THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI®

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
ANNUAL EVALUATION
PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

_____
Director   Date

_____ 9/2/2021
Dean   Date

_____ 9/2/21
Provost   Date

School Policies and Procedures: Evaluation Processes

School: Education
Director: Noal Cochran (Interim)
College: Education and Human Sciences
College Dean: Trent Gould

Mission, Vision, and Values

School Mission
The School of Education (***hereafter SoE***) educates the public through exemplary teaching, excellence in research, and meaningful service that advances professional knowledge and practice so that individuals are empowered to transform the human condition.

SoE's mission is to prepare and further educate capable, committed, and reflective teachers, leaders, social researchers, and other professionals as we engage in outstanding teaching and supervision, innovative and impactful research, as well as meaningful service, professional development, and outreach to educational stakeholders.

School Vision
SoE seeks to become the premier academic unit in the Gulf South that prepares excellent teachers, leaders, and social researchers, for the region's schools, colleges, universities, and other work settings that require their expertise. SoE aspires to build on its history to improve the educational, physical, psychological, and social well-being of our students and society through high impact practices in leadership, teaching, research, and student success locally, regionally, and globally.

School Values
Student learning and the creation of knowledge; health and wellness of self and society; professional integrity, honesty, forthrightness, and personal development; inclusive cultural competency that respects individual giftedness and uniqueness; educational relationships that transform lives and encourage social responsibility; responsiveness to stakeholders including students, families, communities, and state institutions.

Faculty Evaluations: Annual Evaluation Performance Categories
Refer to the Faculty Handbook for more information: Committee Membership Eligibility (1.10.1); Faculty Governance Options (1.10.2); • Faculty Evaluation Process (4.1, 4.4, 4.5.2-4.5.4, Appendix B); • Workload Allocation/Assignment (4.3, Appendix A); • Administrator Workload; • Circumstantial Adjustments to Workload Allocation

General Statement about Annual Evaluation Standards
The following guidelines are to be used to evaluate annual faculty contributions in the categories of teaching, research/scholarship/creative activity/professional development, and service for the various faculty ranks and tracks in SoE: Tenured/Tenure-track (***hereafter "tenure-track,"***) and Teaching/Clinical track (***hereafter***

Approved by faculty May 2021

"teaching-track"). All faculty members in SoE are both entitled to such an evaluation and have the right to appeal their evaluations as is described in the Faculty Handbook.

These guidelines should not be interpreted as inflexible rules, rigorous checklists, or as exhaustive in scope. Their purpose is to help faculty members and evaluators alike, as evaluative fairness depends to a significant extent on reasonable benchmarks that are generally understood and accepted. As with any set of guidelines, these should be applied holistically, balancing the importance of consistency with due attention to relevant differences both qualitative and quantitative. Annual performance is to be assessed in light of each faculty member's individualized workload, negotiated and mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the School director each year.

Teaching and student learning are central to the mission of SoE. Faculty members are expected to hold classes as scheduled and provide quality learning experiences that promote knowledge, skills, and professional expectations necessary for students to be successful in professional/scholarly practice. SoE recognizes both classroom performance and contributions to teaching that draw upon the faculty member's depth and breadth of scholarship and professional experience. Teaching not only includes formal classroom instruction, but also supervising students, student advising/mentoring, and creating and implementing sound assessment strategies to evaluate the effectiveness of individual courses and programs of study. **Additionally, faculty members are expected to adhere to university expectations-such as the Classroom Conduct Policy-posted on the Provost's website (https://www.usm.edu/provost/internalportal/policies-procedures-forms.php)**

High-quality teaching can be demonstrated by a variety of means. The University-administered student evaluation (USE) is understood in SoE to be one measure of student satisfaction with the course and instructor, but is an incomplete indicator of teaching effectiveness. Therefore, it is vital to measure teaching quality not only by numeric course evaluations and students' comments on USE, but also by peer review. Faculty in the school will solicit peer observations of teaching, at least once per academic year, to demonstrate a pattern of positive peer evaluations. The peer observation should take the form of a 1-2 page narrative that summarizes the lesson and assesses its appropriateness, quality, and delivery. Untenured faculty should aim to secure at least half their peer observations during the probationary period from tenured faculty in the school or in their area of expertise from tenured faculty outside of the school.

All members of the Corps of Instruction are expected to utilize evidence-based practice in their work. However, the expectation for scholarship differs for tenure-track faculty and those in teaching-track roles. While tenure-track faculty are expected to contribute unique scholarly contributions to the field through original research and scholarly productivity, this level of scholarly productivity is <u>not</u> required for faculty in teaching-track roles. However, a teaching-track candidate seeking promotion may consider activities and/or products that translate existing research to practice. Scholarly contributions, "may be considered but are not necessary for promotion of non-tenure track faculty (FHB)."

Satisfactory service to the university, professional, and public/community is an obligation for the entire Corps of Instruction. Depending upon type of appointment and academic rank faculty members in the SoE are expected to commit to quality service to the program, school, college, and to the university. The school also recognizes the merit of service to local, state, regional, national, and international organizations. We also recognize that service activities may be limited during the probationary period for the *tenure-track* faculty member to meet teaching and research obligations. Thus, service at the college, university, and professional levels is often included, though not always expected at the pre-tenure level. For these faculty service at the college, university, and professional levels is often included, though not always expected at the pre-tenure level. In consideration of service across all ranks, we underscore service to the program and school because it applies across all ranks.

Among the standard activities that factor into each faculty member's service expectations are regular attendance and contributions in meetings, volunteering in order to contribute to equity of school workload, involvement in school affairs, operating in a manner that serves the best interest of the school, and sharing resources when practical.

Tenured and Tenure-Track

Teaching

General Statement

Quality teaching is important. Tenure-track faculty at any rank must be approved for Graduate Faculty Status in order to teach graduate-level classes. Tenure-track faculty who wish to advise, serve, or chair masters, specialist, or doctoral projects should be aware of the research requirements outlined by the Graduate School. For required and optional ways to document teaching, see Appendix A.

Meets Expectations for Teaching
A tenure-track faculty member who meets annual expectations for teaching:
1. Teaches the full complement of assigned courses as defined by their teaching load.
2. Revises and updates assigned courses as necessary.
3. Communicates with students in-person or remotely during the work week and contract period as necessary to improve their chances for academic success.
4. Returns student assignments with constructive feedback when appropriate.
5. Submits grades and grade roster reports on time.
6. Demonstrates mastery of subject and effective teaching through peer teaching evaluations and other relevant evidence.
7. Provides evidence that students are generally satisfied with one's teaching and courses through student evaluations and other relevant sources.*
8. Serves on undergraduate and graduate thesis and dissertation committees when appropriate, relevant to one's area of expertise, and feasible given one's workload.

With regard to teaching, collegiality includes, but is not limited to, the following expectations:
a. Exhibits collaboration when engaged in teaching-related activities, including supervision, dissertation, capstone, and thesis support.
b. Shows respect for faculty, students, staff, external stakeholders, and others within and outside the University when engaging in teaching-related activities.
c. Engages in constructive interactions during teaching-related activities.
d. Participates in the school's peer review of teaching process.
e. Demonstrates support for the school when undertaking teaching responsibilities.

With regard to teaching, engagement includes, but is not limited to, the following expectations:
a. Responds to students' correspondence in a timely manner and is available for meetings with students/advisees (F2F or virtual as appropriate).
b. Involves or supports students in research/professional development as appropriate.
c. Chairs and serves on undergraduate and graduate research/capstone/ dissertation committees as appropriate within their workload.

* Means of evaluation scores on the University-administered student evaluation (USE) for overall rating of the instructor <u>between</u> 4.0 and 4.59 are generally considered **to meet** expectations.

Fails to Meet Expectations for Teaching

A tenure-track faculty member who falls short of meeting expectations for teaching, consistently fails to satisfy **one or more** of the criteria from the "meets expectations" list from above. Examples of failing to meet teaching expectations include, but are not limited to, the following items. *The tenure-track member does NOT:*

1. Teach the full complement of assigned courses as defined by their teaching load.
2. Revise and update assigned courses as necessary.
3. Communicate with students in-person or remotely during the work week and contract period as necessary to improve their chances for academic success.
4. Return student assignments with constructive feedback when appropriate.
5. Submit grades and grade roster reports on time.
6. Demonstrate mastery of subject and effective teaching through peer teaching evaluations and other relevant evidence.
7. Provide evidence that students are generally satisfied with one's teaching and courses through student evaluations and other relevant sources.*
8. Serve on undergraduate and graduate thesis and dissertation committees when appropriate, relevant to one's area of expertise, and feasible given one's workload.

Non-collegiality in the context of teaching includes, but is not limited to, the following. *A tenure-track member:*

a. Does not collaborate when engaged in teaching-related activities, including supervision, dissertation, capstone, and thesis support.
b. Does not show respect for faculty, students, staff, external stakeholders, and others within and outside the University when engaging in teaching-related activities.
c. Does not participate in the school's peer review of teaching process.
d. Does not demonstrate support for the school when undertaking teaching responsibilities.

Non-engagement in the context of teaching includes, but is not limited to, the following. *A tenure-track member:*

- Does not respond to students' correspondence in a timely manner and is routinely not available for meetings with students/advisees (F2F or virtual as appropriate).
a. Does not involve or support students in research/professional development as appropriate.
b. Does not chair and serve on undergraduate and graduate research/capstone/ dissertation committees as appropriate within their workload.

* Means of evaluation scores on the University-administered student evaluation (USE) for overall rating of the instructor <u>between</u> 3.00 and 4.00 are generally considered **below** expectations. Means of evaluation scores on USE <u>below</u> 3.00 on a 5.00 scale are generally considered **far below** expectations.

Exceeds Expectations for Teaching

A tenure-track member who exceeds expectations for teaching satisfies the criteria from the "meets expectations" list, AND satisfies **two or more** of the items below (or a provides justification for items not listed below). Examples for exceeding expectations for teaching could include, but are not limited to the following items:

- Innovative development and successful implementation of service learning or active learning courses consistent with school directives.
- Exceptional scores on student course evaluations and exceptional peer-review evaluations.*
- Direction of substantially more undergraduate Honors student thesis projects or SPUR projects than needed to meet school expectations.
- Direction of substantially more undergraduate or graduate thesis or dissertation projects than needed to meet school expectations.

- Demonstration of superior course breadth or major improvements through a teaching portfolio.
- Extraordinary individual attention to students through tutoring, conferencing, mentoring, or going to unusual lengths to enhance students' educational experiences.

For clarification of terms used in reference to *teaching*, see Appendix A.

* Means of evaluation scores on the University-administered student evaluation (USE) for overall rating of the instructor 4.6 and above are generally considered **to exceed** expectations.

Scholarship, Research, Creative Activity

General Statement

Tenure-track faculty members in SoE are expected to develop and maintain an active research agenda evidenced through the generation of new knowledge, understandings, interpretations, and develop and maintain a record of publications, presentations, and grant activity. Scholarly contributions in various forms are valuable and encouraged. Annual evaluations may be used to guide candidates' progress toward tenure. Candidates should self-monitor to make sure their achievements align with tenure and promotion guidelines. The following list is not inclusive of all possible scholarly products or outlets. It is expected that faculty members will explain the scholarly significance of any publications/scholarly activities not included below. For clarification of terms used in reference to *research/creative activity*, see Appendix B.

Tenure-track faculty should self-monitor to make sure their achievements align with tenure and promotion guidelines. Meeting annual review expectations may inform progress towards tenure and promotion but does not guarantee meeting expectations for tenure and promotion (see below).

Meets Expectations for Research/ Creative Activity
A tenure-track faculty member who meets annual expectations for research/creative activity, satisfies **one or more** of the following. This list is not comprehensive and may include other projects to be evaluated on a case-by-case and activities basis. Publications may include those that are single-authored to those that have two or more authors.
1. Publication of a peer-reviewed monograph.
2. Publication of a peer-reviewed article.
3. Publication of a chapter in an edited book.
4. Publication of peer-reviewed book.
5. Being awarded a research grant.
6. Edited scholarly books (published by academic presses)

As a general rule, tenure-track faculty members in the SoE are generally expected to publish no fewer than one scholarly product – or its equivalent (i.e., research grant award)-in a peer-reviewed outlet related to their overall research agenda or approach on a yearly basis. Failure to do so would likely constitute not meeting expectations. Colleagues in the probationary period should review the Tenure and Promotion guidelines and should also understand that satisfactory annual reviews do not guarantee positive promotion or tenure. Annual yearly progress and productivity, however, may vary from year to year according to the timing of submissions, review process, revision process, and other circumstances. Submission of an application for internal and external funding of research/creative activities will be looked upon favorably in the annual review process.

Other products, not listed above, that may carry weight for annual review and be considered for meeting expectations include, for example:
- Refereed conference proceedings
- Academic encyclopedia articles exceeding 1,000 words
- Published reports
- Grant submissions

With regard to research and scholarly activity, collegiality includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- Showing respect for colleagues, students, and staff when engaged in scholarship, research, grant writing, and other inquiry-oriented endeavors and processes.
- Engaging in constructive interactions when in scholarship, research, grant writing, and other inquiry-oriented endeavors.
- Demonstrating ethical research practices and protocols.

With regard to research and scholarly activity, engagement includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- Engages in research and distributes scholarship as appropriate (i.e., presentations, publications, research to practice).
- Is supportive of colleagues' research/professional development activities.
- Engages with colleagues and community partners in research, as appropriate.

Fails to Meet Expectations for Research/Creative Activity

A tenure-track faculty member who does not meet expectations for research/creative activity consistently **fails to satisfy one or more** of the criteria from the "meets expectations" list. Examples of failing to meet expectations for research or creative activity include, but are not limited to, **the failure to:**
1. Publish a peer-reviewed monograph.
2. Publish a peer-reviewed scholarly article.
3. Publish a chapter an edited book.
4. Publish a peer-reviewed book.
5. Be awarded a research grant.
6. Submit an application for internal and external funding of research/creative activities.

Non-engagement in the context of research and creative activity includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- Does not engages in research and distribute scholarship as appropriate (i.e., presentations, publications, research to practice).
- Is not supportive of colleagues' research/professional development activities.
- Does not engage with colleagues and community partners in research, as appropriate.

Exceeds Expectations for Research/Creative Activity
A tenure-track faculty member who exceeds expectations for research/creative activity satisfies the criteria from "meets expectations" list AND satisfies one or more of the following. This list is not comprehensive and may include other projects and activities to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. A candidate who exceeds expectations for research activity:

1. Publishes an additional two or more peer-reviewed scholarly articles and/or chapters in edited books.

2. Publishes a peer-reviewed book. (A book counted toward "meeting expectations" cannot be double-counted toward "exceeding expectations.")
3. Receives exceptional scholarly recognition of a book or scholarly article from experts in their field.

Service

General Statement

In addition to standard service to the program, school and college, tenure-track faculty service should be tied to research, teaching, and/or clinical activities, curriculum development, quality instruction and student success initiatives and efforts. Service to the profession and the community may include community education/outreach and consultation if connected to the instructional, supervision, or research activities associated with the position.

Meets Expectations for Service

A tenure-track faculty member who meets the standard expectations for service to the program, school, college, and university satisfies the following criteria:

1. Engages in committee/subcommittee work at the:
   a. Program level (i.e. committee member, chair)
   b. School level (i.e. committee member, chair)
   c. College level (i.e. committee member, chair)
   d. University level (i.e. committee member, chair)
2. Engages in workshops/trainings/certifications conducted at the:
   a. Program level
   b. School level
   c. College level
   d. University level
   e. External level related to your profession
3. Directs/chairs special projects/initiatives and assumes membership or leadership roles as appropriate
4. Participates in recruitment and retention efforts or events
5. Shares in school responsibilities

In general, to meet part of one's annual service expectations, community service beyond teaching and research activities is highly encouraged and may be required. In order to be recognized as valid service, all activities in the community must relate to one's profession and faculty expertise. *Examples of community service include, but are not limited to engagement in:*
1. Professionally-related service on community boards, committees or councils
2. External (to-the-university) instruction, such as teaching a group of public school educators.
3. Professionally-related talks to community groups or constituencies
4. Advising of community boards, committees, councils, or groups based on one's professional expertise
5. Other (Please specify and provide supporting documentation)

In general, to meet part of one's annual service expectations, service to the profession beyond teaching and research activities is highly encouraged and may be required. *Examples of professionally related service include, but are not limited to:*

1. Membership on professional or scholarly advisory committees or boards,
2. Service on professional or scholarly planning committees or awards committees,
3. Service as an editor of a newsletter,

4. Service as a journal or grant application peer reviewer,
5. Service as an elected officer in a professional or scholarly association at the state, regional, national, or international level,
6. Service as a conference proposal peer reviewer (at the state, regional, national, or international level),
7. Service on service grant awards

As noted above, SoE recognizes that service activities may be limited during the probationary period for the faculty member to meet teaching and research obligations. Thus, service at the college, university, and professional levels is often included, though not always expected at the pre-tenure level.

Collegiality in the context of service includes the following:
- Demonstrating interest and involvement in general school welfare
- Operating in a manner that serves the best interest of the school
- Collaborating within the School when undertaking service responsibilities
- Showing respect for colleagues, students, staff, and others within and outside the University when undertaking service responsibilities.
- Attending peer and student presentations when possible.
- Demonstrating support for the school when undertaking service responsibilities.

Engagement in the context of service includes, but is not limited to, the following expectations:
- Participates on and/or leads school committees in ways that support the school's mission and goals.
- Attends and participates in SoE faculty, program, and committee meetings.
- Responds to colleagues' correspondence in a timely manner.
- Promotes the school's mission, vision, and goals in interactions, communications, and activities.
- Participates in school / program tasks to contribute to a shared workload.

Fails to Meet Expectations for Service
A tenure-track faculty member who falls short of meeting standard expectations for service to the school, college, and university fails to satisfy the any of following criteria. A tenure-track faculty member **Does Not:**

1. Engage in committee/subcommittee work at the:
   a. Program level (i.e. committee member, chair)
   b. School level (i.e. committee member, chair)
   c. College level (i.e. committee member, chair)
   d. University level (i.e. committee member, chair)
2. Engage in workshops/trainings/certifications conducted at the:
   a. Program level
   b. School level
   c. College level
   d. University level
   e. External level related to your profession
3. Direct/chair special projects/initiatives and assumes membership or leadership roles as appropriate
4. Participate in recruitment and retention efforts or events
5. Share in school responsibilities

Non-collegiality in the context of service includes the following:
- Lack of interest and involvement in general school welfare.
- Not exhibiting collaboration within the School when undertaking service responsibilities

- Disrespecting students, staff, colleagues, and others within and outside the University when undertaking service responsibilities.
- Not attending peer and student presentations in the school when possible.
- Not demonstrating support for the school when undertaking service responsibilities.

Non-engagement in the context of service includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- Does not participate on and/or leads school committees in ways that support the school's mission and goals.
- Does not attend and participate in SoE faculty, program, and committee meetings.
- Does not respond to colleagues' correspondence in a timely manner.
- Does not promote the school's mission, vision, and goals in interactions, communications, and activities.
- Does not participate in school / program tasks to contribute to a shared workload.

Exceeds Expectations for Service
Service performance that "exceeds expectations" typically consists of substantial time contributions to service activities that have a significant positive effect on the School, College, University, profession, or community. The list below is not comprehensive and may include other activities to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

*A tenure-track faculty member who exceeds expectations for service satisfies the criteria from the "meets expectations" list, AND satisfies **one or more** of the following*:
- Coordinates one or more academic, degree-granting programs
- Receives exemplary recognition from profession, community, college, or university, or scholarly association
- Serves in an executive leadership role in a professional, scholarly, or research organization

More examples of faculty service and acceptable ways to document faculty service can be found in Appendix C.

Teaching and Clinical Track
(full-time, non-tenure track)

Teaching

General Statement
A primary responsibility of all teaching-track faculty at all ranks is teaching. Instruction may include clinical supervision and supervision of internships or externships. Teaching-track faculty at any rank must be approved for Graduate Faculty Status in order to teach graduate-level classes. Teaching-track faculty who wish to advise or chair doctoral projects should be aware of the research requirements outlined by the Graduate School.

Teaching-track faculty are expected to focus on instruction and/or instructional support of internship mentors, internship faculty, and students. Supportive work may involve: securing mentorship agreements; working with students regarding securing internship agreements; assisting students with developing and implementing activities that correlate with accreditation standards; submitting, monitoring and assessing assignments used for accreditation purposes; training mentors; visiting interns and mentors; and working as a liaison between the intern, mentor and university. For required and optional ways to document teaching, see Appendix A.

Meets Expectations for Teaching

A teaching-track faculty member who meets annual expectations for teaching:
1. Teaches the full complement of assigned courses as defined by their teaching load.
2. Revises and updates assigned courses as necessary.
3. Communicates with students in-person or remotely during the work week and contract period as necessary to improve their chances for academic success.
4. Returns student assignments with constructive feedback when appropriate.
5. Submits grades and grade roster reports on time.
6. Demonstrates mastery of subject and effective teaching through peer teaching evaluations and other relevant evidence.
7. Provides evidence that students are generally satisfied with one's teaching and courses through student evaluations and other relevant sources.*
8. Serves on undergraduate and graduate thesis and dissertation committees when appropriate, relevant to one's area of expertise, and feasible given one's workload.

With regard to teaching, collegiality includes, but is not limited to, the following expectations:
- Exhibits collaboration when engaged in teaching-related activities, including supervision, dissertation, capstone, and thesis support.
- Shows respect for faculty, students, staff, external stakeholders, and others within and outside the University when engaging in teaching-related activities.
- Engages in constructive interactions during teaching-related activities.
- Participates in the school's peer review of teaching process.
- Demonstrates support for the school when undertaking teaching responsibilities.

With regard to teaching, engagement includes, but is not limited to, the following expectations:
- Responds to students' correspondence in a timely manner and is available for meetings with students/advisees (F2F or virtual as appropriate).
- Involves or supports students in research/professional development as appropriate.
- Chairs and serves on undergraduate and graduate research/capstone/ dissertation committees as appropriate within their workload.

* Means of evaluation scores on the University-administered student evaluation (USE) for overall rating of the instructor <u>between</u> 4.0 and 4.59 are generally considered **to meet** expectations.

Fails to Meet Expectations for Teaching

A teaching-track faculty who falls short of meeting expectations for teaching, consistently fails to satisfy **one or more** of the criteria from the "meets expectations" list from above. Examples of failing to meet teaching expectations include, but are not limited to, the following. *The candidate does NOT:*

1. Teach the full complement of assigned courses as defined by their teaching load.
2. Revise and update assigned courses as necessary.
3. Communicate with students in-person or remotely during the work week and contract period as necessary to improve their chances for academic success.
4. Return student assignments with constructive feedback when appropriate.
5. Submit grades and grade roster reports on time.
6. Demonstrate mastery of subject and effective teaching through peer teaching evaluations and other relevant evidence.

7. Provide evidence that students are generally satisfied with one's teaching and courses through student evaluations and other relevant sources.*
8. Serve on undergraduate and graduate thesis and dissertation committees when appropriate, relevant to one's area of expertise, and feasible given one's workload.

Non-collegiality in the context of teaching includes the following. *A teaching-track faculty member:*
a. Does not collaborate when engaged in teaching-related activities, including supervision, dissertation, capstone, and thesis support.
b. Does not show respect for faculty, students, staff, external stakeholders, and others within and outside the University when engaging in teaching-related activities.
c. Does not engage in constructive interactions during teaching-related activities.
d. Does not participate in the school's peer review of teaching process.
e. Does not demonstrate support for SoE when undertaking teaching responsibilities.

Non-engagement in the context of teaching includes the following. *A teaching-track member*:
a. Does not respond to students' correspondence in a timely manner and is routinely not available for meetings with students/advisees (F2F or virtual as appropriate).
b. Does not involve or support students in research/professional development as appropriate.

* Means of evaluation scores on the University-administered student evaluation (USE) for overall rating of the instructor <u>between</u> 3.00 and 4.00 are generally considered **below** expectations. Means of evaluation scores on USE <u>below</u> 3.00 on a 5.00 scale are generally considered **far below** expectations.

Exceeds Expectations for Teaching
A teaching-track faculty member who exceeds expectations for teaching satisfies the criteria from the "meets expectations" list, AND satisfies **two or more** of the items below (or a provides justification for items not listed below). *Examples for exceeding expectations for teaching could include, but are not limited to the following:*
1. Innovative development and successful implementation of service learning or active learning courses consistent with school directives.
2. Exceptional scores on student course evaluations (e.g., >1 standard deviation of the school mean) and exceptional scores on peer-review evaluations.
3. Direction of substantially more undergraduate Honors student thesis projects or SPUR projects than needed to meet school expectations.
4. Direction of substantially more undergraduate or graduate thesis or dissertation projects than needed to meet school expectations.
5. Demonstration of superior course breadth or major improvements through a teaching portfolio.
6. Extraordinary individual attention to students through tutoring, conferencing, mentoring, or going to unusual lengths to enhance students' educational experiences.

* Means of evaluation scores on the University-administered student evaluation (USE) for overall rating of the instructor 4.6 and above are generally considered **to exceed** expectations.

Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activity

General Statement
A teaching-track faculty member's primary responsibility is in teaching and/or supervision (FHB). Teaching-track faculty should demonstrate continued engagement in current scholarship and/or professional development through attendance at scholarly or professional events on campus, or participation (in person or online) in

pedagogical training and seminars. A faculty member should present evidence of scholarship and/or professional development and should demonstrate that they are engaged in meaningful activities that contribute to the discipline. These types of contributions should also be linked to research and/or evidence-based practices. Scholarly activities will be looked upon favorably and though not required for annual review, may be tracked annually by the candidate applying for promotion.

Meets Expectations for Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activity

Scholarly activities, which includes professional development specific to teaching and student success initiatives, will be looked upon favorably for teaching faculty at the senior lecturer or assistant teaching level but are not a requirement for annual review. Teaching-track faculty at the Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor levels are expected to engage in ongoing, scholarly activities and/or high-quality professional development to support USM's teaching mission. For example, the following types of scholarship and professional development would count towards meeting expectations:

- practitioner-oriented journals and newsletters,
- textbook chapters,
- peer-reviewed products (journal, monograph, book chapter, etc.),
- technical reports,
- program evaluation reports,
- book reviews,
- case studies,
- policy manuals,
- securing internal/external grants related to education,
- practitioner-oriented presentation at local and regional meetings.

With regard to scholarship and professional development, engagement includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- Engages in research and/or professional development and distributes scholarship (i.e., presentations, publications, research to practice, knowledge gained from professional development) as appropriate
- Is supportive of colleagues' research/professional development activities.
- Engages with colleagues and community partners in research / professional development, as appropriate.

Fails to Meet Expectations for Scholarship/Professional Development at the Associate Teaching Professor and Teaching Professor levels only

*A teaching-track faculty member who does not meet expectations for scholarship/professional development activity consistently **fails to satisfy one or more** of the criteria from the "meets expectations" list. Examples of failing to meet expectations include, but are not limited to,* **the failure to** publish/present**:**

- practitioner-oriented journals and newsletters,
- textbook chapters,
- peer-reviewed product (journal, monograph, book chapter, etc.),
- technical reports,
- program evaluation reports,
- book reviews,
- case studies,
- policy manuals,

- securing internal/external grants related to education),
- practitioner-oriented presentations at local, regional, and national meetings.

Non-engagement in the context of scholarship/professional development includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- Does not engage in research and/or professional development and does not distribute scholarship (i.e., presentations, publications, research to practice, knowledge gained from professional development) as appropriate
- Is not supportive of colleagues' research/professional development activities.
- Does not engage with colleagues and community partners in research/professional development, as appropriate.

Exceeds Expectations for Scholarship/Professional Development

A teaching-track faculty member who exceeds expectations for scholarship/professional development satisfies the criteria from "meets expectations" list AND goes beyond these criteria. For subsequent promotion, scholarly activities will be looked upon favorably and though not required, may be tracked annually.

Service

General Statement
In addition to standard service to the program, school and college, teaching-track faculty service may be tied to teaching and/or clinical activities, curriculum development, quality instruction and student success initiatives and efforts. Service to the community may include community education/outreach and consultation if connected to the instructional and/or supervision activities associated with the position.

Meets Expectations for Service
A teaching-track faculty member who meets the standard expectations for service to the program, school, college, and university satisfies the following criteria:

1. Engages in committee/subcommittee work at the:
   a. Program level (i.e. committee member, chair)
   b. School level (i.e. committee member, chair)
   c. College level (i.e. committee member, chair)
   d. University level (i.e. committee member, chair)
2. Engages in workshops/trainings/certifications conducted at the:
   a. Program level
   b. School level
   c. College level
   d. University level
   e. External level related to your profession
3. Directs/chairs special projects/initiatives and assumes membership or leadership roles as appropriate
4. Participates in recruitment and retention efforts or events
5. Shares in school responsibilities

In general, to meet part of one's annual service expectations, community service beyond teaching activities is highly encouraged and may be required. In order to be recognized as valid service, all activities in the

community must relate to one's profession and faculty expertise. *Examples of community service include, but are not limited to engagement in:*

1. Professionally-related service on community boards, committees or councils
2. External (to-the-university) instruction, such as teaching a group of public-school educators.
3. Professionally-related talks to community groups or constituencies
4. Advising of community boards, committees, councils, or groups based on one's professional expertise
5. Other (Please specify and provide supporting documentation)

In general, to meet part of one's annual service expectations, service to the profession beyond teaching activities is highly encouraged and may be required. *Examples of professionally related service include, but are not limited to:*

1. Membership on professional or scholarly advisory committees or boards,
2. Service on professional or scholarly planning committees or awards committees,
3. Service as an editor of a newsletter,
4. Service as a journal or grant application peer reviewer,
5. Service as an elected officer in a professional or scholarly association at the state, regional, national, or international level,
6. Service as a conference proposal peer reviewer (at the state, regional, national, or international level),
7. Service on service grant awards

Collegiality in the context of service includes the following:
- Demonstrating interest and involvement in general school welfare
- Operating in a manner that serves the best interest of the school
- Collaborating within the School when undertaking service responsibilities
- Showing respect for colleagues, students, staff, and others within and outside the University when undertaking service responsibilities.
- Attending peer and student presentations when possible.
- Demonstrating support for the school when undertaking service responsibilities.

Engagement in the context of service includes, but is not limited to, the following expectations:
- Participates on and/or leads school committees in ways that support the school's mission and goals.
- Attends and participates in SoE faculty, individual program, and committee meetings.
- Responds to colleagues' correspondence in a timely manner.
- Promotes the school's mission, vision, and goals in interactions, communications, and activities.
- Participates in school / program tasks to contribute to a shared workload.

More examples of faculty service and acceptable ways to document faculty service can be found in Appendix C.

Fails to Meet Expectations for Service

A teaching-track member who falls short of meeting standard expectations for service to the school, college, and university fails to satisfy the any of following criteria. Service cannot consist of only activities in the community or in the profession. A teaching-track faculty member Does Not:

1. Engage in committee/subcommittee work at the:
    a. Program level (i.e. committee member, chair)
    b. School level (i.e. committee member, chair)
    c. College level (i.e. committee member, chair)
    d. University level (i.e. committee member, chair)
2. Engage in workshops/trainings/certifications conducted at the:
    a. Program level
    b. School level
    c. College level
    d. University level
    e. External level related to your profession
3. Direct/chair special projects/initiatives and assumes membership or leadership roles as appropriate
4. Participate in recruitment and retention efforts or events
5. Share in school responsibilities

Non-collegiality in the context of service includes the following:
- Lack of interest and involvement in general school welfare
- Not exhibiting collaboration within the School when undertaking service responsibilities
- Disrespecting students, staff, colleagues, and others within and outside the University when undertaking service responsibilities
- Not attending peer and student presentations in the school when possible
- Not demonstrating support for the school when undertaking service responsibilities

Non-engagement in the context of service includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- Does not participate on and/or leads school committees in ways that support the school's mission and goals
- Does not attend and participate in SoE faculty, individual program, and committee meetings
- Does not respond to colleagues' correspondence in a timely manner
- Does not promote the school's mission, vision, and goals in interactions, communications, and activities
- Does not participate in school/program tasks or share in school responsibilities

Exceeds Expectations for Service

Service performance that "exceeds expectations" typically consists of substantial time contributions to service activities that have a significant positive effect on the School, College, University, profession, or community. The list below is not comprehensive and may include other activities to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

A teaching-track faculty member who exceeds expectations for service satisfies the criteria from the "meets expectations" list, AND satisfies **one or more** of the following:
- Coordinates one or more academic, degree-granting programs
- Receives exemplary recognition from profession, community, college, or university, or scholarly association
- Serves in an executive leadership role in a professional, scholarly, or research organization

Goals for Next Evaluation Period

Evaluation meetings should be scheduled annually. There are two distinct meeting of the annual evaluation process for each faculty member. The first meeting is optional. If held, the meeting's purpose is to review and discuss the previous year's activities. The first meeting will include the faculty member, School Director, and/or FEC members. The proceedings include discussion of the basis of the evaluation and the opportunity to clarify any misunderstandings. At this meeting, the evaluation is signed by the faculty member and FEC chair. Faculty member signature does not signify concurrence with the evaluation, only receipt. Prior to signing completed annual evaluations, faculty may request written communication" (FHB).

The second meeting is to establish professional goals and workload allocation for the year ahead. The second meeting is between the school director and the faculty member. When a faculty member and the director are unable to agree on appropriate annual objectives, the dean serves as the final arbiter. The faculty member has the right to appeal a decision (FHB) . The FEC review attends primarily (but not exclusively) to the previous year's activities, while the FWA meeting (see below) attends primarily (but not exclusively) to the upcoming year (FHB). FEC and FWA meetings may be scheduled back- to-back so long as the required elements (such as who participates) are aligned with the FHB.

Faculty Evaluations: Tenure and Promotion

Pre-Tenure Review

Unit Specific Processes
Criteria for pre-tenure review are the same as for tenure but considers the fact that candidates have not had the full probationary period to develop a record of achievements. The school promotion and tenure committee is to identify areas in which the candidate needs to improve to eventually merit tenure and to help the candidate identify strategies for improvement. The faculty member's progress should be monitored in subsequent annual reviews.

Tenure-track faculty will undergo a Pre-Tenure Review (sometimes known as "third year" review) as established in the Faculty Handbook. Pre-Tenure Reviews serve as "progress reports" and alert candidates to their strengths and weaknesses in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. As required by the Faculty Handbook, candidates for Pre-Tenure Review must submit dossiers in accordance with instructions established by the Office of the Provost. Proof of adequate progress in scholarship should include completion or significant demonstrated progress on publishable manuscripts, journal articles, books, book chapters, and monographs in peer-reviewed outlets. Proof of adequate progress in scholarship may also include completion or significant demonstrated progress in submitting grant applications. Proof of effective teaching and service can be provided in the same manner as outlined in the School's annual evaluation standards. The Pre-Tenure Review report, written by the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee, will state whether the candidate's progress is satisfactory or unsatisfactory and will identify areas where improvements are suggested. A favorable Pre-Tenure Review does not guarantee that the candidate will earn promotion or tenure. A negative pre-tenure review may (though not necessarily will) result in a terminal contract (see Faculty Handbook). As required by the Faculty Handbook and timeline on the Provost's calendar.

Promotion to Associate Professor

General Statement

Promotion is official institutional recognition of meritorious achievement in research/creative scholarship, service, and teaching (tenure-track faculty) or service and teaching (teaching-track faculty). Promotion recognizes talented faculty for their records of achievement within their respective disciplines or interdisciplinary settings.

Promotion recommendations are based on patterns of teaching excellence and service activity for all SoE faculty. In addition to these activities (i.e., teaching and service), promotion recommendations for SoE tenure-track faculty are based on patterns of sustained research accomplishments. Therefore, all documentation provided in applications for either or both promotion and tenure should be cumulative, covering the time period applicable toward promotion, tenure, or both. The School Promotion and Tenure Committee, College Promotion and Tenure Committee, and/or University Promotion and Tenure Committee may request additional materials.

Unit specific processes: Tenure-Track

Teaching: For tenure and promotion to associate professor, faculty are expected to demonstrate a sustained pattern of teaching excellence. Instruction may include clinical supervision. Faculty members should present student evaluations, peer review narratives, and any optional documentation they choose that demonstrate a pattern of excellent teaching. The SoE director and associate directors will monitor teaching ratings and advise faculty, when appropriate, concerning strategies to improve classroom instruction and/or acquiring/providing additional evidence that illustrates quality teaching. A pattern of positive student teaching evaluations is expected. Advising theses and/or serving on dissertation committees (as a member or chair) is also considered part of teaching for some members of the faculty. Like expectations for group instruction, faculty in these roles are expected to demonstrate a sustained pattern of excellence.

Research: The minimum research expectations for being considered for tenure and promotion in rank to Associate Professor consists of the following:
1. Sustained scholarly activity
   a. Candidates must have at least seven (7) significant scholarly contributions.
   b. The candidate must be first or second author on the above mentioned four (4) peer reviewed items or provide a compelling justification for the nature and extent of their contribution/author order.
   c. At least four (4) of the seven (7) items must include any of the following peer- reviewed publications: journal articles, law reviews, book chapters, academic books/monographs. However, the faculty member must include evidence of publication in peer-reviewed journals.
   d. The quality of the peer-reviewed outlet or the quality of the publication itself may be considered when determining the weight of an item.
   e. The remaining scholarly items may include funded external and internal funded grants related to scholarship, edited books, academic encyclopedia articles, student-edited or student-reviewed law reviews, scholarly book reviews, published reports, professional/practitioner publications, etc. (See list of examples on pages five and six for more examples/descriptions.)

   Edited books and textbooks will be judged by scope, size, and influence of the text on the faculty member's academic field. Tenured faculty within the SoE will review academic books/monographs and determine the number/weight of scholarly items they represent. This

review may include additional assessment by acknowledged content experts external to the School.

2. Recommendations for external evaluators for tenure-track faculty are explained in the Faculty Handbook. In the School of Education, for promotion to associate professor and the award of tenure, letters of support from two external reviewers are required. An external evaluator should review the evidence provided, and write a letter that: (a) evaluates the degree to which the applicant has met, not met, or exceeded the school's Promotion and Tenure guidelines, and (b) evaluates the degree to which the applicant is engaged in meaningful research that makes significant contributions to the candidate's field(s) of inquiry.
   a. External reviewers cannot have a personal or mentor-mentee relationship with the applicant, nor can they be individuals who co-authored with the applicant at any time in the last five years or worked at the same institution as the applicant. The external reviewers must have tenure and the minimum same time rank of associate professor at their respective institutions. These external reviewers should be employed in units (departments, schools, programs) that are comparable to the applicant's unit (e.g., if the applicant is in a doctoral degree granting program, reviewers should be employed in a doctoral degree granting unit).
   b. The external reviewers need to indicate that they (a) are well-versed in the applicant's scholarly/research area, (b) are willing and able to make professional judgments about the quality of the scholarly selections in the applicant's packet, and (c) have no conflict of interest.
   c. The candidate will provide a list of seven qualified reviewers to the school director in June of the year that the application materials must be submitted. (Two reviewers will be chosen by the school director from the provided list).
   d. The school director will contact the selected reviewers from the list and request their participation in a review of the candidate's work.
   e. Each reviewer will be sent a packet of materials that includes the school's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, the candidate's Curriculum Vitae, a narrative statement written by the candidate, and materials selected by the candidate that documents the quality of their work.

Service: For tenure and promotion to associate professor, the faculty member is expected to provide consistent service at the program and school level by serving on school committees related to, but not limited to student admissions, graduate assistant selection, school awards, strategic planning, etc. (The aforementioned is not necessarily inclusive of all possible program/school service opportunities available to faculty members). Service at the college, university, and professional levels is often included, though not always expected at the pre-tenure level.

Unit specific processes: Teaching/Clinical-Track

Given the nature of teaching-track positions, promotion to Associate Teaching Professor should be considered a desirable goal rather than a mandate (FHB). In general, a five-year probationary period for a new assistant teaching professor or instructor provides time to demonstrate excellence in teaching and service prior to being promoted to the Associate level. However, there is no University-wide mandatory probationary period for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor (FHB). Furthermore, candidates whose initial appointment awards credit for service prior to joining the University or candidates with qualifications far exceeding the guidelines may receive consideration for early promotion (FHB). All documentation provided in applications for promotion should be cumulative, covering the time period applicable toward promotion.

Teaching
All teaching-track faculty members seeking promotion to Associate Teaching Professor are expected to have demonstrated a sustained pattern of excellence in teaching, which may include formal classroom

instruction, advising and mentoring of students, instructional support of internship mentors, internship faculty, and students. Supportive work may involve securing mentorship agreements; working with students regarding securing an internship agreement and district agreement; assisting students with developing and implementing activities that correlate with accreditation standards; submitting, monitoring and assessing assignments used for accreditation purposes; training mentors; visiting interns and mentors; and working as a liaison between the intern, mentor and university. Evidence of sustained exceptional teaching is necessary for promotion in rank to Associate Teaching Professor. Other types of evidence are explained in Appendix A.

Service

All teaching-track faculty members seeking promotion to Associate Teaching Professor are expected to have demonstrated a sustained pattern of excellence in service. For teaching-track faculty service should be tied to teaching and/or clinical activities, curriculum development, quality instruction and student success initiatives and efforts. Service to the community may include community education/outreach and consultation if connected to the instructional and/or supervision activities associated with the position. Service at the university and professional levels may be included, though is not expected for promotion to the Associate Clinical Professor level. Other types of evidence are explained in Appendix C.

Scholarship and/or Professional Development

Teaching-track faculty members seeking promotion to Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate continued engagement in current scholarship and/or professional development through attendance at scholarly/professional events on campus or participation (in person or online) in pedagogical training and seminars. Other types of evidence are explained in Appendix B.

For promotion to Associate Teaching Professor, evidence of practitioner-oriented scholarship and/or professional development activities are expected. The minimum expectations for being considered for promotion in rank to Associate Teaching Professor is evidence of two (2) significant scholarship or professional development contributions. The following list of examples are not comprehensive, and the candidate may include other evidence.

1. Professional development well beyond what is minimally required to teach courses at the University. Evidence may include:
   a. Preparing materials for state level education-related organizations
   b. Holding a leadership position for a state level education-related organization
   c. Development of innovative and effective teaching methods
   d. Preparing handbooks for the program (e.g., student handbook, practica handbook)
   e. Completion of additional academic course work which directly impacts clinical practice or instruction (e.g., service learning, ACUE)
   f. Implementation of professional development programs (e.g., trainings, coaching, workshops).
   g. Organizing a national or regional teaching workshop.
   h. Recognition of scholarly or pedagogical effectiveness/reputation (e.g., major awards, being invited to share their expertise outside of the University).
2. Scholarly contributions well beyond what is minimally expected for teaching and service. Evidence of this type of scholarship includes, but is not limited to publication of any of the following:
   a. Practice and service-related publications and presentations
   b. Generation of scholarly products or practices adopted outside of the University
   c. Multi-media material published
   d. Presentation of poster and oral abstracts at professional meetings.

     e. Presentation of scholarship at local, state, and national level
     f. Software program development
     g. Submitted grant for improving instruction
     h. Funded grant for improving instruction
     i. Significant contributions to pedagogical newsletters, blogs, and other resources designed to share and disseminate best teaching practices.
     j. Providing pedagogical training to campus and regional community institutions and organizations (e.g., face-to-face, online webinar)
  k. Facilitating online webinars for stakeholders related to improving instruction or educational advocacy

Tenure

Unit specific Processes (Tenure-Track only)

By granting tenure, the University exercises its belief in academic freedom and recognizes that a faculty member has the knowledge, skills, and professionalism required to make continuing, positive contributions to the discipline, school, and academic community. The criteria for tenure are assessed in the typical areas of teaching, service, research/creative scholarship with additional considerations of collegiality within the University. Because they aim to become part of the cadre of faculty that will shape the long-term future of the institution, candidates for tenure must exhibit a clear sense of shared responsibility for the excellence of the University; this includes collegiality.

The granting of tenure and promotion to associate professor are separate decisions. While they are discussed concurrently in this document, those interested in seeking either tenure or promotion separately should also consult the guidelines set forth in the Faculty Handbook. Criteria in FHB also apply to any (1) tenured faculty members applying for promotion to Associate professor, and (2) tenure-track faculty members applying for early promotion to Associate professor.

Promotion to Full Professor

Unit specific processes: Tenure-Track

Teaching
For promotion to professor, faculty are expected to demonstrate a sustained pattern of teaching excellence. Faculty members provide documentation of student evaluations, peer review evaluations, and any items that demonstrate a pattern of excellent teaching. (SoE director and associate directors will monitor teaching ratings and advise faculty, when appropriate, concerning strategies to improve classroom instruction and/or acquiring/providing additional evidence that illustrates quality teaching). A pattern of positive student teaching evaluations is expected.

Research
The primary consideration for promotion in rank to Professor is one's influence on their field of research. A faculty member may present evidence of scholarship from their entire career and should demonstrate that they are engaged in meaningful research that contributes to the discipline. The

minimum research expectations for being considered for promotion in rank to Professor consists of the following:

1. Sustained scholarly activity
    a. Candidates must have at least sixteen (16) significant scholarly contributions. At least twelve (12) of the sixteen (16) items must include any of the following peer-reviewed publications: journal articles, book chapters, law reviews, academic books/monographs. However, the faculty member must include evidence of publication in peer-reviewed journals.
    b. The candidate must be first or second author on at least eight (8) of the twelve (12) peer reviewed items or provide a compelling justification for the nature and extent of their contribution/author order.
    c. The candidate must have at least (5) publications while at the rank of Associate Professor.
    d. The quality of the peer-reviewed outlet or the quality of the publication itself may be considered when determining the weight of an item.
    e. The remaining scholarly items may include funded external and internal funded grants related to scholarship, edited books, academic encyclopedia articles, student-edited or student-reviewed law reviews, scholarly book reviews, published reports, professional/practitioner publications, etc. (See list of examples for more examples/descriptions.)
    f. Letters of support from two external reviewers that provide evidence that the applicant is engaged in meaningful research that makes significant contributions to the candidate's field(s) of inquiry. External referees cannot have a personal or mentor-mentee relationship with the applicant. Nor can they be individuals who co-authored with the applicant at any time in the last five years or worked at the same institution at the same time as the applicant. The external reviewers must have tenure and the minimum rank of Professor at their respective institutions. These external reviewers should be employed in units (departments, schools, programs) that are comparable to the applicant's unit (e.g., if the applicant is in a doctoral degree granting program, reviewers should be employed in a doctoral degree granting unit).

2. Recommendations for external evaluators
    a. The external reviewers must indicate that they (a) are well-versed in the applicant's scholarly/research area, (b) are willing and able to make professional judgments about the quality of the scholarly selections in the applicant's packet, and (c) have no conflict of interest.
    b. The candidate will provide a list of seven qualified reviewers to the school director in June of the year that the application materials must be submitted. (Two reviewers will be chosen by the school director from the provided list).
    c. The school director will contact the selected reviewers from the list and request their participation in a review of the candidate's work.
    d. Each reviewer will be sent a packet of materials that includes the school's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, the candidate's Curriculum Vitae, a narrative statement written by the candidate, and materials selected by the candidate that documents the quality of their work.

Service

For promotion to Professor, the faculty member is expected to provide service at the program, school, and college level. University level service as well as professional service beyond the university is expected at the rank of Professor.

Unit specific processes: Teaching/ Clinical-Track

To be eligible for promotion to Teaching Professor, the candidate must have consistent and sustained evidence of high-quality instruction and/or instructional support and service at the school-level, college, and university level. They will also evidence practitioner-oriented scholarship and/or professional development activity. The granting of promotion to Teaching Professor are subject to the deadlines set forth by the Provost.

Teaching
For promotion to Teaching Professor, faculty are expected to continue to demonstrate and provide evidence of a sustained pattern of teaching excellence that was established at the Associate Teaching Professor rank (see details above). Patterns of positive student teaching evaluations and peer teaching evaluations are required.

Scholarship and/or Professional Development
Scholarly activity differs significantly from those for tenure-track faculty, as teaching-track faculty have the primary responsibility of teaching (FHB). Faculty should demonstrate continued engagement in current scholarship and/or professional development through attendance at scholarly/professional events on campus or participation (in person or online) in pedagogical training and seminars. A faculty member may present evidence of scholarship and/or professional development from their entire career and should demonstrate that they are engaged in meaningful activities that contribute to the discipline.

For promotion to Teaching Professor, evidence of practitioner-oriented scholarship and/or professional development activities are expected. The minimum expectations for being considered for promotion in rank to Teaching Professor is evidence of four (4) significant scholarship or professional development contributions. The candidate must have at least two (2) contributions while at the rank of Associate Teaching Professor. The following list of examples are not comprehensive, and the candidate may include other evidence.
1. Professional development well beyond what is minimally required to teach courses at the University. Evidence may include:
   a. Preparing materials for state level education-related organizations
   b. Holding a leadership position for a state level education-related organization
   c. Development of innovative and effective teaching methods
   d. Preparing handbooks for the program (e.g., student handbook, practica handbook)
   e. Completion of additional academic course work which directly impacts clinical practice or instruction (e.g., service learning, ACUE)
   f. Implementation of professional development programs (e.g., trainings, coaching, workshops).
   g. Organizing a national or regional teaching workshop.
   h. Recognition of scholarly or pedagogical effectiveness/reputation (e.g., major awards, being invited to share their expertise outside of the University).
2. Scholarly contributions well beyond what is minimally expected for teaching and service. Evidence of this type of scholarship includes, but is not limited to publication of any of the following:
   a. Practice and service-related publications and presentations
   b. Generation of scholarly products or practices adopted outside of the University
   c. Multi-media material published
   d. Presentation of poster and oral abstracts at professional meetings.
   e. Presentation of scholarship at local, state, and national level

      f. Software program development

      g. Submitted grant for improving instruction

      h. Funded grant for improving instruction

      i. Significant contributions to pedagogical newsletters, blogs, and other resources designed to share and disseminate best teaching practices.

      j. Providing pedagogical training to campus and regional community institutions and organizations (e.g., face-to-face, online webinar)

      k. Facilitating online webinars for stakeholders related to improving instruction or educational advocacy

Service

For promotion to Teaching Professor, the faculty member is expected to engage in service-related activities which are tied to teaching and teaching activities, curriculum development and assessment, quality instruction, and student success initiatives. (The aforementioned is not necessarily inclusive of all possible program/school service opportunities available to teaching faculty members). Some service at the college, university, and profession is expected at the Teaching Professor level. Teaching-track faculty at or above Associate Teaching Professor are eligible to serve on the FEC committee (FHB).

Post-tenure Review (PTR)

Unit specific processes

Provided there are no substantially mitigating circumstances (e.g., serious illness), Post-tenure Review is initiated when, in the annual review process, faculty do not meet expectations in any one category for four consecutive years or in two or more categories for two consecutive years.

Name of Preparer: Kyna Shelley (April 2021 revision)
Email Address of Preparer: kyna.shelley@usm.edu
Date of Submission: 4/29/2021

☒ I certify that the information provided above has been approved by the school director.

Appendix A
Documentation of Teaching and Clarifications

Required documentation of teaching must include:

1. All components of the university-administered student evaluations (USE). Include a summary sheet broken down by course and semester as well as copies of the actual evaluations including student comments during the time period under review. As a guide, means of evaluation scores above 4.00 on a 5.00 scale are generally considered to meet or exceed expectations.
2. Peer-review teaching evaluations, conducted on an annual basis, that document subject matter expertise and excellence in teaching.
3. Syllabi containing clear learning objectives consistent with program goals and substantive course assignments reflective of high academic standards (include all courses, but not all sections of the same course).

The faculty member may include any additional evidence that they believe demonstrates effective teaching (see below).

Optional documentation of teaching effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, any combination of the sources listed below:

- Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments
- Creation, development, or significant revision of programs and courses
- Creation or utilization of innovative teaching materials, instructional techniques, curricula, or programs of study
- Accomplishments of present and former students, including information to show students' success both in learning the subject matter of the discipline and in pursuing it to a point of intellectual significance
- Engagement and investment in academic student advisement
- Engagement and investment in student mentoring
- Participation in programs and/or conferences for improving teaching
- Development of new courses and/or programs where research and new knowledge are integrated
- Unsolicited student feedback (copies of emails, letters, etc.)
- Grants related to instruction
- Receipt of grants/contracts to fund innovative teaching or to fund stipends for students
- Descriptions of high impact practices

The faculty member may include any additional evidence that they believe demonstrates effective teaching (see below).

Clarifications

With regard to phrase "substantially more" on pages above:
The term "substantially more" can be defined as chairing projects or committees that require the director to chair five or more prospectus or defense meetings (in any combination) in the annual cycle. If a project does not require a meeting (e.g., honor's thesis, undergraduate thesis, SPUR project), full completion of the project should be counted as the equivalent of one meeting in the annual cycle.

Appendix B
Clarifications (Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activity)

A.   Grant Activity

Securing grants is considered to be an important means of seeking external support for research, creative and other scholarly activities. Grant activity is expected and may be counted toward teaching (for teaching or training grants), research (for research grants), or service (for program/outreach development grants) accomplishments. Only those grants that have a substantial research component are to be included in the research section of a candidate's dossier. It is preferred that the faculty member fill the role of PI or Co-PI on the listed research grants, however, serving as an evaluator on various types of grants is also valued. While funded grants reflect positively on the candidate and may represent a significant contribution as outlined above, unfunded external grant applications may be considered.

1. Funded ex*ternal* grants from reputable funding sources/agencies that advance data/material collection and/or result in the publication of scholarship, the improvement of teaching/instructional opportunities, or contribute to service activities.

2. External grants may be weighted by purpose (research, teaching, service), ability to promote the progress/publication of scholarship, applicability to improve teaching/generate instructional opportunities, facilitate student success, and/or contribute to or provide valuable service to academic programs, schools, colleges, the university, or professional/academic fields.

3. Internal grants may be weighted by purpose (research, teaching, service), ability to promote the progress/publication of scholarship, applicability to improve teaching/generate instructional opportunities, facilitate student success, and/or contribute to or provide valuable service to academic programs, schools, colleges, the university, or professional/academic fields.

B.   Professional Presentations

Routine research presentations at international, national, and regional conferences are encouraged *though not required.* Conference attendance and participation may result in valuable peer feedback that has the potential to improve existing manuscripts prior to peer- review/publication submission.

C.   Publications

Publications are counted only when the manuscript or book/monograph has been accepted for publication. An article or monograph's status of "published" or "in press" must be documented. Manuscripts and monographs that have been accepted pending revisions may be listed if this provisional acceptance is documented. Collaboration and publication with other faculty members and students are encouraged although single authored publications are by no means discouraged.

Likewise, publishing manuscripts and monographs as a collaborating statistician or other supportive roles (e.g. as a second, third, or fourth author) is recognized in the tenure and promotion process.

Criteria by which publications are evaluated may also include acceptance rate and impact factor. Any criteria to be evaluated must be documented. There are many resources available for finding measures of journal quality. For example, *Cabell's Directory of Publishing Opportunities* provides several measures of "value" regarding a variety of journals.

In order to qualify as peer-reviewed, the outlet and the submission should (a) have a formal peer review process prior to acceptance for publication, (b) be reputable (i.e., no vanity press or predatory publications), (c) be abstracted in at least one recognized and appropriate abstracting index (PsycInfo, ERIC, Web of Science, SCOPUS, etc.), and (d) provide information about its acceptance rate/impact factor, number of views, or other condition(s) of verification (i.e.*, the journal or press should not*

accept virtually all submissions).

Under review A manuscript that has been submitted to a peer-reviewed or refereed journal that has yet to receive a publication decision. Evidence of submission is required.

In press A manuscript that has been accepted for publication but has not yet appeared in print. *In press* publications carry the same weight as published manuscripts. Candidates should provide evidence of acceptance for publication. Manuscripts that have been accepted "pending revisions" may also be considered if the provisional acceptance is documented.

Published A manuscript that appears in a publication. Candidates should provide evidence of publication.

Peer review The foremost accepted criteria for judging journal/book/book chapter/etc. quality is the peer-review process in which professionals within the discipline evaluate the manuscript quality.

1. For peer-reviewed publications, quality indicators must include, but are not limited to, impact factor, acceptance rate, citations. If a scholarly publication has multiple authors, candidates should indicate their percentage contribution.

2. The percent of one's their specific contribution to a publication must be provided.

3. Percentages of contribution must also be provided for all other research activities (proposals, funded research awards, edited volumes, etc.).

4. Law review journals may be either peer-reviewed or student reviewed. Only articles published in law reviews that are peer-reviewed will count as peer-reviewed publications.

5. An academic book/monograph that presents original research/thought, is peer-reviewed, contracted, and published via a recognized university or private academic press that engages in rigorous professional/peer review may carry more weight than a single publication in a refereed journal. An authored scholarly/academic book may be given greater weight than a book that is an edited collection of articles/chapters or a textbook.

Non-refereed Publications in venues that do not undergo a peer-review process. Although some non-refereed work may garner high readership, these publications alone are not adequate to meet the scholarship requirements for promotion and tenure.

Appendix C
Documentation of Service and Other Clarifications

Documentation of Service may include, but is not limited, to the following:
- Committee appointment letters
- Committee membership lists
- Certificates of appreciation
- Website listings of committee members
- Thank you letters/memos/emails from committee chairs
- Grants related to service

Routine service such as attending program, faculty, and school committee meetings need not be documented. Other examples of faculty service are included in the Faculty Handbook.

Clarifications

Community service
Such service must be related to one's profession in order to be included for consideration in promotion and tenure. Examples of community service are:
1. Professionally-related talks to community groups or constituencies
2. Advising of such groups based on professional expertise
3. Professionally related service on boards or councils
4. Direct participation in external-to-the-university instruction, such as volunteering to teach to a group of public school educators.
5. Other (Please specify in supportive documentation)

Things not included in community service are *non-professionally related* activities or other aspects of daily life unconnected to one's professional role.

*Professionally related servi**ce***
Service to the profession is primarily concerned with service involving professional organizations. This would include membership on advisory committees or boards, editorial boards, planning committees or awards committees, newsletter editorships, membership chair, as well as elected office in state, regional, national, or international professional organizations.

Service awards and grants
Service also includes any kind of professionally related service award. It further includes service grants procured that provide a service to the University, the community, or possibly the profession. Service grants are distinguished from teaching grants, which focus primarily on teaching improvement, and from research grants, which are devoted to providing funds to conduct research.

Other Clarifications
It is important for the candidate to not list as service activities, undertakings that are more appropriately listed as teaching (such as dissertation committee membership) or research (such as submission of research grants). Candidates should not include as community service, activities that are not professionally related or connected to one's professional role.

Candidates would ideally demonstrate some activity across all areas. However, tenure-track faculty in the early stages of their career may not necessarily have substantial service contributions to the community or to the profession.

Appendix D
Annual Evaluation Rubric
This document represents selected exemplars. More exemplars are available in the unit document.

SoE Annual Review Rubric –DRAFT

Name of faculty member under review_____ Date_____
Reviewed by _____ **NA**=Not applicable

TEACHING				
Teaching	**Does Not Meet Expectations**	**Meets Expectations**	**Exceeds Expectations**	**NA**
Course Load	Does not teach the full complement of their courses assigned in workload	Teaches full complement of assigned courses in their assigned workload	Teaches more courses than their assigned workload to support program goals, teach out plans, etc.	
Course Materials including course syllabi, teaching materials, assessments, and Canvas. (CM)	Does not revise or update assigned CM as necessary	Revises and updates assigned CM as necessary	Meets expectations of updating assigned CM and develops new courses and materials or redesigns courses as evidenced by teaching portfolio	
Student satisfaction w/ course/instructor. Student teaching Evaluations (STE)	STEs do not reflect bench performance level (BPL) in the unit. Patterns below 4.0 on STE	STEs reflect the unit's BPL. Patterns b/w 4.0 -4.59 on STE	STEs exceed unit's BPL performance level STE Patterns above 4.6.	
Availability and Responsiveness to students	Did not demonstrate an established availability for communication (in person or remotely) with students during the work week and contract period as required.	Demonstrated an established availability for communication (in person or remotely) with students during the work week and contract period as required.	Provided multiple exemplars (3+) from students demonstrating that the instructor was highly responsive and available during the semester in ways that led to students' academic success	
Peer Evaluation of Teaching (PET)	PET does not reflect bench performance level in unit.	PET shows competence with subject matter and instruction.	PET shows expertise with subject matter and mastery of pedagogy.	
Service on UG and graduate students' research committees, as appropriate	Does not serve as committee member or chair when requested, relevant to expertise, and available opportunities.	Is a Committee Member or Chair on student research committees when requested and aligns with workload, area of expertise.	Chairs multiple (3+) UG and/or graduate students' research committees over and above standard workload.	

| Assignment feedback | Did not return student assignments within a timely manner (i e., two-week time frame) | Returned student assignments within a timely manner (i.e., two-week time frame) | Returned assignments with constructive feedback that led to student comprehension and success as evidenced by student communication or comments on STE (+3 exemplars) | |
| Grade submission | Did not submit grades and grade roster reports by unit deadlines. | Submitted grades and grade roster reports by unit deadlines. | | |

TEACHING SCORE:
Scoring 5/8 in Exceeds Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Exceeds Expectations
Scoring 5/8 in Meets Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Meets Expectations
Scoring 4/8 in Does Not Meet Expectations with 0 in Exceeds Expectations = Does Not Meet Expectations

Collegiality and engagement in teaching: (If not covered above, provide 1-3 sentences describing collegial and engagement efforts through teaching):

Overall comments:

		RESEARCH		
Research	**Does Not Meet Expectations**	**Meets Expectations**	**Exceeds Expectations**	**NA**
Activity in research and/or professional development (RPD) and/or grant submission.	Provides insufficient evidence of engagement in RPD (via conferences, correspondence, lectures, etc.), or in seeking grants.	Provides evidence of active RPD engagement (via presentations, publications, research to practice via conferences, correspondence, etc.) and/or research grant submission.	Provides evidence of engagement in multiple RPD projects (via national/international presentations, publications, research to practice correspondence, etc.) and/or has won funding for research.	

Dissemination of RPD- publication	Has not published (or has in press) one peer- reviewed product, or has not sought research grants.	Published (or has in press) one peer- reviewed product and written one research grant at PI or co-PI.	Published (or has in press) three or more peer reviewed products, or won external research funding.	
Support for others' RPD efforts (Collegiality)	~~Provides no evidence that demonstrates support and/or collaboration in RPD efforts of others in the unit and beyond.~~	~~Provides evidence that demonstrates support and/or collaboration in RPD with others in the unit and beyond.~~	~~Provides evidence that demonstrates high levels of support and/or collaboration in RPD with others in the unit and beyond~~	
Research with colleagues and community partners (Engagement)	Does not engage with peers or community partners in research, as appropriate	Engages with colleagues or community partners in research, as appropriate	Provides evidence of consistent engagement with colleagues or community partners in research	

RESEARCH SCORE:
Scoring 3/4 in Exceeds Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Exceeds Expectations
Scoring 3/4 in Meets Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations=Meets Expectations
Scoring 2/4 in Does Not Meet Expectations with 0 in Exceeds Expectations = Does Not Meet Expectations

Collegiality & engagement in RPD: (If not covered above, provide 1-3 sentences describing collegial and engagement efforts through RPD):

Overall comments

SERVICE				
Service	**Does Not Meet Expectations**	**Meets Expectations**	**Exceeds Expectations**	**N A**

Service to the profession	No or insufficient evidence of service to profession	Serves as a committee member; manuscript or proposal peer-reviewer; editor of conference proceedings, newsletter or other similar publication; panel organizer, etc.in one or more scholarly or professional associations	Meets expectations and serves as an officer or governing board member, editor-in-chief, etc. in one or more scholarly or professional associations or peer-reviewed publications.	
Regularly attends and engages in workshops/trainings/certifications conducted at the Program, School, College, University, and/or within one's field	Exhibits a pattern of non-attendance or engagement in workshops/trainings/certifications (PSCU).	Exhibits a pattern of attending and engagement in workshops/trainings/certifications (PSCU).	Exhibits a pattern of leading efforts at workshops/trainings/certifications (PSCU).	
Collaboration, support, and/or respect for others' service efforts in and outside the university.	Fails to support or respect service efforts of others in the unit and beyond.	Supports, respects, or collaborates in service with others in the unit and beyond.	Provides evidence of high levels of support, respect and/or collaboration in service with others in the unit and beyond	
Regular attendance and engagement in committee and subcommittee work as appropriate (Program, School, College, University-PSCU)	Exhibits a pattern of non-attendance at meetings and lack off involvement in committees (PSCU).	Exhibits a pattern of attending meetings and involvement in committees (PSCU).	Exhibits a pattern of leading efforts at meetings and in committees(PSCU).	

SERVICE SCORE:
Scoring 3/4 in Exceeds Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations = Exceeds Expectations
Scoring 3/4 in Meets Expectations with 0 in Does Not Meet Expectations=Meets Expectations
Scoring 2/4 in Does Not Meet Expectations with 0 in Exceeds Expectations = Does Not Meet Expectations:

Collegiality and engagement in service: (If not covered above, provide 1-3 sentences describing collegial and engagement efforts through service):

Overall comments:

FINAL NOTEWORTHY ACTIVITIES or REMARKS – Evaluator(s) may identify noteworthy activities or include other remarks for year under review

Teaching	

Research/ Professional Development	
Service	