

Approved Feb. 25, 2003  
Amended: Nov. 04, 2022

## Department of Teacher Education Bylaws

### SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

The faculty of the Department of Teacher Education (TED) seeks to promote and sustain successful performance in teaching, scholarship, and service, and to participate fully in the governance of the department, college, and university. The bylaws herein specify procedures to:

- Stipulate the participation of Bargaining Unit Faculty Members (BUFMs) in departmental governance.
- Establish procedures by which BUFMs give advice and make recommendations regarding matters affecting the department.
- Establish criteria and procedures for annual evaluation of Tenure and Tenure Eligible (TET) TED faculty. Note: Non-Tenure Eligible (NTE) faculty annual evaluation and promotion criteria and procedures are addressed in the CBA.
- Establish criteria and procedures for promotion and/or tenure of TED TET faculty.
- Establish procedures for departmental meetings and committees. Are consistent with the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between the American Association of University Professors—Wright State University Chapter (AAUP/WSU) and Wright State University.
- Are subject to and consistent with the bylaws of the college.

### SECTION II. FACULTY GOVERNANCE

#### A. DEPARTMENT MEMBERSHIP

1. **Bargaining Unit Faculty.** The voting members of the faculty include all TET and NTE BUFMs, including those with joint appointments with the majority of the appointment being in TED. Subsequent references to “faculty members” or “the department faculty” refer to the BUFMs in the department.
2. **Part-time Faculty.** The Department of Teacher Education will include part-time faculty as adjunct faculty and clinical faculty. Adjunct faculty and clinical faculty are invited to attend all official department functions and open meetings but have no vote.
3. **Emeritus/a Faculty.** Retired faculty from TED may apply for emeritus/a status. Emeritus/a faculty may attend all official department functions and open meetings but have no vote.
4. **The Department Chair.** The Chair participates in faculty governance as described in these bylaws but has no vote.

#### B. FACULTY GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Faculty are uniquely qualified to participate in the governance of the department, particularly with respect to academic matters. It is also recognized that faculty members can provide valuable

contributions to all levels of the department administration. BUFMs' participation in governance consists of making recommendations and contributing to the establishment of the bylaws.

1. **Bylaws Amendments.** These bylaws may be amended as set forth in the TET and NTE Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs).
2. **Department Meetings.** The Department Chair is responsible for determining department meeting schedules, setting meeting agendas, creating ad hoc committees, and other such procedures as needed for faculty participation in governance. However, BUFMs may request a department meeting, add items to the agenda, request to establish a new committee, or engage in other actions to meet departmental needs. Generally, BUFMS are encouraged to consult with the department chair regarding faculty concerns and recommendations.
3. **Department Committees.** Department committees are standing committees with membership as described below. Standing committees and the Department Chair may form ad hoc subcommittees.
4. **Mentors.** Mentors for the new NTE faculty will be identified by the Department Chair with input from program directors. Mentors for untenured faculty will be identified by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

## 5. Committees.

### a. Promotion and Tenure (P & T) Committee

Membership:

- i. The committee will consist of all tenured faculty in the department; the Chair of the department is an ex-officio member of the P & T Committee and attends meetings as a non-voting member.
- ii. A committee chair for the upcoming academic year will be elected by department TET faculty at the last department meeting of the academic year; the election will be conducted by the TED representative to the committee that conducts elections.

Duties:

- i. Initiate and complete the required process for all TETs seeking promotion and tenure as outlined by the CBA.
- ii. Provide each tenure-eligible faculty member with an annual statement summarizing the individual's cumulative progress toward obtaining tenure.
- iii. Provide, upon written request to the P & T Chair by the deadline specified in the CBA, a tenured faculty with a statement summarizing the individual member's progress towards promotion to the next rank.
- iv. Assign a mentor from among tenured faculty to each new tenure-eligible faculty member. Any time after the first semester of employment, tenure-eligible faculty have the option to retain the assigned mentor throughout the probationary period or identify another mentor from among tenured faculty in the department. The P & T Chair and the Department Chair will be notified of the change.

- v. Perform Annual Peer Evaluations of Teaching (APET)s of tenure-eligible faculty, and peer evaluations of teaching of other TET faculty upon request (see IV A 2).

**b. Professional Development (PD) Committee**

Membership:

- i. The committee will consist of a number of elected members that consists of at least half of the department's BUFMs; the election will be conducted by the TED representative to the college committee that conducts elections.
- ii. A committee chair will be elected by members of the committee at the first PD Committee meeting of the academic year. The chair from the previous year will call the meeting.

Duties:

- i. Recommend, design, and/or deliver professional development opportunities for the department faculty according to identified needs.
- ii. While all faculty are encouraged to seek out PD specific to their individual needs and interests, the department PD committee exists to create collegial opportunities developed collaboratively.

**c. Curriculum Committee**

Membership:

- i. The committee will consist of the program director(s) for each program area; in the event of a vote, each program will have one vote.
- ii. A committee chair will be elected from among program directors by department BUFMs at the last department meeting of the academic year for the upcoming academic year; the election will be conducted by the TED representative to the college committee that conducts elections.

Duties:

- i. Review and make recommendations on proposals for new department courses and programs.
- ii. Review and recommend modifications to existing department courses and programs.
- iii. Make recommendations on specific curricular and program issues affecting the department.

**d. All other College Committees**

Membership:

- i. The membership of college committees is dictated by the college bylaws and the CHEH Steering Committee. Committee members may be installed in accordance with the College bylaws. Departmental representatives to college committees will be elected in the final departmental meeting of each academic year.

**SECTION III. PROCEDURES FOR BUFMs' ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS**  
**A. FACULTY APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND DISMISSAL**

- 1. **Faculty Appointment.** A minimum of two bargaining unit faculty in the department will serve on search committees for new faculty positions within the department. Whenever

possible, at least one will be in the same academic area as the posted position. Recommendations for appointment of new faculty will be forwarded to the Dean.

2. **Faculty Reappointment and Dismissal.** The P & T Committee will have the opportunity to make recommendations to the Department Chair in cases of TET faculty under consideration for reappointment or for termination due to deficient performance.

## **B. TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS AND CLASS SCHEDULES, INCLUDING SUMMER AND OVERLOADS**

Faculty will have the opportunity to provide input to the Department Chair before teaching assignments and class schedules, including summer and overloads, are finalized consistent with the CBA. Summer teaching assignments will be determined in a manner consistent with the language of the CBA.

## **C. FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN THE REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS**

All BUFMs in the department will have the opportunity to comment on and make recommendations to the Dean on the review of, or the appointment of, a Department Chair.

## **SECTION IV. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS OF BUFMs**

For NTE faculty, annual evaluations shall be performed in accordance with the CBA.

The annual review process consists of the following components: the Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching, the Faculty Activity Report, the Annual Chair Evaluation, and an Annual Review by the P & T Committee if requested.

### **A. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING**

1. The peer evaluation of teaching will be conducted annually for each tenure-eligible faculty member by a tenured faculty member in the department and selected by the P & T Committee. The intent of the Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching is to improve instruction. The Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching is intended to be collaborative and to emphasize formative growth.

The individual being evaluated will be consulted prior to the implementation of the Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching. The Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching may include a classroom visitation and is derived from the criteria for the evaluation of teaching as outlined in the CBA, and also from the teaching criteria for P & T specified in these bylaws. The Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching will be completed more than five weeks before the CBA-specified deadline for initiating the P & T process in order for the Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching can inform the annual written statements summarizing cumulative progress toward obtaining tenure from both their Department Chair and P & T Committee. The Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching will focus on the tenure-eligible faculty member's strengths and/or areas needing improvement. The completed Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching form (attached as Appendix A) will be submitted to the untenured faculty member, the Department Chair, and may be requested of the P & T Committee.

2. A peer evaluation of teaching for any tenured BUFM will be performed provided the individual requests it in writing to the Chair of the P & T Committee by the final day of the

fall term. In this case, the evaluation will be completed by the final day of classes of the spring term and will otherwise be conducted as in IV A 1 above.

### **B. FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT**

By the CBA-specified deadline, the TET faculty member will prepare the Faculty Activity Report. The requirements for teaching and service are outlined in the CBA; the requirements for scholarship are stated below. All BUFMs will give a copy of the Faculty Activity Report, along with a current vita, to the Department Chair by the deadline specified in the CBA; all tenure-eligible faculty will also submit these documents to the Chair of the P & T Committee by the CBA-specified deadline. In addition to the Faculty Activity Report and a current vita, BUFMs may submit any material that will provide evidence of successful teaching, scholarship, and/or service.

### **C. ANNUAL CHAIR EVALUATION OF TET BUFMs**

After reviewing each BUFM's Faculty Activity Report, the Department Chair will prepare a written Annual Chair Evaluation document that evaluates each TET's professional activity in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and each NTE's area of teaching and service pursuant to the CBA. The Chair assigns a score in each area based on the teaching and service criteria in the CBA and the scholarship criteria in Section V of the TED bylaws. The weighting in each of these areas is outlined in the CBA. The Annual Chair Evaluation will be completed and discussed with each BUFM in accordance with the CBA. For untenured faculty, this evaluation will be completed one month prior to the University P & T Scheduled Deadline, as specified in the CBA for a candidate to initiate the P & T process.

Each BUFM will review and sign the Chair's evaluation. The BUFM's signature will indicate that the evaluation was received and reviewed; a signature does not indicate the BUFM's agreement with the evaluation. If the BUFM disagrees with the evaluation, that BUFM may submit a rebuttal letter that must comply with the CBA.

### **D. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TET FACULTY BY P & T COMMITTEE**

After reviewing each tenure-eligible faculty member's Faculty Activity Report and Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching, and independent of the Annual Chair Evaluation, the Department P & T Committee will provide the faculty member with a statement summarizing that faculty member's cumulative progress toward obtaining promotion and/or tenure at least one month prior to the deadline outlined in the CBA for initiating the promotion and/or tenure process. Upon request by the CBA-specified deadline, the Department P & T Committee will provide each tenured Assistant or Associate Professor with a statement summarizing the individual's progress toward promotion to the next rank.

## **SECTION V. CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS**

The Department Chair will annually evaluate each TET member in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The Department Chair will annually evaluate each NTE member in the areas of teaching and service. The criteria for the evaluation of teaching and service are outlined in the CBA. The criteria for evaluation of scholarship are outlined below.

### **CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP**

TED honors the full scope of quality and excellence in academic work. Each TET faculty member should engage in scholarship that is shared with the relevant audience and should provide evidence of scholarly activities in the ARA. In addition to the criteria outlined in the CBA, the following criteria outline scholarship requirements.

### **1. Criteria for the Evaluation of TET Faculty Scholarship**

In evaluating scholarship, the Chair should not only assess publications and products but also the time, effort, and process of being engaged in scholarly work. Collaborative scholarship, for example, normally requires as much effort as individual scholarship and should be evaluated accordingly.

A score of 0 (Unsatisfactory) in scholarship will be given to any TET who does not satisfy the requirements for an adequate evaluation.

To receive a score of 1 (Adequate) in scholarship, a faculty member must:

- a. Attend at least one professional conference.
- b. Outline a scholarly agenda for publication and/or sharing of scholarship.

To receive a score of 2 (Meritorious) in scholarship, in addition to satisfying criteria in an “Adequate” score, a TET must accomplish at least two of the following:

- a. Present at a professional conference.
- b. Submit a proposal for an external grant.
- c. Submit and/or publish a scholarly article or book chapter to a peer-reviewed publication.
- d. Obtain grant funding of at least \$5,000 total costs.
- e. Submit a scholarly book manuscript for consideration at a scholarly press. This scholarly book manuscript shall satisfy the equivalent of two scholarly articles.

To receive a score of 3 (Outstanding) in scholarship, in addition to satisfying criteria for a “Meritorious” score, a faculty member must accomplish at least one of the following:

- a. Present at two or more professional conferences, one of which is at the national level.
- b. Have a scholarly article or book chapter published (or accepted for publication) in a peer-reviewed publication.
- c. Provide other comparable examples of scholarly activity wherein teaching, service, and scholarship overlap, such as applied research that benefits practitioners or the community.
- d. Obtain grant funding of at least \$25,000 total costs.
- e. Publish or have in press a scholarly book. This scholarly book shall satisfy the equivalent of at least two scholarly articles.
- f. Submit a scholarly book manuscript for consideration at a scholarly press. This scholarly book manuscript shall satisfy the equivalent of two scholarly articles.

To receive a score of 4 (Extraordinary) in scholarship, in addition to satisfying criteria for an “Outstanding” score, a faculty member must accomplish at least one of the following:

- a. Publish a scholarly peer reviewed article or book chapter.
- b. Provide other comparable examples of scholarly activity, such as applied or public research that benefits practitioners or the community.
- c. Publish or have in press a scholarly book.

- d. Perform extensive service beyond that which is required for an “Outstanding” score and that must be prepared for in a scholarly way such that:(1) any human subjects have been ethically consented, informed of the intention of data collection/analysis, and the audiences to whom their data will be disseminated, (2) analysis utilizes and documents rigorous qualitative, quantitative, or theoretical research methods, and (3) reporting is made public to an audience of peers who are provided opportunities to affirm or discount the quality of the work produced similarly to the outcomes of peer review.
- e. Obtain grant funding of at least \$50,000 total costs.

## **2. Evidence for the Evaluation of Scholarship**

Citations of scholarship activities should follow APA guidelines. Citations of articles and papers should indicate whether the work was a peer-reviewed publication (PR), not refereed (N), or invited (I). Examples of acceptable scholarship activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

### **a. Published Scholarship**

- Books
- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- Chapters in books
- Papers published in full in official proceedings
- Research monographs
- Other journal articles
- Applied or public research that benefits practitioners or the community
- Engagement wherein teaching, service, and scholarship overlap
- Instances in which the candidate has performed extensive service beyond that which is required and that must be prepared for in a scholarly way
- Book reviews
- Technical reports
- Other published work (e.g., ERIC documents, software)

### **b. Professional Presentations**

- Presentations at national or international meetings/conferences
- Presentations at local or state meetings
- Invited symposium papers
- Invited keynote addresses
- Invited presentations at external institutions, corporations, federal agencies

### **c. Scholarship under Review**

- Journal articles
- Book manuscripts
- Book chapters

### **d. Grants**

- External grants funded
- External grants pending
- Internal grants funded
- Internal grants pending

## **SECTION VI. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR P & T for TET BUFMs**

The information in this section describes the departmental process for recommending promotion and tenure, the documentation to be included in the candidate’s promotion and tenure document, and the criteria to be used to evaluate the candidate.

**A. PROCESS FOR PURSUING PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE**

The process for recommending promotion and/or tenure for a TET faculty member is initiated at the departmental level as specified in the CBA. The required steps and timelines are specified in the CBA.

Upon request, the candidate will be granted an opportunity to appear before the P & T Committee to present the P & T Document in person. In addition, the P & T Committee may request that the candidate respond in person to clarify questions that emerge upon examination of the P & T Document. The P & T Committee will set the parameters for these presentations.

**B. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE**

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to demonstrate productivity in teaching, scholarship, and service.

**1. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure**

**a. Teaching.** Candidates should have compiled a record of effective teaching at Wright State University. Teaching completed prior to the candidate’s appointment at Wright State University will be considered on an equal level to teaching done while at this institution, but in no case shall all of the teaching assessed be done prior to arrival at Wright State. Candidates must submit WSU peer evaluation and ARA evidence from WSU to document their teaching effectiveness. The table below outlines the criteria for evaluation of teaching and evidence to be included in the P & T Document and/or File.

Criteria for Evaluation of Effective Teaching	Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meets essential teaching-related behaviors outlined for high merit in the teaching criteria for the annual evaluation in the CBA.</li> <li>• Shows effective instructional and assessment practices.</li> <li>• Has a commitment to continuous improvement in teaching, challenging, and supporting students.</li> <li>• Responds to student needs inside and outside the classroom and builds rapport with students.</li> </ul>	<p>Required Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer evaluations and evidence from the ARA</li> </ul> <p>Other Possible Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correspondence with students</li> <li>• Unsolicited feedback from others</li> <li>• Selected syllabi</li> <li>• Selected assignments</li> <li>• Sample feedback to students</li> <li>• Evidence of facilitating critical thought</li> <li>• Narrative that frames the evidence provided</li> <li>• Student evaluations or other forms of feedback from students</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: Even if other university documents (such as the CBA) may require submission of student evaluations, this department recognizes the subjective nature of student evaluations. Because</i></p>



	<i>research demonstrates that women, instructors of color, and other minoritized individuals systematically receive lower scores on teaching evaluations, even when there are no real differences in instruction or what students have learned, this department does not necessarily use student evaluations as influential evidence of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness.</i>
--	--

**b. Scholarship.** Candidates must show that they have pursued a program of scholarly activity while at Wright State University. Candidates may present accomplishments dating from before their hiring at Wright State University. Scholarly work completed prior to the candidate's appointment at Wright State University will be considered on an equal level to scholarly work done while at this institution, but in no case shall all of the scholarship assessed be done prior to arrival at Wright State. Letters from external reviewers will be used to affirm the quality of a candidate's scholarship and will be added to the file when received. The table below outlines the criteria for evaluation of scholarship and evidence to be included in the P & T Document and/or File.

<b>Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship</b>	<b>Evidence of Scholarship</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has given professional presentations at conferences and/or symposiums at state, national, or international levels.</li> <li>• Has a minimum of five external peer-reviewed journal articles, three of which may have equivalent substitutions. At least one of the five articles or substitutions must be published since hire at Wright State. Substitutions may include but are not limited to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ a book (to be counted as two substitutions),</li> <li>○ an edited volume,</li> <li>○ a book chapter,</li> <li>○ a monograph,</li> <li>○ applied or public research that benefits practitioners or the community,</li> <li>○ a funded external grant totaling at least \$50,000 or a combination of funded external grants totaling at least \$50,000 (grants totaling over \$500,000 shall be counted as two substitutions),</li> <li>○ instances in which the candidate has performed extensive service that must be prepared for in a scholarly way such that:(1) any human subjects have been ethically consented, informed of the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Required Evidence provided by the candidate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A copy of each publication</li> <li>• Official letter and printed copy of accepted manuscripts in press</li> <li>• Evidence of peer-review status for all publications</li> <li>• Grant funding notice and a copy of grant proposal</li> <li>• Evidence from a conference booklet</li> <li>• Conference presentation materials</li> </ul> <p>Other Possible Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitted manuscripts</li> <li>• Conference proposal submissions</li> <li>• Grant proposals under review</li> <li>• Unfunded grant proposals</li> <li>• Narrative that frames the evidence provided, including evidence of peer review or vetting of acceptable substitutions, such as applied scholarship</li> </ul>

<p>intention of data collection/analysis, and the audiences to whom their data will be disseminated, (2) analysis utilizes and documents rigorous qualitative, quantitative, or theoretical research methods, and (3) reporting is made public to an audience of peers who are provided opportunities to affirm or discount the quality of the work produced similarly to the outcomes of peer review.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ or applications of scholarship wherein teaching, service, and scholarship overlap.</li> </ul>	
--	--

**c. Service.** Candidates are expected to engage in a program of routine service as defined by the CBA and must participate in additional service. Service completed prior to the candidate’s appointment at Wright State University will be considered on an equal level to teaching done while at this institution, but in no case shall all of the service assessed be done prior to arrival at Wright State. Candidates must submit engage in documented service to WSU. The table below outlines the additional criteria for evaluation of service and evidence to be included in the P & T Document and/or File.

<b>Criteria for Evaluation of Service</b>	<b>Possible Evidence of Service</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Productively serve on an average of two active department-, college-, or university-level committees per year.</li> <li>• Provide other service to the university community.</li> <li>• Engage in service that uses one’s professional expertise.</li> <li>• Actively participate in a professional organization.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letters from committee chairs or members</li> <li>• Meeting minutes</li> <li>• Other forms of communication with others providing or receiving service</li> <li>• Contracts for service</li> <li>• Narrative that frames the evidence provided</li> </ul>

**2. Application for Tenure in Rank**

To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member at the Associate Professor or Professor rank must demonstrate the level of accomplishments defined for promotion to those respective ranks.

**3. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor**

Promotion to Professor requires productivity beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor and requires the demonstration of a reputation of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service.

**a. Teaching.** Since being promoted to Associate Professor, candidates for Professor should have continued to develop a record of effective teaching at Wright State University. Candidates must also support other faculty members’ pursuit of excellence in teaching. The table below outlines the criteria for evaluation of teaching and evidence to be included in the Promotion Document and/or File.

<b>Criteria for Evaluation of Effective Teaching</b>	<b>Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meets essential teaching-related behaviors outlined for high merit in the teaching criteria for the annual evaluation in the CBA.</li> <li>• Shows effective instructional and assessment practices.</li> <li>• Has a commitment to continuous improvement in teaching, challenging, and supporting students.</li> <li>• Responds to student needs inside and outside the classroom and builds rapport with students.</li> <li>• Provides instructional support for other faculty in the department, college, university, and/or the profession.</li> </ul>	<p>Required Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer evaluations and/or evidence from the ARA</li> </ul> <p>Other Possible Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correspondence with students</li> <li>• Unsolicited feedback from others</li> <li>• Selected syllabi</li> <li>• Selected assignments</li> <li>• Sample feedback to students</li> <li>• Evidence of facilitating critical thought</li> <li>• Narrative that frames the evidence provided</li> <li>• Student evaluations or other forms of feedback from students</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: Even if other university documents (such as the CBA) may require submission of student evaluations, this department recognizes the subjective nature of student evaluations. Because research demonstrates that women, instructors of color, and other minoritized individuals systematically receive lower scores on teaching evaluations, even when there are no real differences in instruction or what students have learned, this department does not necessarily use student evaluations as influential evidence of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness.</i></p>

**b. Scholarship.** Candidates must show that they have pursued a program of scholarly activity at Wright State University since being promoted to Associate Professor. Letters from external reviewers will be used to affirm the quality of a candidate's scholarship and will be added to the file when received. The table below outlines the criteria for evaluation of scholarship and evidence to be included in the Promotion Document and/or File.

<b>Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship</b>	<b>Evidence of Scholarship</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has given professional presentations at conferences and/or symposiums at national or international levels.</li> <li>• Has a minimum of seven peer-reviewed publications beyond the five required for promotion to Associate Professor.</li> <li>• Has lead or sole authorship of two of the seven publications.</li> </ul>	<p>Required Evidence provided by the candidate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A copy of each publication</li> <li>• Official letter and printed copy of accepted manuscripts in press</li> <li>• Evidence of peer review status for all publications</li> <li>• Grant funding notice and a copy of grant proposal</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four of the seven publications may be appropriate substitutions. Substitutions may include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ a book (to be counted as two substitutions),</li> <li>○ an edited volume,</li> <li>○ a book chapter,</li> <li>○ a monograph,</li> <li>○ applied or public research that benefits practitioners or the community,</li> <li>○ a funded external grant totaling at least \$50,000 or a combination of funded external grants totaling at least \$50,000 (grants totaling over \$500,000 shall be counted as two substitutions),</li> <li>○ or instances in which the candidate has performed extensive service beyond that which is required for promotion and that must be prepared for in a scholarly way such that:(1) any human subjects have been ethically consented, informed of the intention of data collection/analysis, and the audiences to whom their data will be disseminated, (2) analysis utilizes and documents rigorous qualitative, quantitative, or theoretical research methods, and (3) reporting is made public to an audience of peers who are provided opportunities to affirm or discount the quality of the work produced similarly to the outcomes of peer review.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence from conference booklet</li> <li>• Conference presentation materials</li> </ul> <p>Other Possible Evidence provided by the candidate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitted manuscripts</li> <li>• Conference proposal submissions or presentation materials</li> <li>• Grant proposals under review</li> <li>• Unfunded grant proposals</li> <li>• Narrative that frames the evidence provided, including evidence of peer review or vetting of acceptable substitutions such as applied scholar</li> </ul>
--	---

**c. Service.** Candidates for Professor are expected to engage in a program of routine and expected service as defined by the CBA and must participate in additional service since promotion to Associate Professor. The table below outlines the additional criteria for evaluation of service and evidence to be included in the Promotion Document and/or File.

<b>Criteria for Evaluation of Service</b>	<b>Possible Evidence of Service</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Productively serve on multiple active and productive department-, college-, or university-level committees since promotion to Associate Professor, at least one of which being at the college or university level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letters from committee chairs or members</li> <li>• Meeting minutes</li> <li>• Other forms of communication with others providing or receiving service</li> <li>• Contracts for service</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Productively serve at least three times as a committee chair for an active committee at the department, college, or university level.</li><li>• Provide mentorship to other faculty.</li><li>• Take an active leadership role in other work within the department, college, university, or the community.</li><li>• Engage in service that uses one's professional expertise.</li><li>• Take a leadership role in professional organizations.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Narrative that frames the evidence provided</li><li>• Other evidence that reflects a program of service</li></ul>
---	---

## Appendix A

### Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Faculty Member Being Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Year of Evaluation – Beginning: \_\_\_\_\_ Ending: \_\_\_\_\_

In accordance with the Teacher Education Department Bylaws, the Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching should be part of an ongoing, formative mentoring process that takes place during the calendar year from January through December. The Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching document will include this form as a cover page with an attached narrative addressing each of the evaluation categories listed below. The Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching will use the criteria for the evaluation of teaching as outlined in the CBA, and also from the teaching criteria for P & T specified in these bylaws. The Department Chair's annual evaluation of Faculty will take into consideration the Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching, if applicable, when writing annual evaluation of Faculty.

**Instructions:** The peer evaluator will write a narrative addressing each of the evaluation categories listed below. The peer evaluator and the Faculty Member will discuss the evaluation narrative. The Faculty Member and the peer evaluator must sign this form and initial each page of the attached narrative. The peer evaluator will submit copies of this documentation of the Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching to the Department Chair, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the TET Faculty Member whose teaching is being reviewed. A signature indicates completion of the process, not necessarily agreement. The Faculty Member who disagrees may submit a written rebuttal that will be attached to the Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching document.

**Evaluation Categories:**

- i. Faculty Member's Strengths
- ii. Faculty Member's Areas Needing Improvement
- iii. Additional Comments (Optional)

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty Member Signature / Date

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
Peer Evaluator Signature / Date

# BYLAWS APPROVAL FORM

The bylaws for the College/Department of Teacher Education,  
dated 10/25/2022 are approved as follows.

## Bargaining Unit Faculty Approval

The bargaining unit faculty approved the bylaws by a vote of 7 to 0

Romena Holbert  
Bargaining Unit Faculty Representative

April, 20, 2022  
Date Approved

The most recent revisions provided clarification of concepts already discussed by the faculty. The revisions have been sent to the faculty and no member has raised any concerns with the clarifications. In case an additional TET vote was needed, TETs voted again on 10/25/2022. 5 of the 5 TETs voted to approve the bylaws with the new revisions.

## Dean Approval

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean(s)

10/27/22  
Date Signed

## Faculty Governance Committee Approval

DocuSigned by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
6B7687E103A24D2

Co-Chair (AAUP Representative)

11/4/2022

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Signed

DocuSigned by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
F7B81D3E88144E...

Co-Chair (University Representative)

11/4/2022

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Signed