Department of Elementary, Early, and Special Education
CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND ACADEMIC RANK
February 2017
Preface

Faculty within the Department of Elementary, Early, and Special Education participate in meeting three primary departmental responsibilities. These include: a) the preparation of undergraduate students to become competent teachers and the provision of graduate programs which afford practitioners ample opportunities to increase their knowledge of their profession, b) the dissemination of knowledge of the theoretical and practical aspects of education to other scholars and professional educators, and c) cooperation in the effort to serve the institution as a whole.

The department is also involved in an obligatory relationship with the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and must fulfill prescribed requirements related to state teaching certification. In addition the department's programs have achieved continuing accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) (formerly National Council for the Accreditation of Educators – NCATE). Both certification and accreditation require faculty to participate in ongoing adjustment of curricula to align programs with state and national standards. The certification/accreditation requirements also require department faculty to collaborate to make all sections of courses aligned to standards, as well as to assure vertical alignment and sequence of courses. To achieve these goals, faculty meet regularly and extensively in their programs and as a department.

Based on these requirements, which differ from those of faculty from other departments in the university, the departmental criteria for tenure and promotion are intended to be flexible and to give value to the distinct faculty course and field supervision loads and to certification / accreditation. The criteria are also intended to allow each faculty member to emphasize his or her particular strengths. All faculty seeking tenure and promotion are expected to hold an earned doctoral degree in the appropriate field, and, regardless of rank, are expected to perform acceptably in the areas of teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service to the university. Since significant individual differences in skills and interests are essential for the coordination of the department's programs, faculty members within the department may develop different combinations of "sustained" contributions within each of the evaluated areas. But in the end, it is the quality of those combined accomplishments in teaching, professional growth, and service, which is the standard for promotion in the Department of Elementary, Early, and Special Education.

Areas to be evaluated:

1. Teaching Effectiveness
2. Professional Growth
3. Service to the University

Definitions of Terms:

1. Sustained is defined as a series of accomplishments throughout the period of time in rank with emphasis on the last four years.

2. Quality is defined as above average performance as documented in evaluative support.

3. Areas=Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Growth, and Service
   Categories=Sections under the Areas labeled as A1, A2, B1, etc.
   Entries=actual activities and accomplishments listed under categories.

Required Levels of Performance':

1. Professor/Post Professorial Merit The professor shall be one who is **Outstanding** in one area and is at least **Superior** in the other two other areas.

2. Tenure and Associate Professor The associate professor shall be one who is **Superior** in two areas one of which is Teaching Effectiveness and **Good** in the third area.

3. Assistant Professor The assistant professor shall be one who is **Superior** in teaching and **Good** in the two other areas.

Note: These levels of performance are the minimum criteria.

Required Documents

"The faculty member's promotion dossier shall comprise the Summary Form, a Record of Service of accomplishments organized according to the departmental tenure and promotion criteria, a professional curriculum vita, letters of support from professional colleagues addressing the three areas of Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Growth, and Service, and any supporting materials that the faculty member wishes to include."

This quote is taken from the Faculty handbook (Chapter 2 Faculty Policies and Procedures, F. Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy, The Dossier)

1. The candidate will submit a professional vita.
2. The candidate will include a minimum of three letters from colleagues of equal rank or above. The candidate shall request the writer to speak mainly to one of the three areas to be evaluated. If the writer includes information related to more than one area, the reader shall consider that information under the relevant area. Under III in the Record of Service there must be at least one peer evaluation letter for each of the three areas (Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Growth, and Service).
3. The candidate will submit a list of courses taught (by semester). Include course numbers, titles, credit hours, number of students, delivery format (traditional, field experience, web-enhanced, online, etc) and location (on campus, off campus).

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PAPERS

"The suggestions that follow are intended to assist departments and faculty members in collecting evidence to be included in the dossier. They are not requirements; rather, they are presented as general guides. When integrated with the criteria, these guides suggest how the faculty member can most clearly substantiate his or her performance in a well-documented academic profile, and therefore present the strongest case possible."

This quote is taken from the Faculty Handbook (Chapter 2 Faculty Policies and Procedures, F. Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy – Guides for Collecting Evidence)

Additional Elementary, Early and Special Education Departmental guidelines for preparing papers

1. When including work done at other institutions, materials and entries to be considered for tenure and promotion shall have been completed at a rank equal to or higher than the rank currently held.
2. Peer and self-evaluations shall clarify, strengthen, support, and attest to the quality of the candidate's performance in the categories within that area.
3. Materials and entries to be considered for tenure and promotion shall be relevant to the candidate's field of professional expertise. While the candidate may choose to include items not clearly related to his/her assignment at Southeast Missouri State University, this should be done with great hesitation and with care to explain the item's direct relevance to the professional assignment, as such items generally detract from the candidate's papers.

4. Record of Service should be presented in a clear, concise, and specific manner:

    a. Date all entries, in reverse chronological order.

    b. Where applicable, list names, titles, duration/length, whether peer-reviewed, acceptance rate, professional regard etc.

    c. When entries may not be familiar to readers across the University, a one sentence (or very short) explanation should be included.

    d. When entries involve collaborative work, an explanation of the individual's role should be included.

    e. Duplication of entries should be avoided. When an activity has resulted in more than one product the activity should be listed where its greatest emphasis lies. Additional products should then be clearly referenced back to the "home" entry.

    f. Effort should be made to determine if an activity involved the candidate's involvement in considerable new study, preparation of new materials, or presentation of newly developed ideas, or if it involved primarily reorganizing information and materials and teaching tips used elsewhere. This distinction would determine if the entry mainly contributed to the candidate's professional growth or was a service performed by the candidate. Normally, presentations to another faculty member's class, or local in-service workshops would be included under service rather than professional growth.

    g. In evaluating particular accomplishments the following will be taken into consideration: peer review, level of professional organization (international/national, regional, state, local), source of grants (external, internal), length, sole/joint authorship, and/or professional regard of publication / organization.

Record of Service for Tenure and Promotion

I.   Evaluation by College Dean

II.   Evaluation by Department Chair

III.   Evaluation letters from Peers (See Required Documents # 2)

EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

A.   Delivery of Effective Instruction

1. Student Evaluation of instruction
    Summary of the results of neutrally administered student evaluations of instruction conducted using a departmental or university approved evaluative instrument. In accordance with Chapter 2 (F.) and Chapter 3 (C)(10.) of the Faculty handbook (Faculty Senate Bill 10-A-13), faculty are not required to provide traditional classroom evaluations. However, the candidate is responsible for demonstrating effective teaching. This may include responses from current and former students relating to teaching effectiveness.
2. Evaluation by Peers to Improve Teaching
    Peer review using departmental approved criteria for class observation or review of online courses. This review should be done by peers of equal or higher rank whose qualifications and experience lend to the validity of the review. This review analyzes candidate's strengths in teaching and is used to maintain or improve teaching effectiveness.
3. Evaluations by the Department Chair to Improve Teaching
    Review by the department chair using departmental approved criteria for class observation or review of online courses. This review analyzes candidates' strengths in teaching and is used to maintain or improve teaching effectiveness.
4. Recognition from the education community (College of Education, University, or outside The University) for the quality of teaching or use of effective pedagogy.
5. Self Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness
    A reflective narrative that summarizes strengths and areas for improvement in teaching during the review period. The candidate should highlight strengths and how teaching evaluations have been used to improve instruction and meet student needs.
6. Other evidence.

B.   Currency in the Instructional Field

1. Participation in professional experiences (conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.) directly related to teaching effectiveness.
2. Application of new instructional strategies
3. Application of instructional technology
4. Other evidence (such as achievement of professional certification).

C.   Curriculum Development and Implementation

1. New courses developed and/or taught. (Include syllabi where appropriate.)
2. Revisions of established courses. (Include degree of revisions, and syllabi where appropriate.)
3. Curriculum/program development and revision.
4. Development of new course materials and/or formats/delivery methods (such as web course, web enhanced).
5. Other evidence.

Performance Levels - Teaching Effectiveness

Outstanding   To achieve a performance level of Outstanding, the candidate must present a sustained record of teaching effectiveness documented by two categories under A; and any other 4 categories.

Superior   To achieve a performance level of Superior, the candidate must present a sustained record of teaching effectiveness documented by two categories under A; and any other 3 categories.

Good   To achieve a performance level of Good, the candidate must present a sustained record of teaching effectiveness documented by two categories under A; and any other 2 categories.

To achieve a level of Outstanding, a candidate will demonstrate overall higher quality than for Superior, and for Superior, overall higher quality than for Good.

EVIDENCE OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

A. Professional Development

1. Attendance at educational or professional institutes, seminars, and conferences etc. (Give place and date).
2. Travel which contributes to effectiveness as a faculty member. (Examples might include study tours, participation in faculty exchange programs, or other travel not formally associated with a professional meeting.)
3. Membership in professional organizations.
4. Professional organizations or accrediting agencies in which actively participated (Describe role / activities; give place and date).
5. Honors
6. Other evidence.

B. Scholarly Activities

1. Publications. (Include books, chapters, journal articles, etc. APA bibliographical citation format should be used.) Indicate whether the publication is peer-reviewed or not and give acceptance rate if available.
2. Presentations. (Provide conference acceptance rate, if available, and whether peer-reviewed or not. If co-presenter, describe your role.)
3. Ongoing Research (Describe scholarly research that has promise of leading to presentation and/or publication.)
4. Competitive Grants. (external and/or internal) Include date, title, amount, and responsibility. Indicate whether funded or not funded.
5. Other evidence

Performance Levels - Professional Growth

Outstanding   To achieve a performance level of **Outstanding** the candidate must present a sustained record of professional growth in **A3, A4*, B1** B2*****, **AND two other categories from A or B.**

*Leadership in a professional organization is expected at this level.
**Candidate is expected to have peer-reviewed publications at an average rate of at least two publications per four years, during the period under review.
***Candidate is expected to make at least two peer-reviewed presentations at international/national professional conferences per four years, during the period under review.

Superior   To achieve a performance level of **Superior** the candidate must present a sustained record of professional growth in **A3, A4, B1*, B2** AND two other categories from A or B**.

*Candidate is expected to have at least one peer-reviewed publication per four years, during the period under review.
**Candidate is expected to make at least two peer reviewed presentations per four years, during the period under review.

Good   To achieve a performance level of Good the candidate must present a sustained record of professional growth in **A3, A4, B1*, B2** AND one other category from A or B.**

*Candidate is expected to have at least one publication per four years during the period under review
**Candidate is expected to make at least one peer reviewed presentation per four years, during the period under review.

EVIDENCE OF SERVICE TO THE UNIVERSITY

A. University Service

1. Membership on departmental committees. (Indicate whether chairperson or member; give years and extent of activity.)

2. Membership on college-level committees. (Indicate whether chairperson or member; give years and extent of activity.)

3. Membership on university-level committees. (Indicate whether chairperson or member; give years and extent of activity.)

4. Non-teaching duties and/or related departmental responsibilities. (such as recruitment, faculty mentorship) Indicate if released time or other compensations were granted.

5. Supervision of Graduate Students for such activities as graduate papers, comprehensive exams and action research projects.

6. Academic Advising, undergraduate and graduate students

7. Sponsorship of campus organizations or groups. (Departmental, college or university wide.)

8. Professional contributions to student or faculty groups/classes.

9. Other evidence.

B. Community Service

1. Professionally related contributions to off-campus groups not affiliated with schools. (leadership, presentations, demonstrations, etc.; give places, subjects, dates.)

2. Services to P - 12 schools. (Ex: evaluation committees, consultancies, professional development, volunteer work, contest judging, lectures, etc.)

3. Other professionally related activities. (e.g. Advocacy)

Performance Levels - Service to the University

Outstanding	To achieve a performance level of **Outstanding,** the candidate must present a sustained record of service documented in **A1; A2 OR A3; B1 OR B2; and two additional categories from A or B**. Committee leadership in A 1, A2, OR A3 is expected.
Superior	To achieve a performance level of Superior, the candidate must present a sustained record of service documented in **A 1; A2 OR A3; B1 OR B2**; and **one additional category from A or B**.
Good	To achieve a performance level of **Good**, the candidate must present a sustained record of service documented in **A1; B1 OR B2**, **and one additional category from A or B**.