reviewed journal articles required for tenure, however the grant submission cannot be substituted for the required single or first-author article.

(f) Participation in institutionally-initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes, or alliances/partnerships and in applied scholarship and private consulting may be a component of faculty members' scholarship. These activities **may not** substitute for peer-reviewed publications for tenure, but are valued within SIS and may be included in the dossier; faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the activities.

(g) Participation in activities to boost research capacity, such as research-oriented learning communities, is valued but not required. These activities **may not** substitute for peer-reviewed publications for tenure, but are valued within SIS and may be included in the dossier; faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the activities.

Service. The School defines service as performance of School, College, University, and professional (i.e., "levels") activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance, professional expertise shared with the external community, and contributions to a faculty member's profession. Generally, effective service will be described by the candidate and verified through brief acknowledgment of the faculty member's contributions from committee chairs (or their equivalent for non-committee service) or constituents (i.e., students in the organization for which the candidate is the advisor). Other equivalent forms of documentation may also be acceptable.

Given a workload allocation of 20% service, faculty shall document effective service **across all four (4) levels** for tenure with an **average of at least two (2) levels per year.** If a workload allocation for service is adjusted above or below 20%, this will be reflected through increased or decreased service expectations. For tenure, faculty will include a Service narrative (indicator a) and at least four additional indicators of service from the possibilities specified below.

(a) A compelling service narrative that explains how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness, including descriptions of service activities and individual artifacts to document successful performance of service activities.

(b) Editorial activities (i.e., editing and/or reviewing the work of others) for professional books, journals, newsletters, conferences, or grants.

(c) Workshops and/or speaking engagements related to the profession provided to constituents within or outside the university without remuneration.

(d) Contributions to School, College, University committees (standing or ad hoc), advisory boards, or Faculty Senate as a member or leader.

(e) Contributions to professional associations as a committee member or leader. This may include program reviewer service for accreditation purposes (e.g., CACREP, CAEP, CEC program reviews).

(f) Preparation of accreditation reports (e.g., SPA) for the faculty member's program. This will count as service to the School.

(g) Advisor for student organizations. This will count as service to the University if students from any program may participate, service to the College if only students from EDHD may participate, or service to the School if only students from SIS may participate.

(h) Service awards or citations from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(i) Administrative responsibilities such as program coordinator or center director will be evaluated as Service. If a course release is connected to such responsibilities, then the faculty member's percentage allocation of effort will be reduced by 10% per class and the percentage of service will be increased by 10% per class for purposes of evaluation. In this case, the faculty member will be expected to engage in effective performance of assigned duties, and may include documented contributions consistent with the assignment and/or evaluations by constituents, populations served, or the equivalent.

(j) Other evidence of achievement in service as appropriate and explained in the Service narrative.

Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion to professor requires a cumulative record of sustained teaching effectiveness, sustained scholarly productivity, and sustained and substantial service contributions within and external to BGSU.

Teaching. High quality instruction is a principal component of a faculty member's record of teaching. Indicators and standards of teaching effectiveness are specified below. For promotion to Professor, faculty **must document leadership in teaching, and include indicators a - d** and **at least two (2) from e - l.**

(a) A compelling teaching narrative that explains how successful performance on the indicators (i.e., artifacts) demonstrates that the candidate has met the standard for teaching effectiveness, as well as describes how evaluations from self, students, and peers have informed the candidate's teaching practice and philosophy.

(b) Student course evaluations from all semesters within the six years preceding application for promotion to Professor and since promotion to Associate Professor that document

quantitative mean scores of at least 3.75 on a 5-point scale.

(c) At least **three (3) peer observations** from the six years preceding application for promotion to Professor and since promotion to Associate Professor, which are deemed generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns), from tenured full professors within the College of Education and Human Development. It is the responsibility of the candidate to arrange these specific observation sessions.

(d) Improvements to teaching practice in response to evaluations and/or professional development documented through sample assignments, course syllabi, feedback delivered to students, and/or creation/revision of a course.

(e) Generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) student course evaluation qualitative comments that demonstrate teaching excellence from all sections of at least one course for the six years preceding application for promotion to Professor and since promotion to Associate Professor.

(f) Leadership in teaching through the creation/significant revision of a course or program, including obtaining all necessary approvals across University committees.

(g) Leading a Learning Community with an explicit focus on teaching for faculty within the College or across the University.

(h) Publication and/or dissemination (i.e., beyond the faculty member's assigned course) of instructional materials for use by other instructors.

(i) Teaching awards and distinctions from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(j) Effective undergraduate/graduate academic advising documented by generally positive (i.e., a preponderance of positive comments and the absence of significant concerns) advisee evaluations or letters of support from advisees, program coordinators, and/or the School Director.

(k) Contributions to the graduate program via course/seminar instruction; recruitment, retention, advising, and/or placement of graduate students; direction of student theses/projects and/or membership on committees of students being directed by other faculty as required by student demand.

(l) Other evidence of leadership and achievement in teaching as appropriate and explained in the Teaching narrative.

Scholarship. Making significant and ongoing contributions to the knowledge base of the discipline is critical to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Thus, achievement in this area is vital to the School's evaluation of tenured faculty members who are undergoing review. Candidate will provide evidence that they

are experts and leaders in their fields. Publications, presentations and grants are the primary products of research/creative work and are central to its evaluation. Publications in peer-reviewed journals or grants in peer-reviewed settings are especially significant in the evaluation of faculty performance. The School of Intervention Services faculty members place emphasis on peer-reviewed publications when reviewing scholarship. For promotion to Professor, evaluation of the quality of scholarship shall be done by faculty review and validated by external reviewers.

The primary purpose for external reviews is to evaluate a candidate's scholarly work in terms of quantity, quality, impact on the discipline, and national and/or international reputation. External reviews of scholarly endeavors for all candidates seeking promotion are required. The process for selecting external reviewers will follow procedures outlined by the Provost's office.

Indicators of effectiveness in scholarship are specified below. To be considered for promotion to Professor, faculty members must include the Scholarship narrative (i.e., indicator a) and **at least six (6)** peer-reviewed journal articles (indicator b) or their equivalent (i.e., indicators d and e), as well as **at least six (6)** peer-reviewed or invited presentations (indicator c) **since promotion to Associate Professor.** If the period since promotion to Associate Professor is longer than six (6) years, either (a) the most recent six years will be considered in the review or (b) the faculty member must document (as part of the Scholarship narrative) administrative responsibilities that precluded the typical 20% allocation of effort to scholarship during the period under review. In either case, the faculty member must have **at least six (6)** peer-reviewed journal articles or their equivalent to be considered for promotion to Professor.

(a) A compelling scholarship narrative articulates at least one line of inquiry/research/creative work that can be supported by additional indicators (i.e., artifacts) included in the dossier, as well as an explanation of the way successful performance on indicators document how the faculty member has met the standard for scholarship effectiveness.

(b) Publications in peer-reviewed journals are especially significant in the evaluation of faculty performance. **For promotion to Professor, faculty shall be single or first author on at least one (1) article, and no lower than second author on one (1) additional article.** Faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the inception, design, implementation, and authorship of co-authored publications. Articles "in press" are equivalent to published articles.

(c) Peer-reviewed and invited presentations and/or keynote speeches at international, national, regional, or state conferences are valued and considered a required portion of a faculty member's scholarship.

(d) The publication of books, book chapters, monographs, monograph chapters, and other academic publications and presentations resulting from applied scholarship and consulting are valued and will be considered as part of the faculty members' body of work. **One (1)** of the aforementioned publications may be substituted for one of the six peer-reviewed journal articles required for promotion, however the publication cannot be substituted for the required single or first-author article.

(e) Securing extramural funding is one method of supporting research/scholarship and can be one indicator of external validation of the quality of scholarship. Faculty members are encouraged but not required to secure external funding for research/scholarship. **One (1)** external grant **award** of more than $15,000 may be substituted for one of the six peer-reviewed journal articles required for promotion, however the funded grant submission cannot be substituted for the required single or first-author article.

(f) Participation in institutionally-initiated outreach activities through centers, institutes, or alliances/partnerships and in applied scholarship and private consulting may be a component of faculty members' scholarship. These activities **may not** substitute for peer-reviewed publications for promotion, but are valued within SIS and may be included; faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the activities.

(g) Participation in activities to boost research capacity, such as research-oriented learning communities, is valued but not required. These activities **may not** substitute for peer-reviewed publications for promotion, but are valued within SIS and may be included; faculty members must clearly delineate their role in the activities.

Service. The School defines service as performance of School, College, University, and professional (i.e., "levels") activities that fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance, professional expertise shared with the external community, and contributions to a faculty member's profession. Generally, effective service will be described by the candidate and verified through brief acknowledgment of the faculty member's contributions from committee chairs (or their equivalent for non-committee service) or constituents (i.e., students in the organization for which the candidate is the advisor). Other equivalent forms of documentation may also be acceptable.

Given a workload allocation of 20% service, faculty shall document service **across all four (4) levels** for promotion to Professor with an **average of at least two (2) levels per year within the six (6) years prior to application for promotion to Professor and/or since promotion to Associate Professor.** If a workload allocation for service is adjusted above or below 20%, this will be reflected through increased or decreased service requirements. For promotion to Professor, faculty will include a Service narrative (**indicator a**) and **at least four (4) indicators of service from b – k. Additionally, candidates for Professor must document success for least two leadership positions in service.**

(a) A compelling service narrative that explains how the candidate has met the standard for service effectiveness, including descriptions of service activities and individual artifacts to document successful performance of service and leadership activities.

(b) Administrative responsibilities including, but not limited to School Director, Associate Dean, or Center Director will be considered leadership in Service.

(c) Editorial activities (i.e., editing and/or reviewing the work of others) for professional books, journals, newsletters, conferences, or grants. Leadership related to editorial

activities will include, but not be limited to service as Editor/Associate Editor, Conference Chair/Coordinator, and/or equivalent leadership explained in the Service narrative.

(d) Contributions to School, College, University committees (i.e., standing or ad hoc), advisory boards, or Faculty Senate as a member or leader. Chairing a committee (i.e., standing or ad hoc), at the School, College, or University levels will be considered leadership.

(e) Contributions to professional associations as a committee member or leader. This may include program reviewer service for accreditation purposes (e.g., CACREP, CAEP, CEC program reviews). Chairing a committee or holding an elected office in a state or national professional association within the faculty member's field of expertise will be considered leadership.

(f) Workshops and/or speaking engagements related to the profession provided to constituents within or outside the university without remuneration.

(g) Preparation of accreditation reports (e.g., SPA) for the faculty member's program. This will count as leadership in service to the School.

(h) Advisor for student organizations. This will count as service to the University if students from any program may participate, service to the College if only students from EDHD may participate, or service to the School if only students from SIS may participate.

(i) Service awards or citations from within the university and/or professional associations outside of the university.

(j) Administrative responsibilities such as program coordinator or center director will be evaluated as Service. If a course release is connected to such responsibilities, then the faculty member's percentage allocation of effort will be reduced by 10% per class and the percentage of service will be increased by 10% per class for purposes of evaluation. In this case, the faculty member will be expected to engage in effective performance of assigned duties, and may documented contributions consistent with the assignment and/or evaluations by constituents, populations served, or the equivalent.

(k) Other evidence of achievement in service as appropriate and explained in the Service narrative

Leadership in service may be demonstrated by:

(a) Chairing a committee at the College or University level.
(b) Chairing a committee or holding an elected office in a local, regional, state, or national professional association within the faculty member's field of expertise.
(c) Evidence of significant leadership at the school level (e.g., chairing two or more major committees, leading curriculum revisions, mentoring other faculty, etc.)

(d) Other evidence of leadership in service as appropriate and explained in the Service narrative.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing promotion reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Tenure-track Bargaining Unit Faculty Members who have received appointments for six (6) consecutive years at their current rank shall be subject to a promotion review the sixth year of appointment before an additional appointment can be authorized.

The promotion review requires that the faculty member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and supporting materials separated into the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service in the same format as required for EPR. The promotion materials will also include external reviews. All dossiers should be presented at "collegiate quality" and be error free.

The primary purpose for external reviews is to evaluate a candidate's scholarly work in terms of quantity, quality, and impact on the discipline. External reviews of scholarly endeavors for all candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion are required. The process for selecting external reviewers will follow procedures outlined by the Provost's office.

Approved by the School of Intervention Services

Director _____ Date __11.13.17__

Reviewed by the Dean _____ Date __11/13/17__

____✓____ concur _____ do not concur for the following reason(s):

Reviewed by the SVPAA/Provost _____ Date __11-15-17__

____✓____ concur _____ do not concur for the following reason(s):