Southeast Missouri State University
College of Health & Human Services
Department of Nursing
Promotion and Tenure Criteria and Procedure

Promotion

Introduction:

The Department of Nursing believes that the integrated roles of teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service are essential for faculty performance. Evidence of these three categories should be included throughout the promotion document.

I. Concept of Promotion

The structured process of promotion within the Department of Nursing is based on the following concepts:

A. The promotion process is designed to be an objective mechanism for the purpose of recognizing an individual faculty member's achievement and dedication both as a professional in the field and as a member of this academic community.

B. The promotion process incorporates necessary guidelines and procedures as to identify creditable contributions at all levels.

C. The recommendation for promotion is based upon sustained patterns while at current rank. Sustained is defined as "four productive years while in current rank." The university has defined sustained performance as "over time in rank." However, there should be stronger emphasis on sustained performance during the last four years in rank. It is understood that the candidate's performance does not require entries in each category be made every year to be considered sustained.

D. The promotion guidelines are flexible enough to allow for individual differences.

E. The promotion policy of the Department of Nursing supplements and in no way supersedes the policies set forth by the University.

F. The promotion committee operates under the guidelines of the University promotion document.

II. **Minimum** Standards for Promotion to the Various Ranks (Also see Faculty Handbook for Promotion Policy.)

    A.   PROFESSOR
1. Ratings - one rating of outstanding and two of superior
2. Required education - earned Doctorate in Nursing or a related field

    B.   ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
1. Ratings - two ratings of superior (one must be in teaching) and one of good
2. Required education - earned Doctorate in Nursing or a related field

    C.   ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
1. Rating - three ratings of good
2. Required education - earned Doctorate in Nursing or a related field

III. Criteria

    A.   **EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

1. Evaluative Support

a. Colleague evaluations: Evidence of peer evaluation must be provided. The candidate shall present no more than three evaluation reports by colleagues of equal or higher rank (may include faculty, Department Chair, or Dean). The evaluations must indicate direct knowledge of the candidate's performance in the classroom, lab, or in curriculum development.

b. Student evaluations of instruction (a summary of the results of neutrally administered student evaluations of instruction conducted during the relevant time period.): By University policy, candidates may not be compelled to report the results of student evaluations; however, it is the candidate's responsibility to present a case for teaching effectiveness.
If applicants for promotion and tenure decide to report the results of student evaluations, they should use a common evaluation instrument approved by the Department once a year for each class taught. In addition, the candidate should present evaluative data from a nationally normed evaluation instrument in a time frame that is consistent with University policy. Evaluative data should be presented in tabular format. Narrative student comments as well as unsolicited student feedback may also be included as evaluative data.

c. Evaluation of presentations outside the classroom setting

d. Other*

2. Curricular Innovations/Improvements

   a. New courses developed or taught; include syllabi where appropriate.

   b. Major revision of established courses; include syllabi where appropriate.

   c. Participation in program or curriculum development and evaluation

   d. Creative teaching/learning activities in the classroom or clinical setting.

   e. Development of alternative method(s) of instruction (for example, web-based courses, web-assisted courses, ITV courses, gaming simulation, role play, case studies, lab exercises, etc.)

   f. Collaboration with agencies to initiate clinical practice sites

   g. Other* (Examples: Teaching awards or recognition, funding for innovative teaching/learning methods, etc.)

3. Continuous Teaching Improvement

   a. Identification of course weaknesses and specific actions taken to remedy those weaknesses

   b. Efforts to improve individual teaching through participation in seminars or conferences

   Provide:
   - location with the most recent listed first
   - date
   - title
   - presenter
   - sponsoring organization
   - categories of international, national, state, regional, and local explanation of how each relates to improving teaching effectiveness

   c. Revisions of established curricula and courses; include syllabi where appropriate.

     d. Maintenance of clinical practice sites through effective collaboration with agencies

     e. Maintenance of alternative teaching methods (Examples: Web courses, case studies, etc.)

     f. Other* (Examples: Internal/external funds to improve teaching, etc.)

4. Self Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

The category, "other" appears throughout the document and allows the candidate to supply any further evidence that would strengthen or clarify the candidate's activities within a particular area.

PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

Outstanding: A sustained record of effective teaching (substantial documentation of teaching effectiveness) and evidence of involvement in activities in all four categories with a minimum of six activities across categories two and three.

Superior: A sustained record of effective teaching and evidence of involvement in activities in all four categories with a minimum of four activities across categories two and three.

Good: A sustained record of effective teaching and evidence of involvement in all four categories with a minimum of two activities across categories two and three.

Unacceptable: Insufficient evidence of effective teaching.

B. EVIDENCE OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Note: Candidates shall provide descriptive data whenever possible to clearly define the specific role they played in professional growth activities. They should also include a description of the characteristics of the journals or books in which their writing has been published.

1. Category One (peer –reviewed)

     a. Articles in professional journals
     b. Books/monographs/scholarly media material
     c. Chapters in books
     d. Professional presentations
     e. Grants (approved/funded)

      f. Manuscripts accepted for publication
      g. Editor of professional publication
      h. Other

2. Category Two

      a. Post-doctoral work directly related to departmental goals/needs
      b. Research (completed or in progress)
      c. Thesis or project chair
      d. Articles, books, chapters, and presentations which are not peer-
         reviewed
      e. Referee/reviewer for professional publications/presentations
      f. Member of editorial board
      g. Other

3. Category Three

      a. Session chair and/or participant at a professional meeting,
         seminar, or workshop
      b. Professional recognition or honors
      c. Educational experiences contributing to professional growth
      d. Professional practice to improve expertise in the academic
         setting
      e. Professional certification
      f. Other

4. Self-Evaluation

PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Outstanding: A sustained record of very high quality scholarly and professional activities defined as having significant involvement in four of the activities listed in category one, to include at least two refereed publications and evidence of ongoing research, in three additional activities listed in categories two and three, and completion of the self-evaluation.

Superior: A sustained record of high quality scholarly and professional activities, defined as having significant involvement in three of the activities listed in category one, to include at least one refereed publication and evidence of ongoing research, in two additional activities listed in categories two and three, and completion of the self-evaluation.

Good: A sustained record of quality scholarly and professional activities defined as involvement in two of the activities listed in category one, in

one additional activity from categories two and three, and completion of the self-evaluation.

Unacceptable: Insufficient evidence of quality scholarly and professional activities.

C. EVIDENCE OF SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY

1. Departmental Service:

   a) Committee chair
   b) Committee member
   c) Academic advising
   d) Thesis or research project committee member
   e) Supervision of independent studies
   f) Contributions to department sponsored groups and/or
       activities
   g) Program development
   h) Sponsor/advisor of student organization
   i) Thesis or research project committee chair (only if not addressed in
      Professional Growth)
    j) Other

2. College and University Service:

   a) Committee chair
   b) Committee member
   c) Supervision/mentoring of graduate students
   d) Contributes to activities and organizations
   e) Program development/interdisciplinary activities
   f) Involvement in University projects
   g) Sponsor student organizations
   h) Presentations/intra or interdepartmental classes
   i) Award or recognition
   j) Other

3. Professional Service

   a) Officer or committee member of a professional organization
   b) Coordinator/leader at a professional meeting, seminar, or workshop
   c) Participation in professional organization
   d) Manuscript reviewer (only if NOT addressed in Professional
       Growth)

e) Other

4. Professionally-Related Community Service
   a) Officer or leader of board or task force
   b) Member on board or task force
   c) Projects initiated by community organizations, etc.
   d) Clinical services within the region
   e) Service to area schools
   f) Other
      Note: How a candidate has applied the teacher-scholar model within the context of the candidate's service should be addressed under "Other."

5. Self-evaluation

PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR SERVICE

Outstanding: A sustained record of a very active role to include leadership in two activities under Departmental Service, in three activities from College and University Service, Professional Service, and/or Professionally-Related Community Service, and completion of the self-evaluation.

Superior: A sustained record of an active role in at least two activities under Departmental Service, in two activities from College and University Service, Professional Service, or Professionally-Related Community Service, and completion of the self-evaluation.

Good: A sustained record of quality service in at least two activities under Departmental Service and completion of the self-evaluation.

Unacceptable: Insufficient evidence of quality service

Note: Responsibility for making the case for "leadership" is up to the candidate.