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Overview

This document outlines the annual faculty evaluation process and the procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion in the Department of Leadership, Technology, and Human Development (LTHD). The development of this document was guided by the University System of Georgia Policies, Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook (§205 through §213), and the College of Education mission, goals, and procedures.

Tenure and Promotion Committee Membership

The Committee of Tenured Faculty will be composed of all non-administrative departmental faculty who are tenured at Georgia Southern University. The Promotion Committee for any rank will be composed of all full-time non-administrative departmental faculty who hold rank equal to or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered. At the first Fall Semester meeting of the department, a Chair will be elected by the committee members to serve for the academic year.

The Department Chair will provide the Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee with a timeline for committee actions, which is available on the COE website, as well as a list of eligible committee members. The Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will coordinate a meeting date for the committee. The date of the meeting must be established so that a quorum of faculty is able to attend. Faculty members who are unable to attend the meeting may submit written comments to the Chair of the committee prior to the meeting. Faculty who are not in attendance may not vote (no votes in absentia).
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Pre-Tenure Review

Pre-tenure review is a formal review of a faculty member's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service normally conducted in one's third year of service. Materials to be submitted will be the same as those specified for the Tenure Review. Prior to submitting materials, faculty who are going up for third-year review should meet with the Department Chair. The third-year review results in a formal report for each individual candidate who submits material for review that identifies accomplishment and areas in need of improvement prior to the time the faculty member submits his or her papers for tenure review. The Chair of the Committee of Tenured Faculty will prepare a pre-tenure report for each person who submits materials for review by the committee. These reports will be submitted to the Department Chair.

Pre-Tenure Review Procedures and Timeline

1. Faculty members due for Pre-Tenure review are notified by the Department Chair and provided a copy of the Pre-Tenure Review Timeline by the first Monday in September.
2. Pre-Tenure review materials are submitted to the Department Chair by the first Monday in December. Note: Some departments may require an earlier submission deadline in order to complete the reviews.
3. Department Pre-Tenure Committee’s review and written recommendation submitted to the Department Chair, by the third Monday in January, if department review occurs.
4. Department Chair submits all Pre-Tenure documents and reviews to the Dean by the first Thursday of February.
5. Dean and Department Chair discuss reviews and contents of Dean’s correspondence with the Provost about Pre-Tenure reviews by the third Friday of February.
6. Department Chair discusses reviews with the candidates and, if appropriate, develops a plan for a candidate’s success by the fourth Friday in March.
7. Dean submits Pre-Tenure reviews to the Provost and copies to Department Chairs and candidates by the second Monday in April.
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Tenure Review

Tenure Review is a formal evaluation of the teaching, scholarship, and service of faculty; the needs of the institution; the ability of the professor to function within the Georgia Southern Academic community; and, the length of service as described in the GSU Faculty Handbook (§209). Material to be submitted and specific requirements of that material can be found in the University Faculty Handbook. Tenure materials will be reviewed at a meeting of the Committee of Tenured Faculty. This meeting is normally conducted in the Fall Semester of the academic year to enable the Department, College, and University to meet the timetable. The meeting date will be set by the Department Chair as soon as possible after the announcement of the University/College of Education timetable. The Department Chair will make every attempt to schedule the meeting so that all members of the Committee of Tenured Faculty can attend.

Tenure Review Procedures

1. The Committee of Tenured Faculty will have a minimum of two weeks in which to review the materials submitted by the tenure candidate faculty.
2. At the meeting, each committee member will vote on each case under consideration.
3. Only those committee members present for the discussion can vote. The Chair of the Committee will solicit written comments from committee members who cannot attend the meeting.
4. Abstentions are allowed only when a committee member declares that he or she has a clear conflict of interest concerning a case. Straw ballots may precede the final ballot. Only the votes on the final ballot are binding and recorded.
5. A positive recommendation to the Department Chair results when more than 50% of those casting ballots have voted to recommend a continuing appointment with tenure.
6. The Department Chair will forward his or her recommendation and supporting materials to the Dean of the College of Education. A formal report of the Committee of Tenured Faculty's deliberations for each tenure candidate will be included with the Department Chair’s recommendation to the Dean.
7. The Department Chair will inform each candidate in writing of his or her recommendation prior to the submission of the materials to the College of Education Tenure, Promotion, and Welfare Committee.
8. If the recommendation will result in nonrenewal of contract, the GSU Faculty Handbook identifies the following procedure:

   §211.01 Renewal/Nonrenewal of Probationary Faculty
   Department chairs will seek the advice of the tenured faculty on decisions of
renewal or nonrenewal of probationary (non-tenured, tenure-track) faculty. Department Chairs may seek additional advice as they deem appropriate. Before written notice is given to the faculty member, the Department Chair will discuss with the dean and then the dean will discuss with the Provost each intention not to renew.
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Promotion Review

Promotion materials will be reviewed at a meeting of the Promotion Committee. This meeting is normally conducted in the fall of the year. The meeting date will be set by the Department Chair as soon as possible after the announcement of the University/College of Education Tenure and Promotion timetable. The Department Chair will make every attempt to schedule the meeting so that all members of the Promotion Committee can attend.

Promotion Review Procedures

1. The Promotion Committee members will have a minimum of two weeks in which to review the materials submitted by the probationary faculty.
2. At the meeting, each committee member will vote on each case under consideration.
3. Only those committee members present for the discussion can vote. The Chair of the Committee will solicit written comments from the committee members who cannot attend the meeting.
4. Abstentions are allowed only when a committee member declares that he or she has a clear conflict of interest concerning a case. Straw ballots may precede the final ballot. Only the votes on the final ballot are binding and recorded.
5. A positive recommendation to the Department Chair results when more than 50% of those casting ballots have voted to recommend promotion.
6. The Department Chair will forward his or her recommendation and supporting materials to the Dean of the College of Education. A formal report of the Promotion Committee’s deliberations will be included with the Department Chair's recommendation to the Dean.
7. The Department Chair will inform each candidate in writing of his or her recommendation prior to the submission of the materials to the College of Education Tenure, Promotion, and Welfare Committee.
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Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Departmental criteria for tenure and promotion are intended to help guide faculty with professional endeavors that meet College of Education and University requirements. The expectations for tenure and promotion at Georgia Southern University are based on an evaluation of a faculty member’s contribution in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, the needs of the institution, the ability of the professor to function within the Georgia Southern Academic community, and the length of service as described in the faculty handbook. University requirements for tenure and promotion can be found in the *Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook* §208-213.

Evidence of Professional Activity

To help guide professional activities that support tenure and promotion, the faculty of the Department of Leadership, Technology, and Human Development have identified examples of activities that would be considered appropriate for evaluation. The activities are grouped into two levels. Level I-Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor items are representative of the types of activities that are expected for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. These activities exemplify the types of involvement that indicate the faculty member is making satisfactory contributions to the Institution. These activities can be considered when a sufficient rationale is provided by the faculty member. Level II-Tenure and/or Promotion to Professor items are representative of the types of activities and involvement that are expected for promotion to the rank of Professor during one's career.

The *Faculty Handbook*, §208 states that “Promotions in rank are based on merit and are not automatic….Promotion at Georgia Southern requires satisfactory performance in all areas of evaluation, with noteworthy accomplishment in teaching and one of the other two areas p[scholarship or service].”

Departmental Procedural Guidelines

These guidelines are based upon several realities of our University, College, and Department. The conceptual framework of the College of Education requires inclusion of technology and diversity in all teaching and syllabi. Individual goals and objectives must reflect program needs and the portion of those needs assigned to, or assumed by, each faculty member. Annual goals and objectives are established during the annual review with the Department Chair. To earn any of the ratings listed in each category, the faculty member must provide clear evidence that the appropriate requirements have been met vis-à-vis a self-reflective narrative for each area.
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Expectations for Tenure and Promotion

Teaching

*Georgia Southern University Handbook – §205.01 Criteria for All Types of Faculty Evaluation*

A demonstrated record of superior, effective teaching is the first and most important area of evaluation. Superior teaching is reflective, student-centered, respectful of the diversity of students, adapted to various learning styles, and focused on student learning outcomes. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and direction of research, … mentoring, and the like. Teaching activities also include the development of new courses, programs, and other curricular materials, including the development of online courses. Judgments of the quality of teaching activities are based on measures such as examination of course syllabi and other course materials, peer evaluations when available, critical review and dissemination of teaching products, performance of students in subsequent venues, follow-up of graduates in graduate school or in their employment, and student ratings of instruction.

The Board of Regents recognizes work in schools:

§803.17 Work in the Schools (Board of Regents’ Policy Manual)

- Improving their own teaching so as to model effective teaching practices in courses taken by prospective teachers.
- Contributing scholarship that promotes and improves student learning and achievement in the schools and in the university.
- Collaborating with public schools to strengthen teaching quality and to increase student learning.

Departmental Criteria

Professional responsibilities in the area of teaching and learning encompass activities of classroom and online instruction, field supervision, theses and dissertation direction and committee service, supervision of clinical field experiences, as well as mentoring, academic advising, and course and program development and improvement. Teaching activities also include the development of new courses, programs, and other curricular materials. Judgment of the quality of teaching activities should be based on multiple indicators including, but not limited to, the following: student ratings of instruction, course syllabi and other course materials, peer evaluations, teaching-portfolios, and/or sample assessments with accompanying narratives. In addition to more traditional classroom instruction, examples of teaching may also include activities such as chairing or serving on dissertation or other student-research committees, supervising and evaluating field experiences, and developing and/or delivering Internet web-
based instruction. All faculty must achieve noteworthy accomplishment in the area of teaching to be considered for Tenure and/or Promotion. Judgment of productivity in the area of teaching will include evaluation of the following types of evidence:

**Evaluation**
- Peer evaluations.
- Student evaluations.

**Syllabi**
- Syllabi incorporate a range of appropriate objectives, presentation methods, and evaluation methods to reflect current research and practice in the discipline.
- Syllabi incorporate a range of presentation and evaluation methods to assure mastery of course objectives among a diverse range of learners.
- Syllabi are revised annually to include current research and practices.
- Syllabi incorporate a range of presentation methods appropriate to learner diversity.
- Syllabi include objectives, presentation methods and evaluation procedures and criteria.
- Syllabi incorporate evaluation feedback from students, peers and supervisors.

**Technology**
- Demonstrates that students have acquired competencies in technologies appropriate to the subject and students through varied performance evaluation methods.
- Online courses demonstrate evidence of appropriate integration of current technologies.
- Demonstrates and models technology appropriate to the subject and students in each course.
- Provides opportunities for students to acquire competency in technology through course assignments and requirements.

**Diversity**
- Demonstrates extensive adaptations in syllabi, presentations and evaluations to make course content and skills accessible to all qualified students.
- Demonstrates that all qualified students have acquired the knowledge and skills required by the course objectives.
- Addresses diversity in syllabi and presentations.
- Syllabi address thoroughly diversity in learner characteristics, teaching methods, and outcome assessment to assure competence in knowledge and skills required in course objectives.
- Demonstrates appropriate adaptation to learner characteristics in presentation and evaluation.
Supervision of Students

Level I – Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

- Requires that quantity of supervision activities have been met with acceptable level of quality.
- Consults with students and field personnel beyond routine responsibilities.
- Provides supervision beyond requirements when necessary and/or appropriate.
- Provides recommendations to students and field supervisors that are clear, relevant, and feasible as judged by recipients of the suggestions.
- Member of Ed.D. Student Doctoral Committees.
- Member of Ed.S. Student Research Committees.

Level II – Tenure and/or Promotion to Professor

- Demonstrates that field supervision consultation has had a clear and beneficial effect upon the consultees and the consultees’ students. Effects should be judged by consultees, supervisors and peers.
- Demonstrates consistently that field supervision outcomes have been successful to highly successful. This should be judged through corroborating evidence from students, field supervisors, and administrators.
- Chairs Ed.D. Student Doctoral Committees.
- Chairs Ed.S. Student Research Committees.

Program Development

Level I – Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

- Revises or updates an existing course outline.
- Develops or revises advisement forms.
- Develops a new program emphasis.
- Develops a new academic course (online or face-to-face).
- Provides administrative support via participation on program councils, and coordination of program elements such as admissions, and practicum and internship experiences.
- Plans and implements program recruitment procedures.
- Serves as active member of Program Action Team.

Level II – Tenure and/or Promotion to Professor

- Coordinates academic program.
- Secures approval of new course from Graduate Curriculum Committee/Graduate Council.
- Secures approval of new course from Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and its companion committees.
- Develops and coordinates off campus program.
- Develops new degree program.
- Chairs Program Action Team.
- Serves as mentor to junior faculty in the area of teaching.
Professional Development

Level I – Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor
- Has modest agenda for development, actively pursues agenda, and demonstrates achievement.
- Participates in peer review process of teaching and/or course design.
- Incorporates feedback from peer review in classroom practice.
- Has an agenda of reasonable expectations that are based upon demonstrated program/individual needs and achieves all items on the agenda.
- Actively seeks peer review.
- Provides peer review when requested.
- Incorporates feedback from peer review in instructional practice.

Level II – Tenure and/or Promotion to Professor
- Has agenda of significant expectations that are based upon demonstrated program/individual needs and demonstrates achievement of all.
- Demonstrates extensive incorporation of feedback in syllabi, presentations, student feedback, and peer evaluation follow-up.
- Provides peer review of teaching and/or course design that is clear, relevant, and substantive.
- Presents results of reviews to peers in a constructive, supportive manner.
- Demonstrates that peer review has resulted in improved performance.

The above examples of teaching activity evidence are not exhaustive, and the candidate for promotion and/or tenure may devise a myriad of meaningful and discipline-specific ways that demonstrate noteworthy achievement in teaching. Additional evidence of noteworthy achievement in teaching will also be considered, such as how a candidate’s teaching activities meet the needs of the department; student evaluations of teaching that are consistently above the satisfactory level; evidence of positive outcomes related to engaging in professional development in the area of teaching; and high levels of committed service on graduate committees.
Service

Faculty are expected to make service contributions to their professions and to the institution. Service at the department/school, college, and university levels is essential to the well-being of the University. Service includes the application of one's expertise in the discipline for the benefit of a professional organization, the community, or the institution. Service also includes the academic advisement of Georgia Southern University students. Additionally, service may include work in schools, businesses, museums, social agencies, government, or the like, as well as activities undertaken on behalf of the University that do not entail systematic instruction, such as manuscript reviewing and the design and development of professional conferences. Consulting shall be designated as paid or unpaid.

University-based service includes contributions to the administration and advancement of the university, college, department, and program, while professional service beyond the University includes quality contributions to projects or initiatives that support the public service mission of the COE and Georgia Southern University. Service activities such as communicating with and being available to students, attending graduation, and proctoring comprehensive examinations are expected and assumed. They do not need to be listed for tenure and promotion decisions. However, a lack of participation in such activities may have a negative impact on annual reviews, as well as tenure and promotion decisions. Note: It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate the level of effort or involvement in any of the activities presented as evidence of service.

Departmental Criteria

A satisfactory service record would include consistent service to the institution at all levels (program, department, college, and university community), and external service such as editorial reviewer, service to the schools and local agencies, professional organizations, or similar entities. Furthermore, leadership in some capacity on committees is also expected. A judgment of noteworthy performance in service may include evidence showing leadership roles on multiple committees, service on multiple time-intensive committees, and repeated service to the profession or community (e.g., conference coordinator or officer, manuscript reviewer, professional service to schools or the community, etc.).

Faculty members who are involved in administrative positions (e.g., Program Coordinator/Director; Assessment Coordinator) are recognized as providing a valuable service to
students, and to the Institution. While principally located in the service arena, the faculty also recognizes that the responsibilities of these positions may extend to the area of teaching.

The following Level I and Level II examples of evaluation criteria are not situated in a hierarchy as these items are not prioritized or ranked by value. It is up to the individual candidate to select examples that will exemplify his or her body of work in each area. Judgments of the quality of service activities are based on measures such as:

Level I – Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

Examples of Noteworthy Performance:
- Conducting a workshop/webinar at the state level.
- Serving as a resource to state and local educational agencies and organizations.
- Serving on discipline-related community organizations.
- Providing expert consultation to programs in other departments or colleges.
- Creating/designing and maintaining an online presence for a program, department, college or professional organization (e.g., social media, website).
- Reviewing curriculums for publishing companies.
- Providing consulting services to schools and agencies.
- Taking on leadership roles in program operation and development.
- Taking on leadership roles in school renewal as indicated in the school partnership framework, particularly as related to target level performance.

Examples of Satisfactory Performance:
- Serving on a College of Education Committee.
- Serving as a committee member in local, state, regional, or national associations.
- Conducting workshops for local schools and agencies.
- Chairing a department committee.
- Coordinating a local workshop, conference or webinar.
- Speaking to local school and agency groups.
- Judging local, discipline-related contests.
- Serving on a department committee.
- Actively contributing to program operation and development.
- Reviewing national, state, or regional conference proposals.
- Participating in a mentor/mentee relationship.
- Participating in school renewal as indicated in the school partnership framework, particularly as related to target level performance.

Level II – Tenure and/or Promotion to Professor

Examples of Noteworthy Performance:
- Serving on a Regents Committee.
- Chairing a University Committee.
- Chairing a Regents Committee.
- Serving in an administrative capacity (e.g., Program Coordinator/Director; Assessment Coordinator).
- Coordinating a conference at the state/regional/national level.
- Serving as officer/committee chair of professional organizations and associations.
- Being president/chair of a discipline-related, local organization.
- Taking on leadership roles on Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation /Professional Standards Commission or other accreditation team/committees.

**Examples of Satisfactory Performance:**
- Serving on a University Committee.
- Serving as faculty advisor for a GSU student organization.
- Judging competitive state contests.
- Serving as chair of a College of Education Committee.
- Serving on the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation/Professional Standards Commission or other accreditation team/committee.
- Actively mentoring students individually and in groups.
- Sponsoring student organizations.
- Serving as mentor to junior faculty in the area of service.
- Creating/revising a graduate student handbook.
Expectations for Tenure and Promotion

Scholarship

Georgia Southern University Handbook – §205.01 Criteria for All Types of Faculty Evaluation

The significance of scholarly accomplishments shall be judged rigorously within the context of the discipline. Candidates must provide evidence of work which has been selected for dissemination through normally accepted peer-reviewed venues such as publications, conference presentations, exhibitions, performances, or other professional accomplishments. Scholarship includes the discovery, integration, development, application, and extension of knowledge as well as aesthetic creation and is often demonstrated by publications and presentations designed for professional audiences. Scholarship is manifested in articles, scholarly books and texts, reports of research, creative works, textbooks, scholarly presentations, research grants, demonstration grants, papers read, panel participation, exhibits, performances, professional honors and awards, additional professional training or certification, degrees earned, postdoctoral work, and academic honors and awards.

Departmental Criteria

The Department of Leadership, Technology, and Human Development views scholarship to be a developmental process that is unique to the individual, and expectations of productivity are in relation to the aspiring level of promotion (e.g., Associate Professor or Professor). We acknowledge that individuals early in the process may investigate a broader scope of thematic continuity in an effort to explore and solidify a content niche and/or area of expertise within their discipline. As the individual develops his or her research agenda and content niche, it refines in focus, increases in quality, with less emphasis on quantity, and demonstrates continued scholarly growth that results in wider recognition of one’s work.

The following Level I and Level II examples of evaluation criteria are not situated in a hierarchy as these items are not prioritized or ranked by value. It is up to the individual candidate to select examples that will exemplify his or her body of work in each area. Judgments of the quality of Noteworthy and Satisfactory scholarship activities are based on the following measures:

Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

Satisfactory performance in scholarship may be shown by continued output in scholarly work that includes publications, grant activities, creative products, and other outputs designed for professional audiences. Scholarship is not limited to peer-reviewed publications and
presentations; it is also manifested in articles, scholarly books and texts, reports of research, creative works, textbooks, scholarly presentations, research grants, demonstration grants, papers read, panel participation, exhibits, performances, professional honors and awards, additional professional training or certification, degrees earned, and academic honors and awards. The ability to conduct empirical research must be demonstrated. Elements that are considered include, but are not exclusive of authorship, journal quality, acceptance rate, impact factor, and readership; these elements may be weighted slightly differently across professional disciplines. LTHD does not require a specific number of peer-reviewed publications and other works; national and international publications and presentations are encouraged.

For promotion to Associate Professor, it is expected that the candidate’s research address thematic content within the candidate’s professional scope. Teacher/Scholars have the right to pursue any research or artistic endeavor (BOR §203.1) that has potential value to one’s discipline or the domain of education and is a meaningful contribution to the teaching, learning, and service environments.

Noteworthy scholarship requires greater levels of productivity than required for satisfactory performance in scholarship, but also includes recognition at a national or international level as shown by citations to one’s work; impact factor of one’s work; positive, published reviews of one’s work; research awards or honors; or other means of documenting the stature and impact of one’s scholarly productivity. The quality, quantity, and consistency of the complete body of scholarship surpasses the developmental stage of the candidate’s research focus area(s), and/or there is evidence of a research program or line of created work that shows promise of sustained activity.

Level I – Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor

- Publishing an article in a nationally refereed journal (print or on-line).
- Publishing a chapter in a professional book.
- Publishing an article in a nationally recognized editorially reviewed journal.
- Presenting at a national/international conference.
- Publishing an article in a state refereed journal.
- Publishing an academically related article in a non-refereed journal.
- Publishing a professional work in any media type or development of other creative works.
- Receiving a state grant.
- Receiving a state professional academic honor or award.
- Serving as editor of a state journal.
- Presenting at a state/regional conference.
- Serving as an editorial board member of a national journal.
- Serving as a reviewer for a state, regional, or national journal.
- Serving as a panel member for a national or regional conference presentation.
- Acquiring or renewing state professional licensure or certification.
- Publishing an ERIC document.
- Publishing a research report.
- Publishing a book review in a national journal.
● Receiving an internal (college level or university level) grant that supports the mission of the program, department, College of Education, and/or University.
● Presenting a paper at a local/ state/ or regional conference.
● Serving as a reviewer for a national publisher.
● Serving as a moderator for a national or regional conference presentation.
● Serving as a panel member for a state or local conference presentation.

Tenure and/or Promotion to Professor

Satisfactory performance is primarily demonstrated by a steady record of publications of peer-reviewed articles and presentations designed for professional audiences. The ability to conduct empirical research and a commitment to mentoring junior faculty in scholarship must be demonstrated. Elements considered include, but are not exclusive of, authorship, quality of the journal, acceptance rate, impact factor, and readership. These elements may be weighted slightly differently by professional areas. Scholarship is not limited to just peer-reviewed publications and presentations; it is also manifested in articles, scholarly books and texts, reports of research, creative works, textbooks, scholarly presentations, research grants, demonstration grants, papers read, panel participation, exhibits, performances, professional honors and awards, additional professional training or certification, degrees earned, and academic honors and awards. For promotion to Professor, the evidence should also be focused on a research program or line of creative work that demonstrates thematic continuity and sustainability in scholarly activity. Aspirants to higher ranks are expected to demonstrate progressively more advanced levels of professional maturity, accomplishment, and recognition beyond the boundaries of the university as they are considered for promotion (Faculty Handbook, Section §208).

Noteworthy performance must exhibit quality, quantity, and consistency throughout the complete body of scholarship. Performance activities shall exemplify value and a meaningful contribution to the teaching and learning environment and/or evidence of a research program or distinguished line of created work that demarcates content niche, expertise, and stimulates thought and practice at the national or international level. For promotion to professor, one should demonstrate continued scholarly growth that results in wider recognition of one's work as productivity increases.

Level II – Tenure and/or Promotion to Professor
● Publishing a book related to one's professional field.
● Publishing a monograph related to one's professional field.
● Receiving an external grant that supports the mission of the program, department, College of Education, and/or University.
● Editing a book related to one's professional field.
● Receiving a national professional academic honor or award.
● Serving as editor of a national journal.
● Acquiring or renewing national professional licensure or certification within the faculty member’s area of expertise.
● Publishing an article in a distinguished journal.
● Giving an invited/keynote address at a national/international conference.
Documentation that may be included for annual review evaluations rather than promotion packets:

- Contributing material to a published professional newsletter.
- Developing a state, federal, or university grant proposal (not funded).
- Assisting a colleague with a manuscript or research project not listed as author.
- Developing a conference presentation at any level that does not get selected for presentation.
- Submitting a draft of an article/book/chapter for publication.
- Submitting and/or revising an external grant that supports the mission of the program, department, College of Education, and/or University.