

# Department of Teacher Education Bylaws

Approved: 2-26-03

## SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

The faculty of the Department of Teacher Education (TED), in the College of Education and Human Services (CEHS) at Wright State University (WSU), 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 for the participation of Bargaining Unit Faculty in departmental governance. These bylaws:

- Establish procedures by which TED Bargaining Unit Faculty give advice and make recommendations regarding matters affecting the department.
- Establish criteria and procedures for annual evaluation of TED Bargaining Unit Faculty.
- Establish criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure of TED Bargaining Unit 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. **Full-time Faculty.** The Department of Teacher Education will include full-time faculty at some or all of the following ranks: Instructor, Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor.
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.
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.

### 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. Bargaining Unit Faculty participation in governance consists of giving advice, making recommendations, and contributing to the establishment of bylaws.

1. **Voting Membership.** The voting membership of the department is comprised of all full-time faculty in the department, to include faculty with joint appointments with the majority of the appointment being in TED. Part-time faculty and emeritus/a faculty are not voting members of the department.
2. **Bylaws Amendments.** A majority vote of Bargaining Unit Faculty in the department, along with approval of the Dean and the Faculty Governance Committee, is needed to amend these bylaws.
3. **Department Meetings.** A Faculty Representative will be elected annually by and from among the Bargaining Unit Faculty to consult with the Department Chair in determining department meeting schedule, setting meeting agendas, naming committees, and such other procedures as may be needed

for faculty participation in governance. The election of the Faculty Representative will normally take place at the last department meeting of the academic year for the upcoming academic year.

4. **Department Committees.** Department committees are standing committees with membership as described below. Standing committees and the Department Chair may form ad hoc subcommittees.

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

Membership:

- The committee will consist of all tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty in the department.
- A committee chair will be elected by department Bargaining Unit Faculty at the last department meeting of the academic year for the upcoming academic year.

Duties:

- Provide recommendations regarding all Bargaining Unit Faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure.
- Provide each untenured Bargaining Unit Faculty member with an annual statement summarizing the individual's cumulative progress toward obtaining tenure.
- Provide each tenured Bargaining Unit Assistant and Associate Professor with an annual statement summarizing the individual member's progress toward promotion to the next rank, unless the individual requests in writing to be evaluated every three years.

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

Membership:

- The committee will consist of all tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty of the department.
- A committee chair will be elected by department Bargaining Unit Faculty at the last department meeting of the academic year for the upcoming academic year.
- Although the membership is the same as that of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the function is different. The chair of the Professional Development Committee may not also serve as chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Duties:

- Assign a mentor from among tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty to each new tenure-track faculty member. Any time after the first quarter of employment, untenured Bargaining Unit Faculty have the option to retain the assigned mentor throughout the probationary period or identify another mentor from among tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty in the department. The PDC and the Department Chair will be notified of the change.
- Perform annual peer evaluations of teaching of all untenured Bargaining Unit Faculty.
- Recommend, design, and/or deliver professional development opportunities for department faculty according to identified needs.
- Provide recommendations regarding Bargaining Unit Faculty requests for Professional Development Leave.

c. **Curriculum Committee**

Membership:

- The committee will consist of the program advisors for each program area.
- A committee chair will be elected from among program advisors by department Bargaining Unit Faculty at the last department meeting of the academic year for the upcoming academic year.

Duties:

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

### **SECTION III. PROCEDURES FOR BARGAINING UNIT FACULTY 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee will have the opportunity to make recommendations in cases of faculty under consideration for reappointment or for termination due to deficient performance.

#### **B. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND MENTORING OF NEW FACULTY**

The department's Professional Development Committee (PDC) will recommend, design, and/or deliver professional development opportunities for department faculty. The PDC will assign mentors to new faculty.

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

Bargaining Unit Faculty will have the opportunity to provide input to the Department Chair before teaching assignments and class schedules, including summer and overloads, are finalized.

#### **D. GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM AND ACADEMIC STANDARDS**

The Department Curriculum Committee will review and make recommendations to the Department Chair on all curricular and program issues affecting the department.

#### **E. FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN THE REVIEW OF CHAIRS**

All Bargaining Unit Faculty 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.

#### **F. ISSUES AFFECTING THE DEPARTMENT**

Issues affecting the department will be presented to the faculty at regularly scheduled department meetings for discussion and recommendations from the faculty.

## **SECTION IV. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS OF BARGAINING UNIT FACULTY**

The annual review process consists of the following components: the Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching (APET), the Annual Review of Accomplishments (ARA), the Annual Chair Evaluation (ACE), and the P&T Committee's Annual Review.

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

The peer evaluation of teaching will be conducted annually for each untenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Member by a tenured Bargaining Unit Faculty Member in the Department selected by the PDC. The intent of the annual peer evaluation of teaching (APET) in the Teacher Education Department is to improve instruction throughout the department. The peer evaluation is intended to be collaborative and to emphasize formative growth. The process for peer evaluation, therefore, is not antithetical but actually complementary to the process of mentoring. The APET will be part of an ongoing, formative mentoring process.

The individual being evaluated will be consulted prior to development of a plan for peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness each year, which may or may not include a classroom visitation, but is derived from the criteria for the evaluation of teaching delineated in the Department Bylaws, Section V. The annual peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be completed before the end of each calendar year and will focus on the untenured faculty member's strengths and/or areas needing improvement. As described in the Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching form (attached as Appendix A), documentation of the APET will be submitted to the individual, the Department Chair, and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. It will be reflected in the Chair's annual evaluation and the Promotion and Tenure Committee's annual statement summarizing the individual's cumulative progress toward obtaining tenure.

### **B. ANNUAL REVIEW OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

At the end of each calendar year, the faculty member will prepare a written document, entitled the Annual Review of Accomplishments (ARA), which describes the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service activities during the preceding calendar year. In addition, a faculty member is encouraged to submit a statement describing his/her scholarly agenda and publication plans, as a way of placing in context the performance for a given year. The faculty member will give a copy of the ARA, along with a current vita, to the Department Chair and the Department P&T Committee by January 31. In addition to the ARA and a current vita, Bargaining Unit Faculty may submit whatever material will provide evidence of successful teaching, scholarship, and/or service.

### **C. ANNUAL CHAIR EVALUATION OF BARGAINING UNIT FACULTY**

After reviewing each faculty member's ARA, the Department Chair will prepare a written Annual Chair Evaluation (ACE) document that evaluates each faculty member's professional activity in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service and assigns an integer to each area, based on the criteria as delineated in Section V. Included in the Chair's annual evaluation of each untenured Bargaining Unit Faculty member will be a statement reflecting peer evaluation of the individual's teaching effectiveness. The Annual Chair Evaluation will be completed and discussed with each faculty member not later than March 31.

Each faculty member will review the integers assigned for his or her annual evaluation and the reasons given for the assignment. If the faculty member agrees with the evaluation, he/she will sign a copy of the evaluation

and return it to the Department Chair. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he/she will sign on a second line, indicating that he/she has received his/her evaluation and that a written rebuttal may be forthcoming. This rebuttal is to be submitted to the Department Chair, attached to the original evaluation, and forwarded as provided for in the contract.

After the chair has completed the annual evaluation and assigned an integer from 0 to 4 for each individual's teaching, scholarship, and service, percentages will be assigned by an algorithm that gives each individual the maximum possible overall average within the following ranges:

Teaching: 40% - 60%

Scholarship: 20% - 40%

Service: 20% - 40%

This system will apply to all Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in the department unless the chair assigns a different weighting to allow for unique work assignments that differ from those of other Bargaining Unit Faculty Members, discipline pursuant to Article 14 of the CBA, or correction of a pattern of substandard performance extending more than one year.

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

After reviewing each untenured faculty member's ARA and APET, and independent of the Chair's annual evaluation, the Department P&T Committee will provide him/her with a statement summarizing his/her cumulative progress toward obtaining promotion and/or tenure by March 31. The Department P&T Committee will also provide each tenured Assistant and tenured Associate Professor with an annual statement summarizing the individual Member's progress toward promotion to the next rank, unless the individual requests that the evaluation be conducted once every three years. In addition to the ARA and a current vita, Bargaining Unit Faculty may submit whatever material will provide evidence of successful teaching, scholarship, and/or service.

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

The Department Chair will evaluate each Bargaining Unit Faculty Member in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service annually according to the following criteria.

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

Teaching takes many forms, including lectures, seminar discussions, individual tutorial sessions, field supervision, and other types of instruction. In addition, teaching involves designing, organizing, and refining courses; monitoring and evaluating student performance; guiding and advising students in the educational process; and continuous professional development. Hence, categories for the evaluation of teaching quality and effectiveness include:

- Impact of teaching on developing professionals.
- Impact of teaching on P-12 student learning.
- Relationship of teaching to CEHS conceptual framework.
- Engagement in student-related professional responsibilities.
- Engagement in course-related professional responsibilities.

##### **1. Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching**

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

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

- Teach assigned course load satisfactorily.
- Meet all classes on a regular basis.
- Prepare and distribute syllabi which meet the requirements of the standard college syllabi.
- Incorporate strands of the CEHS conceptual framework (content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, professionalism, diversity, technology, emotional intelligence) in course design as reflected in syllabus and in class.
- Maintain at least six office hours per week and fulfill advising responsibilities.
- Provide regular and timely feedback to students.
- Conduct student evaluations of instruction as required by contract.
- Participate in peer evaluation as appropriate.

To receive a score of 2 (Meritorious) in teaching, a faculty member, in addition to satisfying criteria in the “Adequate” category, must consistently:

- Demonstrate teaching effectiveness.
- Revise syllabi to reflect changes in content and or process.
- Serve as an advisor and/or mentor to students.
- Participate in professional development opportunities.

To receive a score of 3 (Outstanding) in teaching, a faculty member, in addition to satisfying criteria in the “Meritorious” category, must consistently:

- Demonstrate exceptional teaching effectiveness to include documentation of positive impact on developing professionals and/or P-12 student learning.
- Participate in program review and development.
- Demonstrate involvement in public schools or similar agencies in line with CEHS mission.

To receive a score of 4 (Extraordinary) in teaching, a faculty member, in addition to satisfying criteria in the “Outstanding” category, must achieve at least two of the following:

- Receive formal recognition of expertise in teaching from outside the department.
- Lead program review and development.
- Demonstrate leadership in public schools or similar agencies in line with CEHS mission.
- Be readily available to students at times over and above posted office hours for discussion, advising, mentoring, etc.

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

Acceptable evidence includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- a. Impact of Teaching on Developing Professionals
  - Peer evaluations
  - Student evaluations
  - Unsolicited testimonials

- Sample artifacts/demonstrations of student learning as related to course objectives
- b. Impact of Teaching on P-12 Student Learning
- Sample artifacts/demonstrations of P-12 student learning
  - Clinical faculty/cooperating teachers' evaluation
- c. Relationship of Teaching to CEHS Conceptual Framework
- Syllabi and course materials
  - Sample artifacts/demonstrations of student learning
  - Engagement in Student-Related Professional Responsibilities
  - Documents reflecting
  - Advising
  - Maintaining office hours
  - Supervision of student research
  - Engagement in Course-Related Professional Responsibilities
  - Documents reflecting
  - Attendance at professional development opportunities
  - Course and program development
  - Effective use of technology and multi-media

## **B. EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP**

TED honors the full scope of quality and excellence in academic work. Scholarship for annual evaluations is considered using Boyer's four categories: Scholarship of Teaching, Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, and Scholarship of Application. While not required to engage in all four categories of scholarship, each faculty member should engage in scholarship that is shared with the wider academic community and provide evidence of scholarly activities in the Annual Review of Accomplishments.

### **1. Definition of Scholarship**

#### **a. Scholarship of Teaching**

Scholarship of teaching involves an examination of teaching. It requires faculty members to be widely read and intellectually engaged in their fields of expertise. Projects in this area may include but are not limited to designing and leading faculty development workshops; coordinating mentoring activities; engaging in reflective examination of teaching effectiveness; carrying out programmatic curricular revision; developing effective teaching methods, laboratory experiments, or other pedagogical innovations. Scholarly activity should reach a level of excellence sufficient to develop materials that are disseminated through publications, reports, colloquia, conference presentations, or other normally accepted venues for such presentations.

#### **b. Scholarship of Discovery**

Scholarship of discovery adds to the body of human knowledge. Projects in this area may include but are not limited to generating original research; exploring new ideas; expanding the boundaries of current knowledge. Scholarly activity should reach a level of excellence sufficient to develop materials that are submitted for presentation and peer reviewed publication.

c. **Scholarship of Integration**

Scholarship of integration interprets and connects existing ideas within and/or across disciplines, and provides new insight and understandings on original research. Projects in this area should reach a level of excellence sufficient to develop materials that are selected for dissemination through publications, reports, colloquia, conference presentations, or other normally accepted venues for such presentations.

d. **Scholarship of Application**

Scholarship of application presents new, useful, and meaningful ways to apply knowledge and involves the application of knowledge to issues of contemporary social concern. Projects in this area should reach a level of excellence sufficient to develop materials that are selected for dissemination through publications, reports, colloquia, conference presentations, or other normally accepted venues for such presentations.

2. **Criteria for the Evaluation of Scholarship**

In evaluating scholarship, the Chair should not only assess publications, but also the time and effort of preparation. 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 faculty member who does not satisfy the requirements for an adequate evaluation.

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

- Pursue a clearly defined scholarly agenda and present a clear blueprint or outline for publication and/or communication of scholarship.
- Attend at least one professional conference.

To receive a score of 2 (Meritorious) in scholarship, in addition to satisfying criteria in the “Adequate” category, a faculty member must accomplish at least one of the following:

- Present scholarship at two or more professional conferences, one of which is at the national level.
- Submit a proposal for an external grant.
- Submit a scholarly article to an external refereed publication.
- Publish a scholarly article in an internal refereed publication.
- Have internal grant funding of at least \$5,000 total costs.
- Provide other comparable examples of scholarly activity (e.g., have published more than one external refereed scholarly article in the previous year).

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

- Have a scholarly article published (or accepted for publication) in an external refereed publication.
- Have external grant funding of at least \$25,000 total costs.
- Have a refereed book chapter published (or accepted for publication).
- Submit a scholarly book manuscript for consideration at a scholarly press.



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

- Publish a scholarly article in an external refereed journal.
- Publish or have in press a scholarly book.
- Have external grant funding of at least \$75,000 total costs.

3. **Evidence for the Evaluation of Scholarship**

Evidence for the annual evaluation of scholarship may include documentation of any combination of scholarship activities and should be reflective of one or more of the four categories of scholarship designated above: Scholarship of Teaching, Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, and Scholarship of Application.

Citations of scholarship activities should follow APA guidelines. Examples of acceptable scholarship activities include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. **Published Scholarship**

Publications that have been accepted for publication are equivalent to publications that are already in print and should be listed as “in press.” “In Press” is defined as documents that were accepted for publication and are in queue for printing. Citations of articles and papers should indicate whether the work was an external refereed publication (ER), an internal refereed publication (IR), not refereed (N), or invited (I).

- Books
- Refereed journal articles
- Chapters in books
- Papers published in full in official proceedings
- Research monographs
- Other journal articles
- Book reviews
- Technical reports
- Other published work (e.g., ERIC documents, software)

b. **Unpublished Papers and Professional Presentations**

- Presentations at national or international meetings/conferences that were accepted for the program via a peer review process
- Presentations at local or state meetings that were accepted for the program via a peer review process
- Invited symposium papers
- Invited keynote addresses
- Invited presentations at external institutions, corporations, federal agencies

c. **Scholarship under Review**

- Journal articles
- Book manuscripts
- Book chapters
- Other manuscripts

d. **Grants**

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

e. **Other Scholarly Activities**

- Referee or editor of a book or journal
- Reviewer of a textbook or curriculum
- Original Research (e.g., works in progress)
- Publication of curriculum materials
- Development of archival materials (e.g., film, bibliographies, databases, and newsletters)
- Video productions

**C. EVALUATION OF SERVICE**

Faculty service should contribute to the overall mission of the department. Service to community schools as well as service to Wright State University, the College of Education and Human Services, the Teacher Education Department, and local, state, and national organizations is expected from each faculty member within the Teacher Education Department.

**1. Criteria for the Evaluation of Service**

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

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

- Attend department and college meetings.
- Respond to requests for activity reports, workload plans, etc.
- Serve on at least one departmental committee.
- Perform some community or professional service.

To receive a score of 2 (Meritorious) in service, a faculty member, in addition to satisfying criteria in the “Adequate” category, must accomplish two or more of the following:

- Serve on an additional departmental and/or college committee.
- Take an active role with P-12 school/facility.
- Serve as a mentor for the purposes of peer evaluation of teaching.
- Take an active role in community or professional service.

To receive a score of 3 (Outstanding) in service, a faculty member, in addition to satisfying criteria in the “Meritorious” category, must accomplish two or more of the following:

- Take a leadership role in P-12 schools/facilities.
- Take a leadership role in department governance and academic life; for example, directing a departmental program, leading a search, chairing a committee, or participating proactively on ad hoc committees.
- Take a leadership role in college governance and academic life.
- Take a leadership role in university governance and academic life.
- Take a leadership role in a state professional organization.
- Take a leadership role in a national professional organization
- Take a leadership role in a professional function in central capacity in the publication of a professional journal, or the equivalent.
- Serve on dissertation/thesis committee, or the equivalent.

- Take a leadership role in service related to professional expertise.
- Take a leadership role in some aspect of student life.
- Consult and/or provide expert testimony in field of expertise
- Develop and present of workshops, seminars, or clinical programs
- Deliver presentations in WSU departments outside TED or CEHS
- Produce international or national documents or reports (e.g., NCATE reports)
- Produce state or local documents or reports (e.g., ODE or task force reports)

To receive a score of 4 (extraordinary) in service, a faculty member, in addition to satisfying criteria in the “Meritorious” category, must accomplish four or more of the criteria listed in the “Outstanding” category or the equivalent.

## 2. Evidence for the Evaluation of Service

Acceptable evidence includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Description or documentation of level and/or quality of contribution to, or role in, all service activities performed during the year.
- Testimonial letters, memos, or certificates acknowledging service activity.
- Any other materials that support service activities.

Note: The faculty member must build a case for the quality of service performed. Taking an “active” or “leadership” role in a service activity implies an acceptable level of quality.

## **SECTION VI. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE**

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 RECOMMENDING PROMOTION AND TENURE**

The process for recommending promotion and/or tenure for a Bargaining Unit Faculty Member may be initiated at the departmental level by the Bargaining Unit Faculty Member. The Member must submit a written request for consideration for promotion and/or tenure to the Department Chair, with a copy to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean by May 15 of the calendar year in which the candidate will begin the P&T process. The candidate must then submit a complete promotion and tenure document to the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee by the deadline established by the Department P&T Committee.

The candidate and the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall agree on a list of individuals from whom letters of evaluation will be solicited, and the Committee is responsible for soliciting the evaluations from that list. At least three letters of evaluation from peers external to the University are required for all promotion and/or tenure decisions. All letters from external reviewers shall be included in the file. The external evaluators should be experts in the field of the candidate, must be faculty members at academic institutions, and hold at least the rank to which the candidate aspires. These letters should evaluate the candidate’s scholarly and service activities. They should not be testimonial in character, and they should not relate to promotion and tenure at the writer’s institutions. The letters used to solicit the letters and the criteria used to evaluate the candidate must be included in the file.

Upon request, the candidate will be granted an opportunity to appear before the committee to present his/her promotion and tenure 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 his/her promotion and tenure document. The P&T Committee will set the parameters for these opportunities.

## **B. PROMOTION AND TENURE DOCUMENT**

The candidate's promotion and tenure document shall contain all items required by the collective bargaining agreement.

## **C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE**

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to demonstrate productivity in teaching, scholarship, and service. Evidence of scholarship activities may fall into any of the scholarship areas identified and defined in Section V: Scholarship of Teaching, Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Integration, and Scholarship of Application.

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. A record of ongoing scholarship at Wright State must be demonstrated.

In support of scholarship, the faculty member must submit the following:

- For all published works: a copy of the publication.
  - For all works listed as accepted but not yet published: a copy of the official letter from the publisher and/or editor along with a printed copy of the accepted manuscript or galley proofs of the printed publication.
  - For all unpublished papers: a printed copy of the manuscript.
  - For all conference papers: a printed copy of the manuscript.
  - For all grants funded or pending: a copy of the grant proposal and grant funding notice.
1. **Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure**

There is no minimum time in rank requirement for promotion and tenure. However, an Assistant Professor must meet the following criteria.

- a. **Teaching.** Candidates should have compiled a record of effective teaching and advising at Wright State University. A statistical summary and frequency distributions of all student evaluations of teaching are required as evidence of teaching effectiveness and are to be included in the promotion and tenure document. Additional selected evidence that includes but is not limited to peer evaluations of teaching, should demonstrate that the faculty member is consistently effective in the classroom.
- b. **Scholarship.** Candidates must show that they have pursued a successful program of continuous and ongoing scholarship at Wright State University. In addition, success in scholarship sufficient for promotion and tenure will include a minimum of five (5) external refereed journal articles, two of which may have equivalent substitutions. An equivalent substitution may be (but is not limited to) a book, an edited volume, a book chapter, a monograph, or a funded external grant totaling at least \$50,000. Letters from external reviewers will be used to affirm the quality of a candidate's scholarship.

- c. **Service.** Probationary faculty are expected to participate in and render departmental, college, and/or university service and perform some external professional service. The candidate must demonstrate that he/she has been a contributing participant on committees and in activities necessary for the proper functioning of the Department and the College. Candidates will list service accomplishments on the curriculum vita included in the promotion and tenure document. Candidates must also include evidence of effective service performance (e.g., any testimonials, solicited or unsolicited) as part of an appendix to the promotion and tenure document.

## 2. **Application for Tenure in Rank**

To be eligible for tenure, a faculty member already 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 Full Professor requires productivity beyond that required for promotion to Associate Professor and demonstration of excellence in all three areas of faculty activity. The candidate's entire work will be evaluated and should demonstrate a reputation for excellence at a regional/national level.

- a. **Teaching.** A high level of teaching effectiveness must be demonstrated using multiple measures; e.g., student evaluations, peer evaluations, syllabi, course materials, use of technology, letters, and samples of student work. Full professors should not only be excellent teachers, but should also be role models for others in the department.
- b. **Scholarship.** The candidate must have a minimum of seven (7) external refereed journal articles beyond those required for promotion to Associate Professor rank, three of which may have equivalent substitutions. An equivalent substitution may be (but is not limited to) a book, an edited volume, a book chapter, a monograph, or a funded external grant totaling at least \$50,000. Letters from external reviewers will be used to affirm the quality of a candidate's scholarship demonstrating a reputation at the regional and national level.
- c. **Service.** The candidate must provide significant evidence to document active participation and effective leadership performance in Department, College, and/or University service, as well as in external service to the profession and/or the community.

## **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 attached narrative addressing each of the evaluation categories listed below. The Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching will reflect teaching criteria established in the TED Bylaws. The Department Chair's annual evaluation of untenured faculty will reflect the Annual Peer Evaluation of Teaching.

**Instructions:** The peer evaluator will write a narrative addressing each of the evaluation categories listed below. The peer evaluator and the untenured faculty member will discuss the evaluation narrative. The untenured 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 untenured faculty member. Signature indicates completion of the process, not necessarily agreement. The untenured faculty member who disagrees may submit a written rebuttal that will be attached to the APET document.

**Evaluation Categories:**

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

\_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

Untenured Faculty Member Signature / Date

\_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Evaluator Signature / Date