



Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures

of the

Department of Education

(Name of Department/School/College)

Effective Date: July 1, 2019

APPROVALS

SIGNATURE

DATE

Department Faculty

Chair, Primary Review Committee

Tricia Seifert

[Signature]

4-24-19

Primary Administrative Reviewer

Department Head/Director

Christine Rogers Stanton

[Signature]

4-25-19

Intermediate Review Committee

Chair, Intermediate Review Committee

Alison Harmon

[Signature]

4-25-19

Intermediate Administrative Reviewer

College Dean

Dawn Tarabochia

[Signature]

4-25-19

College Review Committee

Chair, College Review Committee

DAVID J. SINGEL

[Signature]

University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

Robert L. Mokuwa

[Signature]

5-7-19

Provost

Role and Scope Document for The Department of Education March 27, 2019

Article I. Role and Scope of Unit

Mission of the Department of Education

The mission of the Department of Education is to prepare highly qualified professional educators and administrators through exemplary campus and distance-based programs and field placements in quality public and private schools. In addition, the department contributes to the State of Montana and the nation through the faculty's active research and outreach efforts.

Role and Scope of the Department of Education

The faculty, staff, and administrators in the Department of Education support the fulfillment of the University's teaching, scholarship, and service mission in the areas of Adult and Higher Education, Curriculum and Instruction, and Educational Leadership. Our primary mission focuses on serving, developing, and enriching the educational capacities of the State of Montana and the nation at large. Through an integrated approach to scholarship, teaching, and outreach/service, faculty members in the Department inform educational practice within public schools, the teaching profession, colleges and universities, and society at large. Therefore, the interpretation of scholarship, teaching, and outreach/service needs to be sufficiently broad and flexible to accommodate a wide range of activities. Broadly, faculty teach future and practicing educators, leaders, and consultants; conduct and disseminate scholarship focused on curriculum, pedagogy, learning and development, educational leadership, and educational policy; and engage in outreach and service to benefit preK-12 schools, colleges and universities, communities, and state and national organizations.

Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

Not applicable.

Article III. Annual Review Process

An annual review assesses a faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year, and is based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, assigned percentages of effort,

annual assignments, annual productivity report, and evaluations of teaching. The outcome of the annual review is independent from retention, tenure, and promotion reviews, and a positive result does not guarantee the faculty member will be eligible for retention, tenure, and/or promotion.

Faculty members in the Department of Education will schedule a one hour meeting with the Department Head and submit all annual review materials to the Department Head at least one week prior to their annual review meeting. These materials shall include a current curriculum vitae, personalized report from the university's reporting system for the past calendar year, and a brief self-reflective narrative outlining the candidate's annual progress and goals for the forthcoming year with respect to scholarship, teaching, service, and integration.

The Department Head will review each faculty member's materials prior to the annual review meeting and develop a draft of the annual evaluation. Corrections and clarifications will be discussed during the review meeting. The Department Head will sign the faculty member's annual review evaluation. The faculty member will also sign the evaluation and retain the right to attach a rebuttal to it. A signed copy will be given to the faculty member and a signed copy will also be retained in the Department file.

Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator

Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment

The form of review in Article IV refers solely to the university's retention, tenure, and promotion process. The Primary Review Committee (the Department RTP Committee) and the Primary Review Administrator (the Department Head) conduct independent reviews of retention, tenure, and promotion candidates' review materials. The Department Review Committee will be comprised of three (3) faculty selected according to the following procedure. Each spring, two members of the review committee will be elected at large. One member will be appointed by the Department Head in order to address the need for representation by diversity and expertise. If a candidate is pursuing promotion, at least two of the committee members will be full professors. In the event that the Department Head is being considered for promotion and/or tenure, the entire committee shall be elected by faculty. Only tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on the Department RTP Committee. Emeritus faculty members are ineligible to serve. Faculty members eligible to serve on the Department RTP Committee will hold appointments of .50 FTE or more in the Department, or whose major academic responsibility is within the Department. Committees will be available for service throughout the academic year. Faculty on leave will be ineligible for service. Faculty will serve no more than two years consecutively. Committees will be constituted and their membership reported to the Provost's Office by the date established by the Provost.

Before conducting a review, committee members and administrative reviewers will attend review trainings offered by the University for the review cycle.

Recommendations made by the Departmental Review Committee regarding retention, tenure, and promotion will be based upon formal motions from which are recorded the total number of votes in favor of the motion, in opposition to the motion, and in abstention.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

The primary review administrator is the Department Head for the Department of Education. This review is independent of the Primary Review Committee's review. Before conducting a review, the Department Head will attend the review training offered by the University for the review cycle.

Section 4.03 Identification of Responsible Entities

The Primary Review Administrator (the Department Head) is responsible for the following tasks:

- (a) Establishing the Primary Review Committee by facilitating the election and/or appointment of the members as described.
- (b) Selecting external reviewers of scholarship, soliciting review letters, and ensuring review letters are uploaded to the review platform.
- (c) Selecting a reviewer for the in-depth assessment of teaching performance, soliciting a review letter, and ensuring the assessment letter is uploaded to the review platform.
- (d) Soliciting evaluation letters from advisees, if appropriate given the candidate's advising duties, and ensuring advisee letters are uploaded to the review platform.
- (e) At the request of the candidate, soliciting stakeholder (e.g. community member, public official, K-12 partner, collaborator) statements of impact regarding the candidate's scholarship, teaching, service, and/or integration efforts, and ensuring the letters of impact are uploaded to the review platform.
- (f) Ensuring a short bio-sketch of each external reviewer of scholarship is uploaded to the review platform.
- (g) Assuring the following materials are included in the Dossier:
 - i. Applicable Role and Scope Document.
 - ii. Letter of hire, any Percentages of Effort changes, all annual reviews, and all Evaluation Letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.
 - iii. In an appendix, the candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period.

- (h) Maintaining copies of all review committee Evaluation Letters and internal and external review letters after the review.

See Section 6.01 for materials to be submitted by the candidate.

Section 4.04 Next Review Level

The next level of review after the Department of Education RTP Committee and the Primary Administrator is the RTP Committee of the College of Education, Health and Human Development.

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator

Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee - Composition and Appointment

Refer to the Role and Scope Document of the College of Education, Health, and Human Development.

Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator

The Intermediate Review Administrator is the Dean of the College of Education, Health, and Human Development.

Section 5.03 Level of Review following Intermediate Review Administrator The next level of review after the Intermediate Review Administrator is the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee. Refer to the College of EHHD's Role and Scope Document for information regarding the selection of members for the University RTP Committee.

Article VI. Review Materials

Section 6.01 Materials Submitted by Candidate

Materials for external review of scholarship must include:

- i. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) listing scholarship, teaching, and service activities of the candidate.
- ii. A brief statement that identifies the candidate's area of Scholarship.

- iii. No more than 5 examples of articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represents their Scholarship.

Materials for in-depth assessment of teaching performance must include:

- i. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) listing scholarship, teaching, and service activities of the candidate.
- ii. A brief statement describing the candidate's philosophy and practice of teaching. The statement can include evidence of innovations and contributions to teaching beyond the classroom (e.g. textbook writing, curriculum and program development, involvement in professional societies, writing about teaching innovation, etc.).
- iii. A list of courses taught during the review period, number of credit and/or contact hours for each course, the number of students per course, and information regarding the course contexts (on-line, required/elective, graduate/undergraduate, first offering, etc.).
- iv. A table summarizing student evaluations and a brief synopsis of the written comments. The candidate is encouraged to supply a brief narrative offering their interpretation of the results. The actual evaluation forms should not be included, but available upon request.
- v. Evidence reflecting supervision/advising responsibilities. This may include advisor evaluations, a statement of workload relating to masters and doctoral committees (such as a count of oral comprehensive exams, thesis, doctoral proposals and defenses), and any other information reflecting these responsibilities.
- vi. Syllabus for a single course. A class session from this course will be observed and evaluated by the in-depth assessor based on the candidate's knowledge, organization, delivery, and assessment.

Candidate-Submitted Materials for the Dossier must include:

1. The "Cover Sheet", obtained from the Provost's Office.
2. A comprehensive CV with scholarship, teaching, and service activities of the candidate.
3. A Personal Statement that includes a description of the candidate's areas of Scholarship, Teaching, and Service. This Statement should also include a description of the candidate's area(s) of integration to demonstrate meeting the standards for retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable.
4. Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation shall include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition itemized by year over the relevant Review Period.
5. Additional Materials

- a. Teaching: In-Depth teaching assessment materials.
- b. Scholarship: Examples of evidence (e.g. publications, presentation documentation, creative works) to demonstrate quantitative and qualitative performance indicators of Scholarship, as appropriate. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should include materials sent to external reviewers in this section. For retention, tenure, and promotion reviews, only scholarly products that have been published or accepted for publication, performance, or exhibition within the Review Period may be considered. Candidates will provide documentation of the acceptance for publication, performance, or exhibition. Scholarly products that have been accepted for publication but not yet published or that have been published in a journal not readily available through university databases must be included in the dossier among the candidate's materials. Creative scholarly products, such as works of art or films, must be made available to reviewers through digital presentation and/or live links to media.

Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

The Department values the role of collaboration and mentorship, especially given our commitment to integrated practice. Candidates are encouraged to pursue independent lines of scholarship and to engage in scholarly partnerships with undergraduate and graduate students, practicing teachers and leaders, community members, and/or colleagues. To demonstrate autonomy and leadership in publications, creative works, and grant proposals and awards, candidates must include a description of their role/contribution in collaborative publications, creative works, and grant activities in their Summary of Evidence of scholarship.

Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure

Four external reviews of candidates' scholarship must be included for tenure and/or promotion. External reviewers will be selected in the following manner. The candidate for tenure and/or promotion will submit the names of at least four (4) faculty members from similar institutions, positions, and areas of expertise. These potential reviewers cannot include collaborators, advisors, or doctoral committee members. For additional information, see the Faculty Handbook Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Rights and Responsibilities Section 3c (Conflicts of Interest). The candidate will submit names and materials for external reviewers to the Department Head by the deadline established by the Department Head. A list of additional external review nominees will be prepared by the Department Head and/or Primary Review Committee. A majority of the external reviews must come from the list submitted by the Department Head and/or the Primary Review Committee. It will be the responsibility of the Department Head to solicit the external reviews. In the event that an external review nominee declines, the Department Head may select any other name from among the remaining nominees.

External reviewers will be provided with sample materials from the candidate's tenure and/or promotion documentation, consisting of a complete CV, a statement of scholarship,

and samples of the candidate's scholarly work (i.e. articles, papers, software, curriculum, etc.). It will be the responsibility of the Department Head to forward such materials as the candidate provides, along with the Department of Education Role and Scope guidelines and criteria for scholarship, to the reviewers. The external reviewer's evaluations must be returned prior to completion of the departmental review. External reviewers will include a copy of their own CV with their evaluations.

Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01 Retention Review – Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position.

Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review – Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review – The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

Article VIII. Retention Reviews

Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Review. Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 8.02 University Standard. The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

- (a) effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and
- (b) integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Scholarship

Candidates for retention meet the standard of effectiveness in scholarship by documenting completed products and/or completed/continuing processes appropriate to their field/scholarly identity, during the review timeframe. The following tables list performance indicators applicable to scholarship. The indicators listed in Tier I are considered the higher impact activities by which performance in scholarship in the field is evaluated. Those from Tier II also demonstrate performance but carry less weight. All items from Tiers I and II are referred to as “scholarly products and processes.”

Tier 1

	Products	Processes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Peer-Reviewed journal articles with a national/international audience <input type="checkbox"/> Peer-Reviewed books/book chapters with a national/international audience <input type="checkbox"/> Peer-Reviewed presentations with a national/international audience <input type="checkbox"/> <u>High impact</u> invited publications <input type="checkbox"/> <u>High impact</u> invited presentations (e.g. “keynotes”) <input type="checkbox"/> Other scholarly/creative products (e.g. curricular resources, films, videos, computer programs, software, innovative teaching materials, artwork, musical compositions, etc.) that demonstrate a <u>high impact</u> based on the characteristics of peer-review, national/international audience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of an article manuscript for re-submission to a leading journal of national/international scope that is relevant and appropriate given the candidate’s area of inquiry <input type="checkbox"/> Nationally funded grant activities (the candidate must be Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator with a significant role)

Tier 2

	Products	Processes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Regional/State journal Publications <input type="checkbox"/> Invited publications <input type="checkbox"/> Invited national/international presentations (e.g., membership on a panel) <input type="checkbox"/> Peer-Reviewed or invited regional/state/local presentations <input type="checkbox"/> Submitted proposals for national grants <input type="checkbox"/> Book reviews <input type="checkbox"/> Technical reports <input type="checkbox"/> Monographs <input type="checkbox"/> Other scholarly/creative products as appropriate to the candidate's field of expertise (e.g. curricular resources, films, videos, computer programs, software, innovative teaching materials, artwork, musical compositions, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Relationship building with communities <input type="checkbox"/> Development of integrated activities <input type="checkbox"/> Collaborations consistent with the candidate's scholarly identity <input type="checkbox"/> Practical applications (e.g. policy revisions, syllabi from other institutions showing inclusion of candidate's work, professional development resources, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Participation in research-based program development <input type="checkbox"/> University/State/Local grant activities (the candidate must be Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator with a significant role) <input type="checkbox"/> Development of scholarly/creative products as appropriate to the candidate's field of expertise (e.g. curricular resources, films, videos, computer programs, software, innovative teaching materials, artwork, musical compositions, etc.)

Teaching

Candidates for retention meet the standard of effectiveness in teaching by documenting evidence of effective teaching and advising during the review timeframe, commensurate with the candidate's assigned percentages of effort.

Performance Indicator (examples)
Development and/or maintenance of a new course
Implementation of a teaching innovation
Awards and recognition for teaching and/or advising
Collaborations with students on scholarship
Teaching collaborations with other faculty
Professional development opportunities
Guest lectures
Leading workshops on teaching and/or advising
Advising/Mentorship
Peer evaluation of teaching

This list is representative of teaching performance indicators, but it is not exhaustive. To demonstrate additional evidence of teaching performance, the candidate may choose to describe other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here.

Service

Candidates for retention meet the standard of effectiveness in service by documenting evidence of consistent participation in service to the department, college, university, professional societies, and/or community during the review timeframe, commensurate with the candidate's assigned percentages of effort.

Performance Indicator (examples)
Membership on department committee
Membership on college committee

Membership on university committee

Contribution to professional association

Contribution to profession

Contribution to community

Integration

Candidates for retention demonstrate they meet the standard for integration by documenting integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

To demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship, candidates for retention should describe and substantiate a cohesive and focused scholarly trajectory specific to their field and scholarly identity. Evidence of effectiveness includes, but is not limited to, creation of scholarly products, such as journal articles and conference papers. For information regarding the status of scholarly products and their qualification for inclusion in review materials, see Section 8.06.

During the retention review period, candidates must show evidence of achieving a minimum of one (1) Tier 1 product or process and/or two (2) Tier 2 products or processes (see Section 8.05 for Tier 1 and 2 attributes and examples). In their Summary of Evidence of Scholarship, candidates should include descriptions to explain how their Tier 1 products and/or processes achieve a “high impact” appropriate to their field.

Collaboration is highly valued in the field of education. Therefore, there is no expectation that candidates must create single-authored publications. In addition, standards for determining order of authorship vary across contexts. Candidates are expected to explain their contributions to collaborative scholarly works (see Section 6.02).

Effectiveness in teaching is achieved through the candidate’s positive contributions to the design and implementation of curriculum and pedagogy. Effectiveness can be demonstrated using a variety of indicators, including descriptions of courses, in-depth teaching assessments and/or peer reviews, evaluation letters from advisees (solicited by the department head), and course evaluations.

All faculty in the Department are expected to contribute to graduate and/or undergraduate advising and mentoring. Evidence of the effectiveness of advising/mentoring can include evaluation letters from advisees (solicited by the department head), evidence of serving as Chair and/or Committee Member, descriptions of collaboration with students, and/or information demonstrating progress toward milestones (e.g., comprehensive exams, theses defenses, etc.).

Candidates can further support meeting the standard of effectiveness through evidence of their advising, teaching innovation, recognition, professional development, and/or collaboration with students. In documenting this evidence, candidates should consider including information regarding the level of courses taught (e.g., undergraduate, graduate), format of teaching (e.g., online, hybrid), scope of course (e.g., major requirement, elective, university core), or other relevant information to assist evaluation of the teaching standard.

Across all courses during the review period, course evaluation scores should, on average, meet or exceed the midpoint as defined by the evaluation instrument and in-depth teaching assessment results should be identified as "effective" or greater. For example, 3.0 is the midpoint score on an instrument with 5 response options (e.g., 1=Poor, 2=Below Average, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, 5=Excellent). Course evaluations provide a measure of student satisfaction with teaching, and they are vulnerable to various forms of bias. Therefore, course evaluations scores and averages should be used as a measure of teaching evidence with caution.

Effectiveness in service is demonstrated through consistent, regular, and/or ongoing service to both internal and external communities, and at least two or three levels of internal communities (department, college, and university). Performance indicators for service include the number of opportunities in process or completed, the level at which a committee serves (department, college, or university), serving in a leadership capacity in a service opportunity, serving in a leadership role for a professional organization, level of commitment to a professional journal (editorial board member, occasional reviewer), scope of professional service (local, regional, national, international), or scope of outreach or volunteer work (local, regional, national, international). As service opportunities vary in terms of time commitment and participation, the candidate should describe in the Service Summary of Evidence the amount and substance of those contributions.

Candidates for retention meet the expectations for integration by documenting and describing current or planned integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

To meet the performance indicators for scholarship, candidates should include evidence demonstrating the following characteristics:

1. **Nature and Level of Inquiry:** Faculty scholarship demonstrates rigorous, rich, and nuanced understanding of problems unique to their field(s) of inquiry. This indicator may be substantiated through evidence demonstrating content expertise (e.g. publication in top journals within a specific field), continuous and integrated nature of the scholarly activity, and/or the level of scrutiny the works receive (e.g. evidence of review by peers, leaders, or juries).
2. **Contribution to Practice and/or Theory:** Faculty scholarship demonstrates an impact on the field of education (e.g. curriculum, instruction, assessment, evaluation, leadership, and/or policy within communities, institutions, and systems). This indicator may be substantiated through evidence such as reputation of journals (as demonstrated through traditional or alternative metrics), product usage (e.g. number of downloads, citations), and description of changes to practice (e.g. policy revisions, curricular applications, adoption in syllabi or professional development, etc.).
3. **Significance of Contribution:** Faculty scholarship engages with timely and important problems using sophisticated and innovative theorizing and/or research methodologies. Faculty contribute to local, state, regional, national, and/or international conversations regarding educational research, theory, and practice. This indicator may be substantiated through evidence such as descriptions of product circulation/usage (e.g. local, state, regional, national, or international audiences and/or applications) and/or the familiarity of the works by national scholars in the field.

	Products	Examples of Evidence
	<input type="checkbox"/> Journal articles	<input type="checkbox"/> Full citation; either a copy of the article or electronic link
	<input type="checkbox"/> Books/book chapters	<input type="checkbox"/> Full citation
	<input type="checkbox"/> Conference or other presentations	<input type="checkbox"/> Full citation; acceptance or invitation letter
	Processes	Evidence

	<input type="checkbox"/> Grant activities	<input type="checkbox"/> Award letter from granting institution
	<input type="checkbox"/> Submitted proposals for national grants	<input type="checkbox"/> Confirmation notice of submission
	<input type="checkbox"/> Manuscript resubmitted for review (for retention only)	<input type="checkbox"/> Notice from publication venue of invitation to resubmit
	<input type="checkbox"/> Relationship building with communities <input type="checkbox"/> Development of integrated activities <input type="checkbox"/> Collaborations consistent with the candidate's scholarly identity	<input type="checkbox"/> Letters of collaboration
	<input type="checkbox"/> Practical applications (e.g. policy revisions, syllabi from other institutions showing inclusion of candidate's work, professional development resources, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Participation in research-based program development	<input type="checkbox"/> Letters of impact from partnering entities; products demonstrating implementation of research

Evidence of meeting the performance indicators for teaching includes student course evaluations, documentation of peer reviews of teaching, and a summary of evidence of teaching as evidence of the performance indicators outlined in 8.04. Candidates who teach and/or advise students in a graduate program should also include a summary of their graduate committee work in the form of tabulated numbers of committees served, completions, chairs, etc. Additional evidence of the performance indicators to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching may include any of the following:

	Examples of supporting materials
Development and/or maintenance of a new course	Course syllabi
Implementation of a teaching innovation	Teaching materials
Awards and recognition for teaching and/or advising	Copy/scan of award, certificate, or similar
Collaborations with students on scholarship	Scholarly products
Teaching collaborations with other faculty	Teaching materials and/or syllabi, evaluations
Professional development opportunities	Number of opportunities completed, certificates
Guest lectures	Letters of invitation
Leading workshops on teaching and/or advising	Letters of invitation, marketing materials of event
Advising/Mentorship	Evaluation letters from advisees
Peer evaluation of teaching	In-depth assessment review letter

Evidence of meeting the performance indicators for service includes documentation of committee work (i.e. a list prepared by department and reviewed by candidate), delivery of knowledge/content to the public through outreach, volunteer work with community organizations, involvement in professional organizations, and service as a journal reviewer. Additional evidence of the performance indicators to demonstrate effectiveness in service may include any of the following:

	Examples of supporting materials
Membership on department committee	Letter of invitation or acknowledgement of effort from committee chair or department head
Membership on college committee	Letter of invitation or acknowledgement of effort from committee chair or Dean
Membership on university committee	Letter of invitation or acknowledgement of effort from committee chair
Contribution to professional association	Letter of acknowledgement from professional association
Contribution to profession	Letter of acknowledgement from professional association
Contribution to community	Letter of acknowledgement from community organization

The candidate will prepare a statement of integration as part of the personal statement submitted with the dossier and provide supporting evidence in accordance with the requisite standards.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

Products: Scholarly products can be documented through publication (e.g. articles with journal title and date visible), official correspondence (e.g. acceptance or “in press” notifications), and/or official notices or programs (e.g. conference programs, art exhibit notices, etc.).

Processes: Scholarly processes can be documented through official correspondence (e.g. request from journal editor to revise and resubmit a manuscript, notifications of grant awards) and/or letters of impact from stakeholders such as community members, public officials, K-12 partners, or collaborators.

Article IX. Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 9.02 University Standard

The University standards for the award of tenure are:

- (a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
- (b) integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) accomplishment in scholarship.

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Scholarship

Candidates for tenure meet the standard of accomplishment in scholarship by documenting one to three (1-3) completed products and/or completed/continuing processes, including a minimum of one Tier 1 product/process, each year (on average) during the review period. See Sections 8.03 and 8.05 for additional information.

Teaching

Candidates for tenure meet the standard of sustained effectiveness in teaching by documenting evidence of effective teaching and advising during the review timeframe, commensurate with the candidate's assigned percentages of effort. See Sections 8.03 and 8.05 for additional information.

Service

Candidates for tenure meet the standard of sustained effectiveness in service by documenting evidence of consistent participation in service to the department, college, university, professional societies, and/or community during the review timeframe, commensurate with the candidate's assigned percentages of effort. See Sections 8.03 and 8.5 for additional information.

Integration

Candidates for tenure meet the standard for integration by documenting and describing current integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

To demonstrate accomplishment in scholarship, candidates should demonstrate a cohesive and focused line of scholarship specific to their field and scholarly identity. During the review period, candidates must achieve a minimum of one (1) Tier 1 product/process each year on average. See Section 8.03 for Tier 1 and 2 attributes and examples. In their Summary of Scholarship, candidates should include descriptions to explain how their Tier 1 products and/or processes achieve a “high impact” appropriate to their field.

For teaching and service expectations, see sections 8.04 and 8.05.

Candidates for tenure meet expectations for integration by documenting and describing current integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

See Section 8.05

Article X. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Section 10.01 University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service in the current rank, however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.

Article XI. Promotion to Rank of Professor

Section 11.01 Timing of Review.

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service in the current rank, however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they “meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.”

Section 11.02 University Standard

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

- (a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
- (b) sustained integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) excellence in scholarship.

Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Scholarship

Candidates for promotion to full professor meet the standard of excellence in scholarship documenting one to three (1-3) completed products and/or completed/continuing processes, including a minimum of one Tier 1 product/process, each year (on average) during promotion review period. For additional information, see Sections 8.03 and 8.05.

Teaching

Candidates for promotion to full professor meet the standard of sustained effectiveness in teaching by documenting evidence of effective teaching and advising during the post-tenure review timeframe, commensurate with the candidate's assigned percentages of effort. For additional information, see Sections 8.03 and 8.05.

Service

Candidates for promotion to full professor meet the standard of sustained effectiveness in service by documenting evidence of consistent participation in service to the department, college, university, professional societies, and/or community during the post-tenure review timeframe, commensurate with the candidate's assigned percentages of effort. For additional information, see Sections 8.03 and 8.05.

Integration

Candidates for promotion to full professor meet the standard for sustained integration by documenting and describing current integration of no less than two of the following during the post-tenure review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

Candidates for promotion to full professor demonstrate excellence in scholarship by documenting and substantiating innovation and/or leadership within a cohesive and focused area of scholarship specific to their field and scholarly identity. During the review period, candidates must achieve a minimum of one (1) Tier 1 product/process each year (on average) (see Section 8.05 for Tier 1 and 2 attributes and examples). In their Self-Evaluation of Scholarship, candidates should include descriptions to explain how their Tier 1 products and/or processes achieve a "high impact" appropriate to their field.

For Teaching and Service expectations, see sections 8.04 and 8.05.

Candidates for promotion to full professor meet expectations for integration by documenting and describing sustained integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.

Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

See Section 8.05

Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document

The Department of Education will undertake a full review of our Role and Scope Document every three years. The Department RTP committee shall be responsible for revising and updating the document. Tenurable faculty within the department shall vote on proposed changes. The revised document will be submitted to the URPTC Chair after the review committee completes all reviews for that year.

Article XIII. Approval Process

Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- (a) tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit;
- (b) promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (usually colleges);
- (c) University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC); and
- (d) provost.

Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- (a) promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of the intermediate unit;
- (b) University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC); and
- (c) provost.

Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document

- (a) University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC);
- (b) Faculty Senate;
- (c) Deans' Council; and
- (d) provost.