

## **Department of Educational Leadership Guidelines for Evaluation and Review of Faculty**

The Department of Educational Leadership is housed in the College of Education at Northeastern State University and aligns expectations to the institutional mission by cultivating “diverse communities with lifelong learning through a broad array of graduate programs. With high expectations for student success, the University provides quality teaching, challenging curricula, research and scholarly activities, immersive learning opportunities, and service to local and professional communities. The institution’s dedicated faculty and staff offer a service-oriented, supportive learning environment where students prepare to achieve professional and personal success in a multicultural and global society” (NSU Mission). The Department embraces the Northeastern's values of integrity, collaboration, creativity, leadership, communication and diversity.

As a department housed in the College of Education that serves practitioners in the respective fields, faculty are committed to “continuous improvement by achieving results through rigor, relevance, relationships, and responsibility, thus facilitating the transformation of candidate to highly qualified professional in a diverse global society” (COE Mission).

Under the guidelines of the *NSU Faculty Handbook*, the Department of Educational Leadership (EL) will use the following information regarding promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review of faculty (NSU Faculty Handbook sections [FH sec] 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.4) which states, “It is the clear responsibility of departments to establish clear expectations for (promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review) with the approval of the dean and consistent with university expectations as delineated in Appendix C. Departments are also responsible for establishing clear requirements for documenting the quality and significance of faculty achievements” (FH sec 3.3.3). The Department of Educational Leadership is dedicated to the investment in individual faculty development and the departmental faculty. To this end, department faculty have highlighted areas of Appendix C which they deem most important to creating and sustaining an intensive practitioner, field-based approach for all programs within the department. Concentrating on the following areas of faculty enhancement, while maintaining alignment with Appendix C-

### **Review of Faculty:**

- **Non-Tenured Faculty:** Non-tenured faculty will choose a tenured faculty mentor in consultation with the department chair (FA sec 3.3.1) to guide the process of promotion and tenure (3.3.1.a). The non-tenured faculty member and mentor will meet a minimum of two times during the academic year. The first meeting must take place in the fall semester to establish goals/plans for the upcoming year. The second meeting must take place before February 1st to review the submitted professional file and discuss progress toward the goals established in the fall semester (3.3.1.a).
  - **Evaluation of non-tenured faculty:** Annual review occurs during the spring semester of each year.
    - Non-tenured faculty will present their professional file to their mentor and department chair by January 2nd. First-year faculty will prepare an abbreviated portfolio that outlines yearly goals in alignment with criteria that follow departmental guidelines/
    - The department chair will schedule a meeting with the non-tenured faculty member after the professional portfolio has been submitted and

## **Department of Educational Leadership Guidelines for Evaluation and Review of Faculty**

complete a written, annual evaluation and recommendation for retention to the dean by February 1st.

- The dean will meet with the faculty member to review the written goals from the mentor and the department chair and provide a written response to the faculty member (3.3.1.b).
  - **Third-Year Review:** The third-year review provides a candid assessment of the faculty member's current standing with respect to obtaining tenure. If the finding of this third-year review is less than satisfactory, the dean will notify the faculty member in writing of the lack of progress toward tenure (3.3.1.b).
  - **Non-Reappointment:** A non-tenured faculty member whose appointment is not renewed will be given written notice on or before March 1st. The non-tenured faculty member shall be given a copy of the evaluation. Failure to reappoint may be without specific or stated causes (RUSO 3.4.7; 3.3.1.c).
- **Tenured Faculty:** Tenured faculty must be formally reviewed at least every three (3) years (RUSO 3.3.5b) to determine whether the faculty member continues to meet expectations in Effective Classroom Teaching, Scholarly or Creative Achievement, and Contributions to the Institution and Profession (3.3.2).
    - **Evaluation of tenured faculty**
      - This review will occur in the third year, fall semester, after the faculty member has been granted tenure, and every third year thereafter.
      - A committee will consist of three tenured faculty members at or above the rank of the faculty member and will be chosen by the faculty member in consultation with the department chair. The committee will determine if the tenured faculty member meets expectations in Effective Classroom Teaching, Scholarly or Creative Achievement, and Contributions to the Institution and Profession by a majority vote. Tenured faculty must meet expectations in all three categories (3.3.2.a).
      - The tenured faculty member will present an extended curriculum vita that includes accomplishments since the last review to the committee. The result of the vote and any recommendations will be communicated by the committee chair to the dean (3.3.2.b).

### **Promotion in Faculty Rank**

Providing that candidates possess the required educational and experience qualifications; the following are considered minimum criteria upon which promotion in rank is based:

1. Effective classroom teaching,
2. Scholarly or creative achievement,
3. Contributions to the institution and profession, and
4. Performance of non-teaching semi-administrative or administrative duties (RUSO 3.2.6).

## **Department of Educational Leadership**

### **Guidelines for Evaluation and Review of Faculty**

Each advancement in rank requires increased levels of performance/achievement in each of these criteria, particularly evidence of involvement in professional and scholarly activities (3.3.3.a).

- **Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor**
  - To qualify for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member shall produce evidence of performance ratings that meet or exceed the criteria stated for Effective Classroom Teaching, Scholarly or Creative Achievements, and Contributions to the Institution and Profession and demonstrate contributions to the mission of the university in an *effective* manner.
- **Promotion from Associate to Full Professor**
  - To be recommended for promotion to the rank of full professor, candidates shall produce evidence of performance ratings that meet or exceed the criteria stated for Effective Classroom Teaching, Scholarly or Creative Achievements, and Contributions to the Institution and Profession. Promotion to Full Professor is reserved for those who have demonstrated *comprehensive* or *specific* excellence to mission of the institution.
- **Procedures for promotion in Faculty Rank**
  - Faculty shall submit a professional file to the department chair for review by September 30th. The promotion committee will be notified of the submission of the professional portfolio by the department chair. The promotion committee will meet to rate the portfolio as “Not Met,” “Met,” or “Not Applicable” which is the criteria established for the faculty rank to which the faculty member is seeking.
  - Both the promotion committee will forward a recommendation letter to the department chair by October 31st.
  - The department chair will forward the promotion committees recommendation to the Dean by November 1st. The department chair will then meet with the faculty member to review the recommendations from the promotion committee and provide a written response to the faculty member. All reviews become part of the faculty member’s file.
  - The dean will forward the promotion committee and department chair’s recommendation to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs by December 1st. The dean will then meet with the faculty member to review the recommendations from the committee and the department chair and provide a written response to the faculty member. All reviews become part of the faculty member’s file (FH 3.3.1b).
- **Procedures for Academic Tenure**

Academic Tenure Criteria - Tenure is granted to non-tenured faculty whose work has satisfied university and department standards of quality and significance in Teaching, Scholarly Activities and Contributions to the Institution and Profession following the Boyer Model, as laid out in Appendix C. Tenure represents the university's long-term commitment to a faculty member, and is only granted when there is evidence that the individual will continue to make increasingly distinguished contributions to the university and its instructional program, her/his discipline, and the community (FH 3.4).

## **Department of Educational Leadership Guidelines for Evaluation and Review of Faculty**

The tenure decision shall be based on a thorough evaluation of the candidate's total contribution to the mission of the University. While specific responsibilities of faculty members may vary because of special assignments or because of the particular mission of an academic unit, all evaluations for tenure shall address at a minimum whether each candidate has achieved excellence in:

1. Effective classroom teaching;
2. Scholarly or creative achievement;
3. Contributions to the institution and profession; and
4. Performance of non-teaching semi-administrative or administrative duties.

The tenured faculty in the department will review and evaluate each tenure candidate's contributions to the mission of the university and the college. The tenured faculty shall write a formal recommendation regarding tenure that summarizes the candidate's strengths and the areas that need development. The recommendation shall also include ratings of activities in all areas. (FH 3.4.1a.) Departmental ratings are "Not Met," "Met," or "Exceeds". "Not Met" is a portfolio submitted by the tenure candidate that only meets the qualifications of Associate Professor. "Met" rating is a portfolio submitted by the tenure candidate that meets the requirements for Associate Professor **and** demonstrates the faculty member's contribution(s) to the mission of the college and the university, and achieved excellence in effective classroom teaching, scholarship, and contributions.

"Exceeds" is a portfolio submitted by the tenure candidate that meets the requirements of "Met" but also includes evidence of dissemination of scholarly activities and engagement within the university. The weight of each rating will be distributed for consideration so that 50% will be given to Effective Classroom Teaching, 25% to Creative or Scholarly areas, and 25% to Contribution to the Institution/Profession.

- **Criteria for Faculty Evaluation**

- Faculty members will be given a rating of "Not Met," "Met," or "Not Applicable" for each area to be reviewed for promotion in faculty rank. Each advancement in rank requires increased levels of performance/achievement in each of these criteria; "Increased levels of performance/achievement" shall be defined as follows:
  - Assistant Professor to Associate Professor - This rank is associated with state and regional activities. The candidate shall receive a rating of not less than "Met" on all categories for the department with some attention dedicated to state and regional activities.
  - Associate Professor to Full Professor - This rank is associated with state, regional, national, and possibly international activities. The candidate shall receive a rating of not less than "Met" on all categories for the department with some attention dedicated to state, regional, national, and possibly international activities. An Associate Professor will also have to include other criteria in Appendix C of the *Faculty Handbook*, beyond those in the department expectations to show evidence of a *comprehensive* excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

## **Department of Educational Leadership Guidelines for Evaluation and Review of Faculty**

**Professional Portfolio:** The professional portfolio for tenure and promotion review should follow the table of contents below in APA style (where applicable):

1. Current curriculum vitae (updated annually).
2. A comprehensive, reflective narrative of three to five pages.
3. Evidence supporting progress in meeting tenure and promotion as stated below (RUSO 3.3.3; *Faculty Handbook* 3.3.3.a).
  - a. Effective Classroom Teaching
  - b. Scholarly or Creative Achievement (Boyer's Areas of Scholarship)
  - c. Contributions to the Institution and Profession
  - d. Performance of Non-teaching, Semi-administrative, or Administrative Duties (when applicable)
4. All applicable, relevant letters of review evaluation.

### **Effective Classroom Teaching**

The department faculty believe in investing in students and their learning. To this end, the following activities/evidence from Appendix C regarding *effective classroom teaching* are expectations of all faculty in the Educational Leadership Department:

- **Immersive Learning:** As described on page XX of Appendix C, immersive learning or “active learning” pedagogy takes on numerous aspects of teaching. Because department faculty believe the field-based approach to learning is vital, working with practitioners who are working in their own environments and who are developing leadership capacities is a key component of all programs. The expectation is this will be documented for promotion through syllabi used in courses, descriptions of specific activities in courses or internships, and/or projects that may be implemented that could fall outside of the syllabus.
- **Peer Reviews/Chair Reviews:** Department faculty believe we learn best from working with each other. To that end, department faculty encourage and have an expectation of peer review/chair review of courses utilizing all delivery methods of instruction. While review itself is important, it is the modifications/improvements in design and delivery of courses that has an impact on student learning. Documentation of peer review/chair review of courses can include, but is not limited to, review worksheets, emails back and forth, notes about discussions, Quality Matters (QM) review of courses, or Review of Online Courses (ROC) reviews of courses. Highlighting changes in design and/or delivery of courses will be encouraged, though not required. Faculty members will be required to participate in a minimum of one type of peer review activity each academic year.
- **Continuous Curriculum Improvement:** While some faculty teach a wide variety of course, others teach specific courses and do so for extended lengths of time. The expectations of the faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership are to engage in continuous improvement to meet the needs of students and best practice.
- Advisees (when applicable)
- Student Evaluations (optional)
- **Learning Outcomes/Learning Gains:** The primary evidence of effective teaching should come from the assessment of learning outcomes/learning gains exhibited by students.

## **Department of Educational Leadership Guidelines for Evaluation and Review of Faculty**

Potential evidence may include (these will be different for each faculty member), but not limited to: Internship projects, theses, capstones, standardized assessments, research proposals, or field-based projects. This assessment of learning will serve as evidence of immersive learning.

- Course Load: The Department of Educational Leadership faculty are required to teach a 9-hour course load each semester, with 20-25 students maximum. The curriculum in the departmental programs are immersive, individualized, and faculty provide constructive feedback to students resulting in an academic scholarly-based instructional environment.

The department faculty provide instruction for practitioners who are in their own environments, developing skills that add to their existing knowledge base. While these areas are specifically highlighted for department expectations, other areas mentioned are not disregarded and may add to what the department has established as minimum expectations. Faculty are encouraged to develop other activities and provide evidence listed on page XX of the *Faculty Handbook* in addition those bulleted above items.

### **Creative or Scholarly Activities**

The department adheres to the Boyer Model as expressed in the Faculty Handbook (pp. XX-XX) for Scholarly Activities considerations. The four areas of the Boyer Model highlighted are:

- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
- Scholarship of Discovery
- Scholarship of Application
- Scholarship of Integration

“Faculty are **not** required or even encouraged to demonstrate scholarship in all four Boyer categories. A faculty member may use only one category” (p. XX). The Boyer Model maintains that the process of any of the above types of scholarly activity almost always includes: Clear goals; adequate preparation; appropriate methods; significant results; effective presentation; and, reflective critique (Appendix C). As illustrated in the faculty handbook, and stated earlier, college faculty have an expectation to engage in scholarship, but are not expected to engage in all four categories of the Boyer Model. In fact, many choose to concentrate on one Boyer category. It is true that some scholarship may blend into other categories as the lines of separation are somewhat fluid. Evidence of scholarship can be documented by:

- Articles published in refereed journals;
- Chapters published in scholarly books;
- Scholarly books written or edited;
- Papers presented at professional meetings;
- Posters presented at professional meetings;
- Sessions chaired at professional meetings;
- Panel participation at professional meetings;
- Papers reviewed for professional meetings;
- Book reviews;
- Grant proposals submitted; or,
- Grants funded.

## **Department of Educational Leadership Guidelines for Evaluation and Review of Faculty**

This list is not exhaustive, and faculty are encouraged to develop other activities a complete suggested list of evidence on page XX of the *Faculty Handbook*.

Assistant Professors are required to fulfill scholarly activities at the state and/or regional level.

Associate Professor are required to publish in a refereed journal(s) and fulfill scholarly activities at the national (or international) level.

Professors are required to continue scholarly activities and mentor students and/or faculty in scholarly activities.

### **Contributions to the Institution and Profession**

The Educational Leadership Department has the expectation that faculty members will contribute to the institution, community and the profession. This can be represented in many ways and includes work within the community that highlights the expertise held by each faculty member. Building relationships with the institution, community, and other professionals in the specific disciplines strengthens faculty in their own areas of expertise. Department expectations are that faculty members will contribute to at least one of the following areas, while they are encouraged to participate in all areas:

1. Service to Institution activities include, but are not limited to:
  - a. Involvement in departmental administration, service on committees, task forces, councils, search committees, and Faculty Council.
  - b. Mentoring or advising other faculty, organizing colloquia and seminars; or supervising student activities or student groups.
  - c. Development such as participating in student recruitment; public relations and marketing of program; or retention activities.
2. Service to the discipline/profession activities include, but are not limited to:
  - a. Governance, such as leadership role in a professional association, participation in organizing, convening, or presiding for an association meeting or function.
  - b. Scholarly activities such as serving on an editorial board or journal editor; reviewing books for publication, grant proposals for funding agency, conference submissions for possible acceptance, and articles for journal publication.
  - c. Sharing expertise, such as serving on an accrediting team; writing questions for licensure or certification exams; participating in a program review for a university.
3. Service to the community utilizing one's professional discipline activities include, but are not limited to:
  - a. Providing service to a local, regional, or global community or governmental agency, such as the PreK-12 community, non-profit agencies, and economic development groups.
  - b. Providing services to support or enhance economic development in the region.
  - c. Providing consulting services or technical assistance.
  - d. Serving on boards, committees, commissions utilizing one's disciplinary expertise.

## **Department of Educational Leadership Guidelines for Evaluation and Review of Faculty**

Assistant Professors should highlight one area of contribution to the community and the profession.

Associate Professors will highlight two areas of contribution to the institution, community and the profession.

Full-Professors will highlight one area of contribution to the institution and profession and mentor faculty and/or students in contributing to the institution and profession.

Faculty members in the Department of Educational Leadership are expected to show evidence in the areas; Effective Classroom Teaching, Scholarly or Creative Achievement, and Contributions to the Institution and Profession, to be considered for promotion, academic tenure, and post-tenure reviews. Because department faculty believe the field-based approach to learning is vital, working with practitioners who are working in their own environments and who are developing leadership capacities is a key component of all programs, weight will be distributed for consideration so that 50% will be given to Effective Classroom Teaching, 25% to Creative or Scholarly areas, and 25% to Contribution to the Institution/Profession in all department considerations for promotion, academic tenure, and post-tenure reviews.

Submitted Respectively by the Department of Educational Leadership Faculty on December 11, 2017.