

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL STUDIES TENURE AND  
PROMOTION STANDARDS  
AND  
GUIDELINES FOR DEPARTMENT TENURE AND PROMOTION  
STANDARDS

The faculty of the College of Education and Professional Studies (COEPS) adopts the University Standards as the College Standards. Each of the constituent departments within the COEPS will implement department standards that define the performance measures for these College/University Standards. The departments will be guided in this process by the Constituency Standards Committee (CSC) Guidelines and by CSC oversight.

The *Guidelines* presented here are adapted from the *Guidelines for Department Promotion Standards* developed by the College of Letters and Sciences Constituency Standards Committee and approved by the University Standards Committee in 2007. Both colleges embrace a wide range of disciplines, each with its own methods of inquiry, modes of reporting, and pedagogical traditions, and both colleges require tenure and promotion standards that ensure fairness and consistency across this range of disciplinary practices. The College of Letters and Sciences *Guidelines* meets this requirement by recommending criteria of “best practices” that each department defines in accordance with its methods and conventions. The College of Education and Professional Studies recognizes the soundness of this approach, and acknowledges the efforts of the College of L&S by following the work that they have accomplished. The *Guidelines* presented here are in part taken from the L&S *Guidelines*, but adapted to the specifics of the COEPS. The COEPS Constituency Standards Committee also thinks that the common approach represented in these two sets of *Guidelines* affords fairness and consistency across colleges within the university.

The *Guidelines* contained in this document represent a “best practices” approach as determined by departmental representatives to the COEPS Standards Committee. Departments are urged to adhere as closely as possible to the recommendations. In the event that a department chooses to vary significantly from these guidelines, a detailed side-note explaining the rationale for this variance should be included. For guidance the departments may also refer to the UW-Whitewater Faculty Personnel Rules III C. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

**Procedure:**

1. All COEPS departments receive a copy of the *Guidelines for Departmental Promotions Standards*
2. In accordance with the *University Standards, the Standard Classification of Performance Data\** and with this document as guidance, each department designs and drafts a set of departmental Standards for Promotion and Tenure
3. Departments forward the draft standards to the COEPS Standards Committee

4. The committee reviews the department's standards and side-notes against the *Guidelines* in consultation with the departmental representative to the committee
5. The committee may:
  - a. Recommend ratification of the departmental draft standards without comment
  - b. Recommend ratification with minor suggestions for improvement
  - c. Recommend non-ratification and include a detailed summary of necessary improvements in order to bring the standards into line with other COEPS departments

\* *Standard Classification of Performance Data* can be found at: <http://acadaff.uww.edu/Promotions/PromotionPortfolio.htm>

### **Guidelines Format:**

Each COEPS Promotion Standard is followed by guidelines for establishing corresponding department standards. The COEPS Constituency Standards Committee (CSC) elected to adopt the University Standards as the College Standards, and to leave to each department the task of defining the performance measures for each standard.

This decision reflects the CSC's recognition that there are significant and meaningful differences between the academic disciplines that comprise the College of Education and Professional Studies. The "process of achieving professional recognition" and a "record of effectiveness" may be demonstrated in quite different ways in the various disciplines represented in the departments. Faculty who are the most knowledgeable about their own discipline are best able to define the performance measures and benchmarks that establish "professional recognition" and a "record of effectiveness."

At the same time, the CSC is committed to standards and a promotion/tenure process that is equitable and consistent for faculty across departments. In order to balance the real differences between disciplines with the requirement for equity and consistency, the CSC is implementing these Guidelines to support the drafting of standards by all COEPS departments.

## **PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE; PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR FOR ONE WHO ALREADY HAS TENURE; AND AWARDED TENURE TO ONE WHO ALREADY HAS THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

### **TEACHING**

#### **STANDARD:**

The candidate must achieve *a record of effectiveness in teaching, advising and other teaching-related responsibilities*. In the College of Education and Professional Studies, this criterion is met as defined by the individually approved departmental standards with oversight from the Constituency Standards Committee.

## **GUIDELINES:**

In creating standards for teaching performance, departments first may need to define what it means to be an “effective” instructor. Subsequently, the scope and substance of the record that documents this effectiveness must be clearly and completely articulated in the department standards. *What is the evidence* that a particular instructor has achieved a record of effectiveness? This evidence should be as uncompromised as possible (e.g., does not rely on the same reviewer each year). At a minimum, department standards should define the expected performance standards from both student and peer evaluations.

Additionally, departments should define what is meant by “other teaching-related responsibilities.” In some departments, this may mean curricular innovation, Learn Center or teaching enhancement participation, or thesis or independent study advising.

1. *Department standards must require one or more peer reviews for each year in rank.* Peer reviews must:
  - Evaluate teaching based on direct observation, review of instructional materials and review of student work
  - Evaluate all course-delivery formats taught (instructional presentation, lab, on-line, hybrid)
  - Evaluate teaching with reference to course organization, classroom presentation, interaction with students and mastery of course content
  - Conclude with a statement from the reviewer that the review is or is not positive for purposes of tenure and promotion
  
2. *Department standards must require student evaluations conducted in all courses.* Student evaluations must:
  - Use the department-approved format and question set
  - Use a scoring system of 1-5, with 5 being the highest
 Department standards must define a “standard of effectiveness” within the 1-5 range (e.g., “Instructors are expected to achieve an average rating of 3.50 during the period under review” or “Rising student evaluations scores that achieve an average rating of 3.5 during the most recent year under review”)
  
3. *Department standards may include activities that enhance teaching skills.* Examples include:
  - Participation in a structured professional development activity or program related to teaching, as defined by department standards
  - Participation each service year in an individual or informal professional development activity or program related to teaching, as defined by department standards
  
4. *Department standards may include a requirement for support of department instructional goals.* Examples include:
  - Teaching classes requiring special preparation (e.g., on-line or outside the instructor’s field of expertise)

- Accommodating department scheduling needs
- Accommodating department course rotation needs
- Assuming responsibility for courses on short notice (e.g., to fill unexpected vacancy)

5. *Department standards must include academic advising to students.* The standard must address:

- Caseload; simply having an advising caseload does not *of itself* document effectiveness. What is the evidence that an instructor has achieved a “record of effectiveness” as an advisor?
- In addition to documentation of the advising caseload or its equivalent, the following may also be considered:
  - the use of a simple departmental “advising satisfaction scale” as a record
  - a standard of participation in advising workshops
  - randomized interviews of students by the chair
- Notes:
  - Departments that exempt faculty from academic advising should specify the terms of that exemption and the purpose of the exemption (for example, some departments may exempt new faculty from advising duties for the first probationary year in order to support their research agenda)
  - University/College standards require that certain kinds of service to students (i.e., advisor to a student club) must be recorded as “Service,” not as “Teaching”

## **JOB PERFORMANCE IN NON-TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS**

### **STANDARD:**

The candidate must *achieve a record of effectiveness in professional effort and responsibility* in the non-teaching assignment (such as department chair, program coordinator, librarian, or faculty position in the University Library), and must *demonstrate skills and knowledge relevant to the job*. In the College of Education and Professional Studies, this criterion is met as defined by the individually approved departmental standards with oversight from the Constituency Standards Committee.

### **GUIDELINES:**

This standard must be completed by all candidates who have received *release time* for one or more of the following activities: Department Chair, Program Coordinator, Advising or other similar activities. It *does not* apply to faculty who have received release time for sabbatical or research grants. Departments must define a “record of effectiveness” for these activities. What is the evidence that the candidate has been “effective” in the duties?

- In establishing this standard the departments may want to include a minimum number of

faculty and/or administrator review letters that speak to significant aspects of the non-teaching assignment. Examples include:

- Reports filed in timely manner (e.g., Audit & Review, Annual Report, Accreditation, Purple Book support letters)
- Effective scheduling
- Effective budget management
- Leadership in personnel and intra-department communication
- Effective promotion of department, college or university goals

## **RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

### **STANDARD:**

The candidate must achieve a record of professional research, or its creative equivalent, and other professional activity. This record should include evidence that *the faculty member is in the process of achieving professional recognition in the individual's discipline* through: scholarly publications; professional papers, presentations, exhibitions or performances; artistic achievement; or other scholarly and creative activities. In the College of Education and Professional Studies, this criterion is met as defined by the individually approved departmental standards with oversight from the Constituency Standards Committee.

### **GUIDELINES:**

Department standards must require that the candidate for tenure and promotion demonstrate a well-defined research agenda that includes goals determined with the tenured faculty of the department and reviewed annually.

In establishing this standard, departments may want to look to the recent productivity of the department scholars who best represent what it means to be “in the process of achieving professional recognition” in the context of the many other responsibilities of a faculty member at UW-Whitewater. The goal is to foster the development of scholars who will be able to achieve “significant professional recognition” as they progress to the rank of Professor.

Departments must include the requirement of at least two peer reviewed publications or equivalent creative activities.

Departments may want to consider a tiered system of research and creative activity. An example of a tiered system follows:

#### **Tier 1**

In this tier the department may articulate a required number of scholarly *publications or creative activities*. Examples include:

- Peer reviewed publications
- Invited book chapter in a scholarly volume
- Full-length scholarly book or creative equivalent
- A funded federal grant or other discipline-related grant that results in a faculty buy-out

### Tier 2

This tier recognizes and validates additional forms and venues of scholarship. Examples include:

- Conference paper or poster presentation (designate refereed, international, national, regional to the extent that this is significant)
- Private or state grants received (designate size or granting sources to the extent that this is significant)
- Significant encyclopedia entry
- Book review
- Proceedings entry

### Tier 3

This tier recognizes activities and work in progress that demonstrate an active research agenda.

Examples include:

- Peer reviewed journal article submitted or nearly ready for submission
- Grant application submitted
- Abstract submitted
- Manuscripts in preparation

## **PROFESSIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

### **STANDARD:**

The candidate must achieve a record of service to the profession, to the university community, and to the public through various activities that take place outside the classroom. The candidate must show a *potential to assume a contributing role within the faculty* as one moves toward the rank of Professor. In the College of Education and Professional Studies, this criterion is met as defined by the individually approved departmental standards with oversight from the Constituency Standards Committee.

### **GUIDELINES:**

Departments must specify standards for service to the university community (department, college, university) and to the profession and public:

Consult the *Standard Classification of Performance Data* to ensure that department standards and candidate's evidence of performance are consistent with University definitions for each of the service areas.

1. *Departments must require participation in the work of the department or program throughout years in rank.* Examples of participation in the work of the department include:
  - Committees
  - Campus events
  - Faculty meetings
  - Department retreats and workshops
  
2. *Departments must require service at the College and/or University level.* Examples of service at the college and/or university level include:
  - Committees
  - Campus events
  - Faculty Senate
  - Advising student organizations
  
3. *Departments must require professional and public service contributions.* Examples of professional service include:
  - Officer of a professional association
  - Grant proposals reviewer
  - Member of a professional credentialing body
  - Manuscripts reviewer
  
4. *Departments may require a record of potential leadership in one of the above areas of service.* Examples of evidence of potential leadership include:
  - Committee chair
  - Organizing a conference panel
  - Officer in a professional association
  - Book review editor

## **PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR; AND AWARDING TENURE TO ONE WHO ALREADY HAS THE RANK OF PROFESSOR**

The candidate must provide evidence of *an outstanding reputation in at least one of the following*: teaching, job performance in non-teaching assignments, research and creative activity, or professional and public service.

### **Guidelines:**

When crafting criteria for promotion to Professor, departments should attend to the language in the University and College standards above that requires “*evidence of an outstanding reputation in at least one of the major areas.*” It is unlikely that a department will be able to argue successfully that simply meeting the minimum departmental criteria for promotion in all areas is evidence of an outstanding reputation in one. Rather, a summary of the evidence for “outstanding” should be specifically noted in the Chair’s letter and the facts must be as clear as possible to every subsequent reader of the candidate’s promotion file (Purple Book) up the line.

Whereas it is true that one person's "outstanding" may be another's "ordinary," departments and candidates are urged to develop and articulate a strong and defensible "evidence" trail. Candidates are advised to factor this requirement into their planning early in the process and avoid last minute efforts to manufacture a reputation with only weak support.

## **TEACHING**

### **STANDARD:**

The candidate must achieve *a sustained record of effectiveness in teaching, advising, curriculum development and other teaching-related responsibilities. The candidate must achieve a record of innovation in at least one of these teaching areas.* In the College of Education and Professional Studies, this criterion is met as defined by the individually approved departmental standards with oversight from the Constituency Standards Committee.

### **GUIDELINES:**

See guidelines for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

In addition, the University/College standards for promotion at this level differ from those for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure by requiring:

- A "sustained" record of effectiveness
- A demonstration of effectiveness in "curriculum development"
- That the candidate achieve a "record of innovation" in one teaching area

1. *Departments must require peer reviews.* At least two peer reviews must be done within years in rank as Associate Professor with Tenure, with at least one review done within one year of the date of application (i.e. submission of the Purple Book) for promotion to Professor.

The peer review must:

- Evaluate teaching based on direct observation, review of instructional materials and review of student work
- Evaluate all course-delivery formats taught (lecture/seminar classroom, lab, on-line, hybrid)
- Evaluate teaching with reference to course organization, classroom presentation, interaction with students and mastery of course content
- Conclude with a statement from the reviewer that the review is or is not positive for purposes of tenure and promotion

2. *Departments must require student evaluations conducted in all courses for at least the last four semesters.* Student evaluations must:

- Use the department-approved format and question set
- Use a scoring system of 1-5, with 5 being the highest

Department standards must define a "standard of effectiveness" within the 1-5 range (e.g., "Instructors are expected to achieve an average rating of 3.50 during the period under review")

- Demonstrate that the candidate has maintained the department's designated "standard



of effectiveness” for at least the last four semesters

3. *Departments may include activities that enhance teaching skills.* These may include:
  - Participation in a structured professional development activity or program related to teaching, as defined by department standards
  - Participation each service year in an individual or informal professional development activity or program related to teaching, as defined by department standards
  - Evidence of sustained engagement in one or more activities that enhance teaching skills throughout years in rank
  
4. *Department standards may include a requirement for support of department instructional goals.* This may include:
  - Teaching classes requiring special preparation (e.g., On-line or outside field of expertise)
  - Accommodating department scheduling needs
  - Accommodating department course rotation needs
  - Assuming responsibility for courses on short notice (e.g., To fill unexpected vacancy)
  - Evidence of sustained support of department instructional goals throughout years in rank
  
5. *Department standards must include academic advising to students.* The standard must address:
  - Caseload; simply having an advising caseload does not *of itself* document effectiveness. What is the evidence that an instructor has achieved a “record of effectiveness” in his or her service to students as an advisor?
  - In addition to documentation of the advising caseload or its equivalent, the following may also be considered:
    - the use of a simple departmental “advising satisfaction scale” as a record
    - a standard of participation in advising workshops
    - randomized interviews of students by the chair
  - Evidence of sustained effectiveness as an academic advisor throughout years in rank (e.g., master advisor)
  - Note: University/College standards require that certain kinds of service to students (i.e., advisor to a student club) must be recorded as “Service,” not as “Teaching”
  
6. Departments must require a *record of innovation* in either teaching, advising, curriculum development **or** other teaching related responsibilities. Examples of activities or achievements that constitute a record of innovation include:
  - Application of teaching strategies or methods derived from professional development activities that substantially and positively promote student learning
  - Development of teaching strategies or methods whose efficacy leads to their adoption by colleagues
  - Development of new or significantly improved methods that increase advisor-advisee communications
  - Development of new or significantly improved methods that track student progress to degree
  - Development of new or significantly improved methods designed to increase student

- retention
- Development of cross-disciplinary courses or programs
- Development of units taught in multiple courses throughout the major or general education classes
- Development of technology or resource materials that enhances teaching and learning in multiple courses throughout the major or general education classes

## **JOB PERFORMANCE IN NON-TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS**

### **STANDARD:**

The candidate must achieve *a sustained record of effectiveness in professional effort and responsibility* in the non-teaching assignment (such as department chair, program co-ordinator, librarian, or faculty position in the University Library), and a sustained record of demonstrated skills and knowledge relevant to the job. In the College of Education and Professional Studies, this criterion is met as defined by the individually approved departmental standards with oversight from the Constituency Standards Committee.

### **GUIDELINES:**

See guidelines for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

In addition, the University/College standards for promotion at this level differ from those for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure by requiring:

- a “sustained” record of effectiveness
- a “sustained record” of demonstrated skills and knowledge relevant to the job

In defining performance standards departments might consider a standard that includes a minimum number of evaluative letters from faculty and/or administrators that speak to significant aspects of the non-teaching assignment *throughout the years in rank*.

Examples include:

- Reports filed in timely manner (e.g., Audit & Review, Annual Report, Accreditation, Purple Book support letters)
- Effective scheduling
- Effective budget management
- Leadership in personnel and intra-department communication
- Effective promotion of department, college or university goals

## RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

### **STANDARD:**

The candidate must achieve a record of professional research, or its creative equivalent and other professional activity. This record should include evidence that the faculty member *has achieved significant professional recognition in the individual's discipline* through: scholarly publications; professional papers; presentations, exhibitions or performances; artistic achievement; or other scholarly and creative activities. In the College of Education and Professional Studies, this criterion is met as defined by the individually approved departmental standards with oversight from the Constituency Standards Committee.

### **GUIDELINES:**

See guidelines for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

In addition, the University/College standards for promotion at this level differ from those for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure by requiring:

- That the faculty member “has achieved significant professional recognition”

In establishing this standard, departments may want to look to the recent productivity of the department scholars who best represent what it means to “have achieved significant professional recognition” in the context of the many other responsibilities of a faculty member at UW-Whitewater. The goal is to promote faculty whose research or creative activity is recognized at the national or international level for having contributed to knowledge in their field.

Departments may want to consider a tiered system of research and creative activity. An example of a tiered system follows:

#### Tier 1

In this tier the department might articulate a required number of scholarly *publications or creative activities*. Examples include:

- Peer reviewed publications
- Invited book chapter in a scholarly volume
- Full-length scholarly book or creative equivalent
- A funded federal grant or other discipline-related grant that results in a faculty buy-out

#### Tier 2

This tier recognizes and validates additional forms and venues of scholarship. Examples include:

- Conference paper or poster presentation (designate refereed, international, national, regional to the extent that this is significant)
- Private or state grants received (designate size or granting sources to the extent that this is significant)
- Significant encyclopedia entry

- Book review
- Proceedings entry

### Tier 3

This tier recognizes activities and works in progress that demonstrate an active research agenda.

Examples include:

- Peer reviewed journal article submitted or nearly ready for submission
- Grant application submitted
- Abstract submitted
- Manuscripts in preparation

Departments may include *external assessment* that one or more of the research activities makes a significant contribution to the scholarly field.

Examples include:

- External letter
- Published Review
- Number of Citations

## **PROFESSIONAL AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

### **STANDARD:**

The candidate must achieve a *demonstrated record of service* to the profession, to the university community, and to the public through various activities that take place outside the classroom.

The candidate must *show leadership in at least one of these service areas*. In the College of Education and Professional Studies, this criterion is met as defined by the individual approved departmental standards with oversight from the Constituency Standards Committee.

### **GUIDELINES:**

See guidelines for promotion to associate professor with tenure.

In addition, the University/College standards for promotion at this level differ from those for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure by requiring:

- A “demonstrated record of service”
- Evidence of “leadership in at least one of the service areas”

1. *Departments must require satisfactory participation in the work of the department or program throughout years in rank.* Examples include:

- Committees
- Campus events
- Faculty meetings

- Department retreats and workshops
- Documentation of the contributions of the candidate's service to the department, including leadership in this area if applicable

2. *Departments must require service at the College and/or University level.* Examples include:

- Committees
- Campus events
- Faculty Senate
- Advising student organizations
- Documentation of the contributions of the candidate's service to the College or University, including leadership in this area if applicable

3. *All departments must require professional and public service contributions.* Examples include:

- Officer of a professional association
- Grant proposals reviewer
- Member of a professional credentialing body
- Manuscripts reviewer
- Consultant
- Documentation of the contributions of the candidate's service to the profession and public, including leadership in this area if applicable

4. *All departments must require a record of leadership in one of the above areas of service.*

Evidence of leadership includes:

- Department, College, or University Committee chair
- Organizing a conference
- Active service on a national or international conference committee
- Officer in a professional association
- Book review editor

Approved by the faculty of the COEPS May, 2012

Approved by the University Standards Committee October 16, 2012

Approved with suggested changes by Chancellor Telfer November 27, 2012

Approved by the faculty of the COEPS with Chancellor Telfer's suggested changes May 17, 2013

Approved by the University Standards Committee with Chancellor Telfer's suggested changes October 2, 2013

Approved by the COEPS Constituency Committee with editorial changes suggested by the Faculty Senate November 15, 2013

Approved by the University Standards Committee with editorial changes suggested by the Faculty Senate December 3, 2013

Approved by Chancellor Telfer December 4, 2013

Approved by the Faculty Senate December 10, 2013

Approved by Chancellor Telfer December 30, 2013

