

2014

Educational Administration: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation

The College at Brockport

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Repository Citation

The College at Brockport, "Educational Administration: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation" (2014). *Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation*. 70.

<http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/apt/70>

This Document is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Documentation by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact kmyers@brockport.edu.



The College at
BROCKPORT
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

*Faculty
Appointment, Promotion, & Tenure
Policies & Procedures Document
Educational Administration*

Submitted: March 20, 2013

Table of Contents

Contents

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| <u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u> | ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. |
| <u>I. INTRODUCTION</u> | ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. |
| <u>II. FRAMEWORK FOR WORKLOAD</u> | ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. |
| <u>Teaching >Scholarship>Service where Teaching is >50%</u> | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| <u>Timeline for appointment, promotion and tenure review processes</u> | 6 |
| <u>III. TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE EXPECTATIONS</u> | 6 |
| <u>Teaching Expectations</u> | 6 |
| <u>Scholarship Expectations</u> | 7 |
| <u>Service Expectations</u> | 8 |
| <u>IV. TENURE, PROMOTION AND CONTINUING PERFORMANCE</u> | 8 |
| <u>A. Performance at Rank: Assistant Professor</u> | 8 |
| <u>B. Performance at Rank: Associate Professor</u> | 9 |
| <u>C. Performance at Rank: Professor</u> | 10 |
| <u>V. PROMOTION PROCEDURES</u> | 11 |
| <u>A. Promotion to Associate Professor</u> | 11 |
| <u>1. Teaching</u> | 11 |
| <u>1a. Teaching Criteria</u> | 11 |
| <u>2. Scholarship</u> | 13 |

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| <u>3. Service</u> | 14 |
| <u>B. Promotion to Professor</u> | 15 |
| <u>V. The Role of the Candidate</u> | 15 |
| <u>VI. A Role of the APT Committee</u> | 16 |
| <u>VII. Role of Department Chair</u> | 16 |
| <u>VIII. Role of Department Vote</u> | 16 |
| <u>IX. Application Contents</u> | Error! |
| Bookmark not defined. | |
| <u>X. THE REVIEW PROCESS</u> | 17 |
| <u>A. The APT Review Process</u> | Error! |
| Bookmark not defined. | |
| <u>B. Appeal Process</u> | Error! |
| Bookmark not defined. | |
| <u>1. APT Level</u> | 18 |
| <u>2. Chair Level</u> | 18 |
| <u>APPENDIX A</u> | ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. |
| <u>Summary of Scholarship Standards</u> | Error! |
| Bookmark not defined. | |

Department of Educational Administration
DEPARTMENT CRITERIA FOR PERSONNEL ACTIONS

I. Introduction

This document provides guidance for full-time, tenure track faculty in the Department of Educational Administration regarding performance-related responsibilities and expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The document outlines requirements for full-time, tenure track faculty regarding Term Appointments, Tenure, Promotion, and Continuing Performance.

The guidelines presented below represent the minimal performance that is required for full time faculty at the various stages of their career. It is important to note that minimal performance automatically does not guarantee tenure and promotion. At rank performance, in addition to meeting the minimal criteria outlined below, leading to tenure and promotion involves such issues as the quality of teaching, scholarship, and service, modeling of professional counselor behavior, collegiality, ability to work cooperatively and share responsibility in the workload of the department.

The burden of proof rests with the faculty member. The faculty member shall be responsible for supporting/documenting all claims concerning the importance, relevance or quality of any teaching, scholarship and service. Any claims made must be supported.

A climate and culture conducive to shared governance is critical to a department's ability to function effectively. This requires that faculty interact with one another in a manner that is cooperative, professional, collaborative, and mutually respectful. The candidate's contribution to the collegiality of the department is considered in the review process.

The College's Guidelines for Continuing Appointment (7/9/11) state:

While the guidelines contained in departmental APT documents provide useful information about departmental expectations and a framework or guide for evaluation, nominal (and/or apparent) attainment of these guidelines does not ensure a favorable recommendation for the candidate. APT committees, department chairs, deans, the Provost, and the President have the responsibility to interpret a candidate's performance relative to departmental, College, and SUNY guidelines. Furthermore, decisions on continuing appointment must also consider the candidate's potential for the future as well as the present and future programmatic needs of the department or the College.

Candidates for continuing appointment should demonstrate potential for promotion to the next academic rank. A positive recommendation for continuing appointment reflects the expectation that the person has the potential for attaining the highest rank in the department and that the person's contribution to the program will be significant and necessary in the future.

Review for continuing appointment may also take programmatic considerations into account. Such considerations may include enrollment patterns, the need for the faculty position in degree or curricular offerings or requirements, and the addition, reduction or elimination of programs or courses at the College.

II. Framework for Workload

The normal expectation is a 3/3 course load or its equivalent for faculty demonstrating an active program of scholarship and/or with major or multiple service responsibilities. The blend of teaching and supervision, scholarship and service may change from year to year and across the career of an individual faculty member as long as departmental responsibilities are met on an annual basis.

Faculty persons who do not demonstrate an active program of scholarship should contribute more in the areas of teaching and/or service. In practice, this alternative contribution will generally be in the area of teaching. Thus, a faculty member who is heavily involved in scholarship may have a reduction in expectations of service. Likewise, a faculty member that has major and multiple service responsibilities may have a reduction in scholarship expectations. In practice, only unusually demanding "service responsibilities" will meet this expectation in the absence of an active program of scholarship. The individual expectations will depend on the needs of the department and the individual faculty member's needs (e.g., reappointment, tenure and promotion) and interests.

The department weighs the relative importance of teaching, scholarship, and service in terms of activity, consistency, and increasing development over time in each of these areas. A fuller description of expectations for each of the areas of performance is provided in discussion that follows.

Evaluation of overall performance of an individual faculty member must conform to the following formula:

Teaching >Scholarship>Service where Teaching is $\geq 50\%$

These criteria are in agreement with the Report on Faculty Roles and Rewards dated 10/28/98 and the 9/3/04 memo from Deans' Council. Therefore, teaching is weighted at 60%, scholarship is weighted at 20%, and service is weighted at 20% in assessing and evaluating faculty performance.

Timeline for appointment, promotion and tenure review processes

| Year | Begins | Ends | Product | Scholarly Products | Notification |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Sept. Year 1 | | | | Begin Appointment |
| | | June Year 1 | Annual Report | Scholarship Plan | |
| 2 | Sept. Year 2 | | Application for Reappointment (First Review) | | |
| | | June Year 2 | Annual Report | Evidence of research and/or manuscripts in progress | Notification of Reappointment |
| 3 | Sept. Year 3 | | | | |
| | | June Year 3 | Annual Report | 1- 2 publications | |
| 4 | Sept. Year 4 | | | | |
| | | June Year 4 | Annual Report | 2 -3 publications | |
| 5 | Sept. Year 5 | | Application for Reappointment (Penultimate Review) | | |
| | | June Year 5 | Annual Report | Minimum 3 publications and one in progress | Notification of Reappointment |
| 6 | Sept. Year 6 | | Application for Tenure and Promotion (Final Review) | Minimum 4 peer reviewed publications | |
| | | June Year 6 | Annual Report | | Notification of Reappointment |
| 7 | Sept. Year 7 | | | | Begin Promotion |
| | | June Year 7 | Annual Report | performance at rank | |
| 8 | Sept. Year 8 | | | | Begin Tenure |
| | | June Year 8 | Annual Report | performance at rank | |

III. Teaching, Scholarship, and Service Expectations

Teaching Expectations

We consider teaching and supervision, and thus student learning, to be the most important part of our mission. Teaching and supervision serve not only to provide instructional support for our students but also modeling of important leadership and professional behaviors that will assist students in the development of their own leadership styles and professional identities. Teaching and supervision - and the advisement that goes along with these - encompass promoting, guiding, facilitating, evaluating, and providing experiential opportunities for student learning.

An active program of teaching involves multiple aspects of demonstrated knowledge of leadership as a discipline and profession that includes the following:

1. Skills of pedagogy, including clear and precise communication and methods of instruction.
2. Skill in communicating and projecting this knowledge.
3. Skill in facilitating student learning
4. Effectiveness as a role model for the attitudes and behaviors of an educational leader.
5. Demonstrated interest in the educational achievement of students.
6. Continual self-reflection regarding the effectiveness and impact of one's teaching.
7. Utilization and integration of contemporary knowledge and resources.
8. A consistent record of respectful, courteous and ethical interactions with students.
9. Currency in teaching areas (e.g. through workshops, research, reading of professional materials)
10. Demonstration of evidence of student success (e.g., performance on standardized tests, student testimonials and samples of student work)
11. Obtainment of student evaluation scores consistent with department norms
12. Regard by colleagues as a competent teacher, one who has created an overall positive impression through day-to-day professional interactions with other faculty.
13. Advisement that helps students successfully plan their graduate career with the department, supports students with challenges, and addresses job search needs such as letters of recommendation, etc.
14. New applications of technology to teaching
15. Evidence of rigor in course preparation and teaching (See appendix for description of rigor/data tracking)

Scholarship Expectations

Scholarship encompasses the production of an identifiable product or presentation subject to systematic internal or external evaluation by professional peers. Included in scholarship is the discovery, integration or application of knowledge.

Scholarship accepted for publication in which a peer reviewed, refereed procedure is used shall be considered to meet the evaluation criteria for scholarship defined by Boyer (1997).

The criteria for assessment of scholarship are:

1. clarity of goals
2. adequacy of preparation
3. appropriateness of methods
4. significance of results
5. effectiveness of presentation
6. reflective critique where appropriate

(See Appendix A for brief description of these criteria)

An active program of scholarship related to the discipline is defined as ongoing engagement in scholarly activity that builds upon and expands research focus beyond the dissertation, contributes to the body of knowledge in the field, and leads to more sophisticated levels of scholarly achievement.

Renewal Expectations

The first renewal should indicate that the candidate has developed a research agenda and has taken steps to implement. This agenda and steps taken should be included in the renewal application. By the fifth year renewal, the candidate's performance should indicate continuous productivity in his or her research agenda, including a minimum of three peer-reviewed publications. The Department requires a minimum of 4 peer-reviewed national or international publications at the time of the tenure application. Peer reviewed may be defined in the traditional sense, but can also be defined as presenting at a national refereed conference, publishing the paper given at a national or international refereed conference in a national or international peer reviewed journal, grant writing which leads to a research based paper either given in a refereed national/international conference or peer reviewed national/international journal. Such progress must be evidenced in the annual report as demonstrable progress (e.g. a draft) of a scholarly product that will lead to a peer reviewed product.

The scholarly productivity should be considered in the context of the significant service obligations in the department (e.g., small number of faculty, accreditation requirements and assessment demands).

Service Expectations

Professional service includes service activities at the departmental, college and professional level. An ongoing program of service begins with service in the department and expands to include service at the college and professional levels. Service also typically begins with membership on committees but generally includes leadership positions within the department, college and profession. Where service is community-based, such activity should have a direct relationship to the candidate's disciplinary expertise.

IV. Tenure, Promotion and Continuing Performance

Performance at rank: It is expected that after promotion, the quality of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service will continue at the same level after the candidate has achieved rank. This continuing performance at rank is used as the basis for consideration for promotion to the next rank, is a prerequisite for consideration for discretionary salary increases, and influences decisions about awards. Each faculty member is expected to carry a 3/3 course load or its equivalent, that he/she will maintain an active, productive program of scholarship and make significant service contributions. Faculty who do not maintain an active program of scholarship will not be demonstrating performance at rank and may be required to contribute significantly more in teaching and service.

A. Performance at Rank: Assistant Professor

The candidate is actively involved in teaching, scholarship and service such that he or she will be able to obtain promotion to Associate Professor. See the above discussion of active teaching, scholarship, and service (Section III).

The achievement of an appropriate terminal degree (e.g., doctorate) establishes the individual as qualified in the profession. The expectation is that the individual has the ability to achieve the highest rank in the department and the potential to demonstrate excellence in the counseling profession. Performance at rank includes the preparation of a portfolio of teaching materials that addresses the multiple aspects of the instructional role. This includes documentation and demonstration of knowledge of the counseling discipline, skills of pedagogy, including clear and precise communication and methods of instruction, interest in the educational achievement of students, utilization of student feedback to improve teaching, and involvement in student advising.

Teaching:

Student evaluation of teaching scores should be in the good to excellent range for IAS and departmental evaluation. (0.xxx-1.xxx) If these scores are not in this range, improvement in teaching should be demonstrated during the following year. At minimum, evidence of updating syllabi that reflects student feedback and currency in the field must be reflected in the faculty annual report. Demonstration of reflection on the current year's teaching and plans

for improvement or updating teaching for the upcoming year is required. Evidence of rigor in the form of resubmission data tracking.

Minimally, faculty should be functioning at rank on an annual basis in teaching.

Scholarship:

In the department the successful completion of doctoral dissertation demonstrates minimal scholarly competence at this level. Additionally, evidence of a commitment to continued scholarly productivity is necessary and involves demonstrated initiative by the candidate, to establish a framework and focus for scholarship, future research and professional development. The candidate is expected to begin writing for publication in the Educational Administration field and presenting at various levels in professional and leadership forums., Renewal applications should demonstrate scholarly activity e.g., scholarly publications and professional presentations done in the counselor education field.

Service:

Service is an important role in the academic and professional communities and is an expectation within the total professional obligation. At this level, the faculty member's expected role is that of active participant on departmental committees. Department expectations can be hosting monthly program information meetings, developing and serving as manager of an off campus cohort as well as outreach service to schools and community agencies. This may come in the form of providing professional development to staff, mentoring new administrators and being a member of local school advisory boards. Initial involvement in College, community and/or regional professional service also begins at this level.

B. Performance at Rank: Associate Professor

Teaching:

To maintain performance at rank in teaching, the associate professor must consistently meet the *Teaching Expectations* that define minimal requirements for teaching competency. He/she is expected to achieve mastery of teaching methods, to be able to provide evidence of effective student learning, and to make significant contributions to the development of new methods and curricula. Evidence of rigor through submission of resubmission data tracking is also expected.

Minimally, faculty should be functioning at rank on an annual basis in teaching.

Scholarship:

To perform at rank in scholarship, the associate professor must continue to maintain an active and productive scholarship program. The best evidence of this is a record of producing at least 3-4 significant products (e.g., journal articles, book chapters, grant submissions that lead to products, presentations at major conferences and/or professional meetings, etc.), or equivalent (e.g., scholarly books, textbooks, published software, etc.) every five years. The candidate must be first author on at least one of the products, and all published materials must be peer-reviewed.

Minimally annual performance at rank includes an active program of scholarship. An active program is conference presentations, consistent work on scholarship agenda, grant submission etc.

Service:

For performance at rank in service, the associate professor must maintain a continuing commitment to service activities, including regular service on departmental committees as needed, a solid record of participation in other department functions e.g. Department expectations can be hosting monthly program information meetings, developing and serving as manager of an off campus cohort as well as outreach service to schools and community agencies. This may come in the form of providing professional development to staff, mentoring new administrators and being a member of local school advisory boards. The associate professor is also expected to participate in the revision of department policies and procedures. The associate professor should also provide additional activity at the College level (e.g., membership on college-wide committees) and beginning service to the profession. There should be evidence of leadership in service, (e.g., chairing committees at the department, College or professional level and or significant contributions to committees).

Minimally, faculty should perform at rank annually in service.

C. Performance at Rank: Professor

Teaching:

The professor is expected to be a model and mentor for less experienced colleagues and provide leadership in such matters as changes in departmental curricula and assessment of curricula and student learning. The professor will be one to whom younger colleagues will look for assistance, information, ideas, wisdom and inspiration. Additionally, to demonstrate excellence in teaching, the candidate must show clear evidence of excellence success and or involvement with students.

Minimally, faculty should perform at rank annually in teaching.

Scholarship:

To perform at rank in scholarship, the professor must continue to maintain an active and productive scholarship program. Being rank may be demonstrated by the accumulative, ongoing body of scholarly publications, editorial positions on academic publications, demonstrating a significant impact as evidenced by reputation, citation, and invited addresses.

Minimally, faculty should perform at rank annually in scholarship.

Service:

For performance at rank in service, the professor must maintain an outstanding record of participation in departmental, college and or professional service activities . Examples may include holding a major office in professional organization, chairing departmental committees and/or substantial documented contributions as a committee member. Performance at rank

consists of more than spending a lot of time and effort on service activities; it also means that the professor demonstrates his or her service activities have made a major impact on the department, the college and or the profession.

Minimally, faculty should perform at rank annually in service.

V. Promotion Procedures

A. Promotion to Associate Professor

A person promoted to the rank of Associate Professor has demonstrated achievement on a continuous basis in the rank of Assistant Professor in all three major performance areas: Effectiveness in Teaching, Scholarship, and University Service. There must be evidence that the person has made sustained high quality contributions to the Department and the College as an Assistant Professor. The faculty member has begun to establish a commendable reputation beyond the campus for scholarly work in the field. In addition, there is the expectation that the person has made discernible progress toward achieving excellence in the discipline/profession and for attaining the highest rank in the department.

1. Teaching

For promotion to rank of Associate Professor, teaching excellence and commitment should extend beyond that demonstrated at the rank of Assistant Professor. The candidate must present a teaching portfolio that demonstrates growth and continued teaching excellence and addresses the following 6 teaching criteria. Information from the time of appointment in the department to the time of application for tenure and promotion should be included.

Documentation should include course syllabi and materials, demonstration of rigor and candidate's evaluation of performance in the 6 categories outlined below. Reviewers will look for evidence of achievement of excellence in teaching as demonstrated in the 6 categories above.

Asterisks (*) mark required documentation; other information should be included if available.

a. Teaching Criteria

Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Focus*

This statement should begin this section and address the candidate's teaching and supervision pedagogy and educational values, ideals, and goals. The statement should include self-evaluation of successes in teaching, efforts to improve teaching generally or in a particular course, assessment and achievement of student learning outcomes, and general and specific course effectiveness. Minimally, this section should include:

- List courses taught including contact hours and the number of students enrolled in each*
- Include other pertinent information directly related to teaching and advisement (e.g., successful undertaking of new course assignments such as provide leadership in course revisions, new assessments, innovative teaching methods, use of technology and delivery of material.
- Data supporting rigor in each course, i.e. number of submissions required to meet mastery. See Appendix A

b. Student Evaluation

The candidate must evaluate his/her performance in this area. Discussion may include any or all of the following (or more).

- Summary of student ratings of instruction for all courses taught during the period under review including IAS mean scores, Departmental Evaluation Form mean scores. Instructor-developed feedback
- A personal interpretation of student evaluation in light of teaching philosophy and utilization of student feedback. *
- Department-solicited letters of support or comments about teaching and supervision*.

c. Student Outcomes and Accomplishments

The candidate must evaluate his/her performance in this area. Discussion may include any or all of the following (or more):

- Student performance on state licensure tests related to instructor's expertise
- Student employment rates in the field and success in the workplace related to the instructor's expertise.
- Student accomplishments, e.g., conference presentations, published papers, awards, performances, exhibitions, student-faculty research projects.

d. Improvement of Teaching and Supervision

The candidate must evaluate his/her performance in this area. Discussion may include any or all of the following (or more).

- Professional development as a teacher and supervisor (workshops, conferences pertinent to the counseling profession.) *
- Efforts to remain current in the field
- New applications of technology to teaching and supervision
- Revision of course instructional approach, course revisions
- A statement by the applicant that addresses how documentation provided in this category helps to improve teaching
- Evidence of rigor with provision of data showing resubmissions for each course taught

e. Teaching-Related Activity Beyond the Classroom

The candidate must evaluate his/her performance in this area. Documentation presented may include any of the following:

- Number of advisees
- Evidence of advising quality (surveys, letters, etc.)
- Independent study
- Mentoring of students
- Student involvement in scholarship, publication, and/or presentations resulting from student-faculty collaboration
- Achievement and maintenance of relevant certification, licensure etc.
- Invitations to be guest speaker/guest lecturer

f. Peer Evaluation: *Suggested but not required*

The candidate must evaluate his/her performance in this area. The evaluation will include a representative sample of instructional materials along with written peer evaluation that includes two or more peers, of syllabi and teaching.

- Review of course syllabi, assignments, and examinations by faculty within the department
- Appropriate integration of technology
- Interviews of current students and/or alumni
- Awards or recognition related to teaching.

2. Scholarship

Scholarship is broadly defined to include discovery, integration, and application and may include any or all of the following products: journal articles; books (authored or edited including textbooks); book chapters; conference presentations; panel discussion involving a critique; and published media or software materials. Grant development may be considered as scholarship if it relates directly to research activity and results in a product.

For promotion, the person must show significant advancement in the area of scholarship beyond the level of Assistant Professor and beyond the presentation of doctoral dissertation results to new areas of investigation. The demonstration of scholarship must include products that are subject to external, anonymous, peer refereed reviews for journal articles. Book chapters that are in books edited by well-known scholars in the educational administration field will be considered. Books will be considered and should be subjected to external review by experts in the topic. All material should contribute to the body of knowledge in the field. At least four national and/or international journal publications are expected. Articles published in state and regional journals will be considered depending upon the quality of the journal and must be appropriate to the educational leadership field but should not comprise the entire scholarship portfolio. The majority of journal publications must be in those known in the educational leadership field. Other evidence of scholarly production can be a paper delivered at a nationally/internationally refereed conference, publication of that paper in a nationally/internationally peer reviewed journal or a grant leading to a refereed national presentation or subsequent publication in a peer reviewed national/international

journal.

The candidate will prepare a Scholarship Focus and Summary. This statement will include the following components: a) an overview of the area of scholarship; b) a list of each scholarly product with a brief description of the peer review process and reputation of each piece; and c) a brief reflective critique. A narrative statement discussing the faculty member's scholarly activity is also required. This narrative should include the relationship of the individual's scholarly work to his or her teaching and service activities, a review of the scholarship produced, and an outline of future plans. In the case of joint or multiple authorship, the faculty member must provide a brief review of his or her contribution to the scholarly products.

Scholarly products published within two years prior to the initial appointment may be considered if the products meet the above criteria.

3. Service

The candidate should demonstrate excellence on a continuous basis in the area of service during the period as Assistant Professor. *For promotion*, the level and impact of service should have expanded significantly beyond the Assistant Professor level. Service to the department, the college, and the profession is expected.

The candidate will prepare a statement of all relevant service activities with a brief description of the individual's responsibilities, participation, and any product developed. Where service is community-based, such activity should have a direct relationship to the candidate's disciplinary expertise.

- administrative and/or leadership roles on departmental, College, community, and/or professional committees;
- Hosting monthly program information meetings
- Developing and serving as manager of off campus cohorts
- Reviewing and revising department policy and procedures
- participation in service activities beyond the department (some faculty may become focused in one area of service outside the department, e.g., professional association leadership, while others may participate at many levels);
- Evidence of outreach service to schools and community agencies in the form of professional development for staff, mentoring new administrators; assisting with searches and serving on district and agency advisory boards
- Evidence of participation and leadership should be provided through several types of evaluation, i.e., peer review, letters from committee chairs citing specific contributions to the work of the committee, substantive letters of recommendation from colleagues and/or community agencies that cite contributions and successful initiatives, and active leadership in disciplinary professional organizations.

B. Promotion to Professor

A person promoted to the rank of Professor has demonstrated professional growth and excellence on a continuous basis in the rank of Associate Professor in all three performance

areas: Effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service. There should be evidence of new and more sophisticated levels of achievement in teaching and service beyond the Associate Professor level. The evidence must clearly support the person's role as an established leader in the department and participation in College level service, and that his/her contributions are of high quality and have been sustained over a reasonable period of time as an Associate Professor.

Accomplishment in the scholarship area should be significantly greater than was expected to achieve the rank of Associate Professor. At minimum, continual performance at rank at the Associate level and at least four new published, peer reviewed, scholarly products in the most recent five years are expected. The significance of the person's accomplishment is attested to by peer and reputable figures in the field away from campus:

- Recognition of the quality of work should be made evident and available in the form of reviews, comments and citations in the works of others, direct letters of assessment by recognized authorities off-campus and/ or invitations from leaders in the field to contribute to publications, conferences, and exhibitions, to serve on editorial boards, to review books, etc.
- The candidate will provide a list of potential external reviews to the Department Chair. The external reviewers should have expertise in the scholarship area to be reviewed. The Department Chair reviews the candidates proposed external reviewers and forward the final names to the Dean of the School of Education and Human Services. The Dean solicits the external reviews and provides the criteria for the review of scholarship. The Dean will forward the external reviews to the APT Committee to consider in their deliberations. Additionally, it is the Candidate's responsibility to give the names to the Chair and the scholarship to be reviewed by the mid-semester of the academic year prior to the semester in which the Candidate applies for tenure and/or promotion.
- Reputation of place (i.e., journal, book, etc.) in which articles, research projects, etc. have appeared will be an important consideration, as will be the publishers or sponsors.
- Honors or awards that serve to recognize the person's contributions for long term work in the field and/or new interpretations and applications of scholarship.

V. The Role of the Candidate

It is the responsibility of each individual seeking reappointment, continuing appointment, or promotion within the Department to prepare a complete and organized package of materials supporting his or her request. It is the responsibility of each individual to know and understand 1) the terms of his or her current appointment, 2) application deadlines for contract renewal, continuing appointment, and promotion, and 3) to supply the information requested in the APT document.

VI. The Role of the APT Committee

The role of the APT Committee Chair is to provide guidance to the candidate about college and departmental expectations on teaching, scholarship and service. In addition, it is the responsibility of each APT Committee member to review the candidate's portfolio thoroughly before scheduled APT meetings. It is the role of the Chair of the APT committee to hold meetings and write the APT recommendation with input from the committee members.

Candidate documents will be kept in the Chair's office. In order to keep track of the documents and to ensure that all members have reviewed the documents, committee members will sign out the documents on a sign out sheet.

VII. The Role of Department Chair

The role of the Department Chair is to provide guidance and clear expectations to the candidate about college and departmental expectations on teaching, scholarship and service. In addition, it is the Chair's responsibility to approval the external reviewers used to review the Candidate's scholarship and to forward the final reviewers' names and contact information along with the material to be reviewed to the Dean of the School of Education and Human Services. Where there are no tenured faculty within the department to serve on the APT committee, the chair should either serve as mentor or seek a tenured member the School of Education and Human Services to serve as mentor.

VIII. The Role of the Department Vote

The college's policy states "department (as committee of the whole) vote on agreement/disagreement with the APT Committee's recommendation." All tenure track faculty in the department are eligible to review the Candidate's portfolio using the APT document. The review is of the candidate's portfolio and the APT Committee's recommendation letter. The vote is an agreement that the APT committee has accurately applied the department and college standards regarding promotion and tenure. The vote may be "yes," "no," or "abstain."

The APT chair will provide a copy of the APT Committee's recommendation regarding the candidate's application to the Chair of the Department and all tenure track faculty. The APT Chair solicits tenure track faculty votes and communicates the votes anonymously to the department chair. The applicant may request and receive the numerical tally but no more detail about the vote is released to the applicant.

IX. Application Contents

Materials supporting the Candidate's request for reappointment, continuing appointment, or promotion, shall be organized and indexed in accord with any administrative guidelines in effect at the time of application. The Candidate should strive to ease the burden of those

reviewing the Candidate's request through the use of clear, concise, and consistent labeling for all supporting documents. Where guidelines do not exist, the following ordering of materials should be used:

- * Letter of application
- * Cover sheet containing Candidate's degrees, licenses, certifications, term of appointment, type of application (e.g., term appointment, etc), time at rank, potential tenure date (if applicable), and classes taught.
- * Means from all teaching and supervision evaluations
- * Inventory of materials submitted
- * Comment pages with signatures from annual reports
- * Teaching portfolio
- * Supporting documents related to scholarship
- * Supporting documents related to service
- * Other applicable documents and appendices.

Where possible, materials should be organized into three-ring binders that are clearly labeled. A candidate should not expect individuals reviewing his or her materials to sift through unorganized and loose materials.

X. The Review Process

A. The APT Review Process

The APT committee shall consist of a minimum of three tenured faculty from the Department of Educational Administration. In case of promotion, the committee shall be comprised of faculty at or above the rank being sought. If the department does not have enough qualified individuals, it shall seek the help of Emeriti Professors within the department or other qualified individuals of the appropriate rank within the College. Should the APT committee be comprised solely of members external to the department, the APT committee chair shall meet with the Educational Administration Department chair to review department procedures for renewal as well as expectations for the renewal candidate within the department.

The outcome of the APT review process will be a written report containing:

- * The APT committee's recommendation
- * A supportive narrative summarizing the Committee's conclusions as they pertain to the criteria of teaching, scholarship and service.

The Chair of the APT Committee is responsible for writing the report which reflects the committee as a whole review. The report is then distributed to the following:

1. APT Committee members
2. Candidate

3. Department Chair

The APT Committee letter is addressed and sent to the department chair. A copy of the APT committee's letter is given to the Candidate at the same time the letter is given to the chair. The Chair then reviews the Candidate's portfolio and writes his or her recommendation. The Chair's recommendation is sent to the Dean but copies are also sent to the Candidate and the APT Committee.

B. Appeal Process

It should be noted that the Candidate has the option of withdrawing his or her request for re-appointment, continuing appointment or promotion at any time during the process, provided the Candidate withdraws in writing.

1. APT Level

If the Candidate disagrees with the APT Committee's review and recommendation, the Candidate must write an appeal letter directed to the APT chair outlining the reasons for his or her disagreement. This must be done within two weeks from the date of the letter to the Chair. Further, the Candidate has the option of asking to talk with the APT Committee as a whole to discuss the disagreement. Upon receipt of the letter, the APT chair must share the letter with the APT Committee as a whole. It is up to the APT committee to decide if and how it may respond to the appeal letter from the Candidate. The APT Committee's response must occur within two weeks from the receipt of the Candidate's letter. The APT Committee's options include (1) meet with the Candidate to discuss their recommendation and the Candidate's disagreement with the recommendation with the intent to come to some conclusion regarding the disagreement, or (2) write a response letter (with a copy to the Chair) to the candidate indicating its decision regarding the Candidate's appeal. If option number one (1) is chosen, the APT Committee must put its final decision in writing to the Candidate with a copy to the Chair.

2. Chair Level

If the Candidate disagrees with the Chair's review and recommendation, the Candidate must write an appeal letter directed to the Chair outlining the reasons for his or her disagreement. The appeal must occur within two weeks from the date on the Chair's letter to the Candidate. The Candidate has the option of requesting a meeting with the chair to discuss the appeal. The Chair must put in writing to the Candidate his or her decision regarding the Candidate's appeal. Copies of the letter are to be sent to the APT Committee and attached to the Chair's review and recommendation letter to the Dean.

If the Candidate continues to disagree with the Chair's decision, he or she must write an appeal letter to the Dean, School of Professions outlining his or her disagreement. The Candidate also has the option of requesting a meeting with the Dean to discuss his or her concerns.

Appendix A

Summary of Scholarship Standards

Boyer, E. (1997). In C. E. Glassick, M. T. Huber, & G. I. Maeroff (Eds.). *Scholarship assessed*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rigor

Educational leaders and administrators are expected to have flawless written and oral communication skills. As a part of the program's training, those teaching in the department of Educational Administration practice master learning. That is, a student's paper can be returned and re-submitted numerous times until it receives an A. For this reason, it appears that the program is giving out all A's. In order to demonstrate rigor within the program, department members will data track the submissions and resubmissions via TK20 or noted in the Angel grading book. Department members will submit their rigor/data tracking as part of their annual report.

Clear Goals

Does the scholar state the basic purposes of his or her work clearly? Does the scholar define objectives that are realistic and achievable? Does the scholar identify important questions in the field?

Adequate Preparation

Does the scholar show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? Does the scholar bring the necessary skills to his or her work? Does the scholar bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?

Appropriate Methods

Does the scholar use methods appropriate to the goals? Does the scholar apply effectively the methods selected? Does the scholar modify procedures in response to changing circumstances?

Significant Results

Does the scholar achieve the goals? Does the scholar's work add consequentially to the field?
Does the scholar work open additional areas for further exploration?

Effective Presentation

Does the scholar use a suitable style and effective organization to present his or her work?
Does the scholar use appropriate forums for communicating work to its intended audiences?
Does the scholar present his or her message with clarity and integrity?

Reflective Critique

Does the scholar critically evaluate his or her own work? Does the scholar bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? Does the scholar use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?

SLG
Department of Educational Administration
Disk: I:EDA CHAIR
File: 2004-05\COLLEGE WORK\dept criteria for personnel actions
Created: 3/6/00
Revised: 3/29/05, 2/2/06, 4/1/06, 4/28/06

