



AUBURN
UNIVERSITY

College of Education

Department of Curriculum & Teaching

**Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Procedures
(Tenure-Track Faculty)**

Approved by the Curriculum and Teaching Faculty on February 8, 2024

Approved by the Office of the Provost - September 2024

Department of Curriculum and Teaching | College of Education
Guidelines for Annual Assessment and Promotion and Tenure

I. Introduction

The faculty in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching have developed the following promotion and tenure guidelines:

- Criteria for promotion and tenure.
- Evaluation standards for the criteria.

In a separate section, we have created evaluation procedures so faculty members receive direct and helpful feedback in their annual reviews, third-year reviews, and during the departmental evaluation phase of the promotion and tenure process.

II. Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

A. General Criteria and Considerations

According to the [AU Faculty Handbook](#), faculty scholarly contribution is evaluated in the areas of teaching, research/creative work, outreach, and service. Section III of this document provides the guidelines for promotion and tenure within Curriculum and Teaching. Section III.A. explains some general criteria for understanding teaching in C&T. Section III.B. details criteria for research/creative work. Section III.C. presents expectations in outreach, and Section III.D. details service contributions.

Promotion Standards for Tenure Track Faculty in Curriculum and Teaching

1. *Tenure Track Assistant Professor Seeking Promotion to Associate Professor*

As noted in the AU faculty handbook, “A candidate for associate professor should have demonstrated mastery of the subject matter of their field and the ability to apply it well in the primary area(s) to which they are assigned, whether in teaching, research/creative work, or outreach. Additionally, the candidate should have contributed, typically through significant scholarly or creative work, to their area of specialization; participated in professional life; and served on departmental, college, and/or University committees. Through their scholarly and professional activity, the candidate should demonstrate an emerging stature as a regional or national authority.”

In Curriculum and Teaching, a candidate seeking promotion from assistant professor to associate professor should present a holistic body of work that demonstrates distinction through an *emerging national/international reputation*, substantiated through the dissemination of scholarship and/or creative work, with an emphasis on peer-reviewed outlets. It is the responsibility of the candidate to develop a professional record that offers evidence of an emerging national/international reputation. While a candidate is not required to develop a national/international reputation based solely on research/creative work, research/creative work should play a central role in the candidate’s case of having demonstrated an emerging national/international reputation. In addition, an acceptable record in research, teaching, outreach, and service is expected, commensurate with the candidate’s workload allocation.

2. *Tenure Track Associate Professor Seeking Promotion to Professor*

As noted in the AU faculty handbook, “A candidate for professor should have demonstrated significant involvement in the teaching, research/creative work, or outreach functions of the University. They should also have participated in professional life and have been actively involved in departmental, college, and University affairs. For this rank it is essential that the candidate should have demonstrated a marked degree of scholarship appropriate to their assignment through work, typically publication or creative endeavor, subjected to peer review. By means of such activity, a candidate for the University’s highest academic rank should have a respected national reputation.”

In Curriculum and Teaching, a candidate seeking promotion from associate professor to professor should present a holistic body of work that demonstrates distinction through an *established national/international reputation*, substantiated through the dissemination of scholarship and/or creative work, with an emphasis on peer-reviewed outlets. It is the responsibility of the candidate to develop a professional record that offers evidence of an established national/international reputation. While a candidate is not required to develop a national/international reputation based solely on research/creative work, research/creative work should play a central role in the candidate’s case of having demonstrated an established national/international reputation. In addition, an acceptable record in research, teaching, outreach, and service is expected, commensurate with the candidate’s workload allocation.

Presenting a Comprehensive and Cohesive Body of Work

To be considered for promotion, candidates need to present a comprehensive and cohesive body of scholarship across the areas of their academic mission. The following table illustrates how that is achieved.

Levels:	Distinction: <i>“An emerging or established national/international reputation...”</i>	Acceptable: <i>An acceptable level for workload allocation.</i>
Research/ Creative	Required component (although not necessarily the only component) in demonstrating distinction	Major requirement (unless an atypical workload allocation)
Teaching	Optional component in demonstrating distinction	Major requirement (unless an atypical workload allocation)
Outreach	Optional component in demonstrating distinction	Required (typically weighted less based on workload allocation)
Service	Optional component in demonstrating distinction	Required (typically weighted less based on workload allocation)

General Guidelines for Productivity

Typically, candidates for promotion in C&T would demonstrate an average of 1.5-2.0 publications (or equivalent artifacts as described in Section III below) per year at rank. However, we recognize the variability of fields and programs within this department, so candidates should contextualize their work and make a case for why and how it serves as evidence of acceptability or distinction. More highly-valued publications or other artifacts may be considered to weigh more, while less highly-valued publications or artifacts will weigh less. **Meeting a numerical target is not sufficient to demonstrate readiness for promotion by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.** It is the responsibility of the candidate to develop a coherent professional profile that offers evidence of an emerging or established national or international reputation.

III. Departmental Definitions of Value in Areas of Effort

The following sections provide definitions for Teaching, Research/Creative Work, Outreach and Service as well as criteria for tenure-track faculty seeking promotion.

A. Teaching

According to the [Auburn University Mission](#), “Our first responsibility is to educate our students and prepare them for life. We endeavor to expand their minds, broaden their experiences, and hone their capabilities by imparting both theoretical knowledge and practical skills. Our goal is to empower and inspire our students to be their very best and to achieve their hopes and dreams. A key element of our public charter and of the Auburn Creed is to ensure our students are instilled with a strong work ethic, sound character traits, and core values of honesty and respect. We encourage students to make valuable contributions and to lead their fellow citizens in creating meaningful change. This responsibility to build moral character and inculcate active social responsibility distinguishes the student experience at all land-grant universities, and certainly at Auburn University.”

For the purposes of this category, teaching is defined to be post-secondary teaching. Teaching is typically a major component of a faculty member’s workload allocation in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching (C&T). Demonstrated excellence in teaching is essential to our mission “to enable all teacher faculty and teachers to understand, utilize, communicate, and appreciate the teaching profession in the world today and view themselves as part of that global community. It is the mission of the department to provide teachers with the knowledge and skills to enhance learning among student populations characterized by diversity of individual learning needs, gender, ethnicity, culture, language, and socio-economic status.”

Research-based teaching practices are central to C&T’s mission. Auburn University faculty may demonstrate quality teaching activity through meaningful integration of pedagogy, applied content knowledge, and scholarship through activities such as classroom instruction, advising undergraduate students’ degree progression, advising graduate students, and supervising their research, developing and maintaining productive field-experience partnerships with P-12 schools, as well as a variety of teaching-focused professional activities.

A candidate is not required to develop a national/international reputation in teaching (external reputation), although teaching may contribute to that national reputation. Moreover, a candidate cannot be promoted to Associate Professor or Professor without demonstrating strong teaching in the department (internal reputation).

Distinction in Teaching

1. Assistant to Associate Professor in Curriculum and Teaching

Candidates demonstrate teaching distinction for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor by disseminating impactful scholarship related to teaching, with an *emphasis on peer-reviewed outlets*. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate how their professional record in teaching offers evidence of an *emerging national/international reputation*. All criteria for acceptable teaching (below) must also be met.

Candidates demonstrate acceptable teaching levels in departmental teaching by providing *strong, consistent evidence over time* of teaching effectiveness in their classes.

2. Associate to Full Professor in Curriculum and Teaching

Candidates demonstrate teaching distinction for promotion from associate professor to professor by disseminating impactful scholarship related to teaching, with an *emphasis on peer-reviewed outlets*. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate how their professional record in teaching offers evidence of an *established national/international reputation*. All criteria for acceptable teaching (below) must also be met.

Candidates demonstrate acceptable teaching levels in departmental teaching by providing *strong, consistent evidence over time* of teaching effectiveness in their classes.

Evaluating Teaching

A faculty member's workload allocation for teaching should be a component of the evaluation of a candidate's dossier. The candidates' one-page teaching narrative in the vitae should describe their teaching philosophy and impact. A candidate building a case for an emerging or established reputation that includes teaching should highlight peer-reviewed outlets that bolster their argument.

The following are ways that candidates can demonstrate the value and impact of their teaching work, or ways other professionals recognize the value and/or impact of their work. Publishing and presenting your work in collegiate teaching can enhance your national/international reputation in teaching. [Note: publishing and presenting your work related to P-12 teaching could be included in research or outreach, depending on the venue and audience, but should not be included in this category.]

Categories of Teaching Work

- a. Actual courses taught for each semester of the past three years.** Indicate lecture/lab hours per week and enrollment.

- b. Graduate students whose work has been completed.** Indicate degree awarded to the student, year, and, if known, position now held by the student; indicate whether the candidate was the major professor or a committee member.
- c. Graduate students on whose committee the candidate is presently serving.** Indicate whether the candidate is the major professor or a committee member. Indicate the degree the student is working for and the work that the candidate has done.
- d. Courses and curricula developed.**
- Creating new programs to meet constituency or innovate practice changes.
 - Initiating and developing new distance programs.
 - Initiating and leading a program's redesign to include innovative shifts and/or approaches that reflect changes in the pedagogical, philosophical, content-specific knowledge (etc.) in the candidate's field.
 - Designing or redesigning courses to meet innovative shifts and/or approaches that reflect changes in the pedagogical, philosophical, content-specific knowledge (etc.) in the candidate's field.
 - Description of unique and sustained field experience programs candidate developed.
 - Description of courses for university students taught at a P-12 school site over a sustained period of time.
 - Creating, leading, and maintaining unique field-related experiences in P-12 schools or other education or education-related settings.
 - Providing significant support as part of a team in unique field-related experiences in P-12 schools or other education or education-related settings.
 - The candidate may provide evidence about other curricular work they do that supports the value of their teaching.
- e. Grants received related to teaching.** Note these grants should be cross-listed in Awards, Research, or Outreach. The following activities are particularly valued:
- Leading (P.I. or Co-P.I.) a team or demonstrating a substantial contribution to grant/funded proposals related to teaching.
 - Serving as single P.I. on grant/funding proposals related to teaching.
 - Securing funding through AU programs (e.g., Tiger Giving Day, Development Office funding, etc.) that support teaching.
 - Securing other external funding directly related to a faculty member's teaching work.
- f. Publications pertaining to teaching.** Note these publications should be cross-listed in Research and/or Outreach Publications.

- **Books.** Authoring a disciplinary book with a quality publisher that focuses on teaching can be a major accomplishment in scholarship. Editing a book or monograph can also be a significant accomplishment, depending on the publisher and content.
- **Article-length publications.** The following article-length publications related to teaching are valued by the department. This list is not exhaustive.
 - **Chapters in a Book or Monograph.** A chapter in a high-quality disciplinary book focused on teaching is valued. Chapters in practitioner books are valued depending upon the scope of the audience and quality of publisher or organization.
 - **Journal Articles.** Potential peer review journal venues vary by discipline. A candidate may publish in a journal of a related discipline and/or have an interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary focus. International and national journals are valued more than regional and local journals. Top-tier journals in a field are valued more than non-premier ones. While publications in peer-reviewed research journals are essential in demonstrating one's progress in the area of research, peer-reviewed articles in respected practitioner journals that are based on one's research and/or post-secondary teaching practices can also demonstrate progress.
 - **Proceedings.** Some conferences focusing on teaching may have refereed published proceedings. Conference venues are valued differently by discipline. Vitae should indicate if the conference is peer reviewed. Acceptance rates and length of the document may indicate value.
- g. Other contributions to teaching.** An additional list of potential ways to demonstrate the value of the candidate's teaching work is included below. Note that the areas listed are examples of ways candidates can demonstrate the value of their teaching work and are not the only ways a candidate can demonstrate value in their teaching work.
 - Summary of course evaluations.
 - Quotes from student evaluative letters demonstrating teaching impact.
 - Quotes from peer evaluations documenting a candidate's innovative classroom or teaching-related practices, research-supported approaches, teaching effectiveness, etc.
 - Mentoring and/or teaching awards or other recognition related to working with/teaching undergraduate and/or graduate students.
 - Student publications, professional presentations, accomplishments, awards, completed degrees, employment data, etc. particularly when a candidate has provided special mentoring beyond normal teaching activities.
 - Graduate student supervision and/or advising, graduate teaching assistant supervision, graduate research assistant supervision.

- A sustained record of supervising and/or mentoring graduate students':
 - theses, field projects, dissertations (with specific emphasis on ensuring students graduate in a timely manner);
 - peer reviewed publications, and/or
 - peer reviewed presentations, workshops, posters (etc.) in regional, national, and/or international conferences.
- Mentored graduate students receiving awards (e.g., distinguished dissertation award)
- Work with graduate students beyond the department (e.g., serving on doctoral committees outside of the department).
- In-service workshops focused on improving post-secondary teaching (e.g., presenting at state or national conferences focused on improving teacher education, presenting research-based updates or new approaches for teaching in the candidate's specific content areas, etc.).
- Peer-reviewed presentations or posters focused on innovative post-secondary teaching and learning approaches that reach a broader audience with demonstrated impact.
- Social media or other online discussion groups (e.g., podcasts, webinars, etc.) on post-secondary teaching practices that demonstrates professionals are discussing innovative, successful post-secondary teaching practices, that center on essential questions in the candidate's content area(s), etc. Ways to demonstrate impact for this kind of work could include showing that an online discussion included a considerable amount of written feedback to participants' questions and comments. Demonstrating impact is critical.

B. Research/Creative Work

According to the Auburn Faculty Handbook 3.6.1.B. "A faculty member engaged in research/creative work has an obligation to contribute to their discipline through applied and/or basic research, through creative endeavors, or through interpretive scholarship. To a large extent, each discipline and each department must determine how much and what quality of research/creative work is appropriate for promotion (and/or tenure) and judge its candidates accordingly. In appraising the candidate's work, faculty members should consider the quality and significance of the work, the quality of the outlet for publication or exhibition, and, in cases of collaborative work, the role of the candidate."

In the Department of Curriculum and Teaching, research is a required, although perhaps not the only, component of a candidate's national/international reputation. Moreover, a candidate cannot be promoted to Associate Professor or Professor without demonstrating an acceptable record in research.

Distinction in Research/Creative Work

1. *Assistant to Associate Professor in Curriculum and Teaching*

Distinction in research is demonstrated by an emerging national/international reputation, indicating a sustained and distinct body of work investigating a distinct line of inquiry in the candidate's professional field. The department will value both the quality and quantity of the candidate's work. The candidate should demonstrate continuous research productivity. The total body of work submitted as part of the tenure and/or promotion process may include research completed prior to the Auburn University appointment. The faculty member has the responsibility to convey the impact of the research they are pursuing.

An acceptable level of achievement in research indicates a body of work investigating a distinct line of inquiry in the candidate's professional field. The candidate should demonstrate general research productivity. The body of work submitted as part of the tenure and/or promotion process may include research completed prior to the Auburn University appointment. The faculty member has the responsibility to convey the impact of the research they are pursuing.

2. *Associate to Professor in Curriculum and Teaching*

Distinction in research is demonstrated by a recognized national/international reputation, indicating a distinct line of inquiry in the candidate's professional field. The candidate should demonstrate advanced productivity that demonstrates growth as a researcher in one's field. The total body of work submitted as part of promotion process may include research completed prior to the Auburn University appointment. The faculty member has the responsibility to convey the impact of the research they are pursuing.

An acceptable level of achievement in research indicates a body of work investigating a line of inquiry in the candidate's professional field. The candidate should demonstrate general research productivity. The body of work submitted as part of the promotion process may include research completed prior to the Auburn University appointment. The faculty member has the responsibility to convey the impact of the research they are pursuing.

Evaluating Research/Creative Work

The Department of Curriculum and Teaching disciplines are varied and encompass different types of scholarship in research/creative work. Faculty members' work will be evaluated regarding the significance of their work and productivity for areas within each of the following categories, which reflect the expectations of Auburn University's Curriculum and Teaching Department. Candidates should situate their work within the standards of their field.

When going up for promotion, a candidate is required to include a document in their dossier explaining the reputation and scope of each venue in which they disseminate their work. This should include readership, acceptance rates, reputation of the venue, citation indices and/or impact factors. If any of these metrics are not available for leading journals in the candidate's field, it is up to the candidate to make the case for the value of the venue.

The candidates' one-page research narrative in the vitae should describe the significance of their research/creative work and how it is moving them toward distinction at their appropriate professional level.

Categories of Research/Creative Work

Candidates can draw upon the following sources of evidence in making their case for distinction in the area of research.

Peer-reviewed publications are most valued in the research/creative work category. This may include electronic publications. Demonstrating the degree of authorship contribution is a significant factor in determining value of research activities. For example, sole author or lead author is valued more than a less significant contribution. Stating the percentage of the author's contribution is required in the vitae. Publishing with students is valued both as an effort to increase research quality and demonstrate research mentorship with students. Creative works (d & e below) should likewise demonstrate significance and impact.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence about the quality and impact of research venues in which they have published.

- a. Books.** Authoring a disciplinary book with a quality publisher on a research subject can be a major accomplishment in scholarship. Editing a book or monograph can also be a significant accomplishment, depending on the publisher and content.
- b. Article-length publications.** The following article-length publications are often included by faculty in the department. This list is not exhaustive.
 - **Chapters in a Book or Monograph.** A chapter in a high-quality disciplinary book on research is valued. Chapters in practitioner books are valued depending upon the scope of the audience and quality of publisher or organization.
 - **Journal Articles.** Potential peer review journal venues vary by discipline. A candidate may publish in a journal of a related discipline and/or have an interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary focus. International and national journals are valued more than regional and local journals. Top-tier journals in a field are valued more than non-premier ones. While publications in peer-reviewed research journals are essential in demonstrating one's progress in the area of research, peer-reviewed articles in respected practitioner journals that are based on one's research can also demonstrate progress.
 - **Proceedings.** Some conferences may have refereed published proceedings. Conference venues are valued differently by discipline. Vitae should indicate if the conference is peer reviewed. Acceptance rates and length of the document may indicate value.
- c. Papers or lectures.**
 - **Papers at professional meetings.** Candidates should determine the categories of their presentations according to their field. Value of presentations will be weighted by authorship, acceptance rates, and size and scope of audience, e.g.,

international, national, regional, etc.

- **Invited lectures.** Invitation to speak or present can indicate level of expertise in the discipline. Scope of audience for the speech should be explained (e.g., plenary to entire conference, panel, break-out session, etc.)
 - **Workshops.** Invitation to lead a workshop for colleagues or teachers based on research can indicate a level of expertise in the discipline. Value depends upon the external audience and venue.
- d. Exhibitions.** Exhibitions are not typically a part of the work of our department, but if a candidate contributes to a scholarly product that leads to an exhibition, they should describe its alignment to their research agenda and offer evidence of the product's impact.
- e. Performances.** Faculty in some areas may include performances. If a candidate contributes to a scholarly product that leads to a performance, they should describe its alignment to their research agenda and offer evidence of the product's impact.
- f. Patents and inventions** are not typically a part of the work of our department, but if a candidate contributes to a scholarly product that leads to a patent/invention they should describe its alignment to their research agenda and offer evidence of the product's impact.
- g. Other research/creative contributions.** Faculty members can include a range of other contributions related to research that can add to the case for distinction. The following is a non-exhaustive list:
- **Technical Report.** The broader the external audience and impact, the higher the value
 - **Professional Commentary or Blogs** can be written at the local, state, national, and international levels. Faculty can show the impact and reach of the blog by the readership, whether the opportunity was invited or a call for proposals, and where the media is housed and by whom.
 - **Podcasts and Webinars** can be presented at the local, state, national, and international levels. Faculty can show the impact and reach of the media by the number of attendees, whether the opportunity was invited or a call for proposals, and where the media is housed and by whom.
 - **Editorials** can be written at the local, state, national, and international levels. Faculty can show the impact and reach of the editorial by the readership, whether the opportunity was invited, and where the editorial is housed and by whom.
- h. Grants and contracts.** This section focuses only on external grants and contracts. As stated in the Faculty Handbook, note all co-authors, identifying the principal investigator and the involvement of the candidate; indicate funding source and amount. Distinguish between grants received and grants applied for but not funded. The quality of the granting agency as valued by the candidate's discipline or by other disciplines if the work is inter-disciplinary, as well as the acceptance rate, if

known adds to its significance. The level of contribution also adds to its significance, particularly Principal Investigator or Co-Principal Investigator. The amount of funding can also add to its significance. Evidence of attainment of intellectual property rights including patents, copyright, licenses, or inventions is also considered evidence of external support.

Description of candidate's scholarly program.

The candidate should describe in one page the focus and impact of their scholarly work, highlighting related awards and research accomplishments. Works in progress and the candidates' research trajectory should also be included.

C. Outreach

As identified in the [AU Faculty Handbook](#), Chapter 3.6.1.C, outreach refers to “the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of **external audiences** in support of university and unit missions” (Chapter 3-58). Given the often blurred boundaries with other aspects of a faculty member’s academic mission, close attention should be paid to the following criteria for an activity to count as outreach: “(1) there is a substantive link with significant human needs and societal problems, issues, or concerns; (2) there is a direct application of knowledge to significant human needs and societal problems, issues, or concerns; (3) there is utilization of the faculty member’s academic and professional expertise; (4) the ultimate purpose is for the public or common good; (5) new knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele; and (6) there is a clear link/relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit’s mission” (Chapter 3-58).

The Department of Curriculum and Teaching (C&T) has a strong history of outreach. While outreach is typically a part of the load for C&T faculty, outreach is not required of all Auburn University faculty members, and the evaluation of outreach should depend on the negotiated level of effort in the faculty member’s workload. Typical audiences for C&T faculty members include PK-12 school personnel (teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals), PK-12 students, families of PK-12 students, business and industry professionals, and the general public.

In addition to the AU Faculty Handbook, which is the primary resource regarding the definition and assessment of outreach activities, “Outreach Scholarship: An Assessment Model,” found on p. 77 of [University Outreach: University Connections to Society](#) may provide useful insights, along with other publications in the "[Outreach Publications](#)" section of the Auburn University web site.

A candidate is not required to develop a national/international reputation in outreach (external reputation), although outreach can contribute to that national reputation. Moreover, a candidate cannot be promoted to Associate Professor or Professor without demonstrating contributions in the area of outreach (internal reputation).

Distinction in Outreach

1. Assistant to Associate Professor in Curriculum and Teaching

Candidates demonstrate distinction in outreach for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor by establishing a coherent program of outreach aimed at

specific outcomes that demonstrate impact and emerging national/international reputation. This national/international reputation can most easily be demonstrated by disseminating impactful scholarship related to outreach, with an emphasis on peer-reviewed outlets. In addition, establishing relationships with stakeholders, invited professional development initiatives, invited presentations on the outreach program, and funded projects can also contribute to a candidate's national/international reputation. This program should be connected to other aspects of the faculty member's academic work. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate how their professional record in outreach offers evidence of an emerging national/international reputation.

Candidates demonstrate acceptable levels in service for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor by engaging in a number of outreach activities and demonstrating evidence of an emerging program of outreach. This level may include relationship building with potential partners, professional development initiatives, or professional presentations/publications.

2. Associate to Full Professor in Curriculum and Teaching

Candidates demonstrate distinction in outreach for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor by establishing a long-term, coherent program of outreach aimed at specific outcomes at local, state, regional, national, and/or international levels that demonstrate an *established national reputation*. This national reputation can most easily be demonstrated by disseminating impactful scholarship related to outreach, with an emphasis on peer-reviewed outlets, as well as establishing relationships with stakeholders, invited professional development initiatives, invited presentations on the outreach program, and funded projects. This program should be connected to other aspects of the faculty member's academic work. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate how their professional record in outreach offers evidence of an *established national/international reputation*.

Candidates demonstrate acceptable levels in outreach for promotion from associate professor to full professor by establishing a record of meaningful outreach activities that demonstrate positive impact at local, regional, national, or international levels. Impact can be demonstrated in a variety of ways, such as established relationships with stakeholders, invited professional development initiatives, or peer reviewed professional presentations/publications. Typically, this program will be connected to other aspects of the faculty member's academic work.

Evaluating Outreach Work

A faculty member's workload allocation for outreach should be a component of the evaluation of a candidate's dossier. As outlined in Chapter Section 3.6.5-C-(2)-3 of the AU Faculty Handbook, documentation of outreach should include a description of outreach programs -- "set(s) of activities that share a common focus and depend upon a particular expertise" -- as well as particular outreach activities and products. Thus, overall progress in outreach is determined by progress in developing program(s) of outreach as documented in the particular outreach activities and products.

Defining outreach is very dependent upon the audience. For example, an effort to improve instruction in a P-12 environment through professional development is an example of outreach because it addresses an external audience. [Note: Presentations or publications on post-secondary teaching are considered part of the Teaching category.]

Overall progress in developing a coherent and sustained program of outreach will be assessed based on the commentary provided in the CV and the criteria above.

Examples of Outreach Programs

Curriculum and Teaching faculty may engage in a range of systematic, sustained efforts to impact an external audience. Such projects may include but are not limited to:

- a. A long-term professional development initiative with a school, school district, or other institution.
- b. An after-school or summer program in a school or informal setting.
- c. A series of activities meant to engage with the local community.

Curriculum and Teaching faculty may play a range of roles within these projects, such as development and planning, management, implementation, and/or evaluation. The broader the external audience and impact, the higher the potential for Distinction. The duration and intensity of the project and the value that outside constituencies ascribe to it, including peers at other institutions and funding agencies will also help to determine the level of distinction the outreach merits.

Demonstrating Impact

The following evidence might be included in your commentary to help document the impact of a program of outreach.

- a. **Outreach/extension impact**—documentation of “changes in practice,” including formal and informal reports of impact based on data collection
- b. **Outreach/extension awards**—state, regional national, and international levels
- c. **Other forms of recognition** for outreach/extension, such as stakeholder letters

Activities and Products

There are multiple ways to demonstrate an established and on-going outreach agenda. The following artifacts may be presented as examples of evidence of the development of a program of outreach in a coherent description of the outreach program in the narrative. The numbering corresponds to the categories included in the AU Faculty Handbook.

- a. **Instructional activities.** Several audiences may typically be considered in this category:
 - **Professional clientele** (e.g., presentations, workshops, sustained professional development programs, video conferencing, web-based modules, etc.). The duration and intensity of the PD and the value that outside constituencies ascribe to it, including peers at other institutions and

funding agencies, will be considered.

- **Lay clientele** (e.g., presentations, workshops, etc.). The duration and intensity of the professional development and the value that outside constituencies ascribe to it, including participants/recipients, peers at other institutions, and funding agencies, will be considered.
 - **Continuing education workshops.** The duration and intensity of the professional development and the value that outside constituencies ascribe to it, including participants/recipients, peers at other institutions, and funding agencies, will be considered.
 - **Pk-12 students.** For example, conducting a clinic, honor choir/band/orchestra, working directly with P-12 students, etc.
- b. Technical assistance.** This category includes outreach/extension consultancies and technical assistance (i.e., school systems, State Departments of Education, educational agencies). The breadth of the external audience and impact will be considered.
- c. Outreach scholarship.** Note this scholarship should be cross-listed in Research and/or Teaching Scholarship as appropriate.
- **Books (including published manuals and reports).** Book- or monograph-length documentation of outreach program. Author, co-author, or editor of book- or monograph-length publication documenting outreach program (e.g., design, implementation, impact, etc.). Scholarship and publishing outlet may be considered for evaluation purposes.
 - **Article-length publications.**
 - *Articles in peer reviewed practitioner journals.* Being the sole author or equal co-author of an article is valued more than lesser contributions. Peer reviewed publications and publications in reputable refereed journals with national editorial boards in a field are valued more than publications in lower-level journals.
 - *Invited articles in practitioner journals.* Publications in reputable refereed journals with national editorial boards in a field are valued more than publications in lower-level journals. Sole author or equal co-author (or lead author) is valued more than subsequent author among multiple authors. The significance of invited publications will be determined by the level of the journal.
 - **Papers, and lectures.**
 - *Professional presentations at state, regional, national, and international conferences.* Potential conference venues vary by discipline. The conference “Request for Proposals” (RFP) should indicate if the conference is peer reviewed. Acceptance rates may indicate difficulty of endeavor. Peer reviewed conference presentations at venues with low acceptance rates are valued over ones with high

acceptance rates. Acceptance rates may indicate that a regional venue is equally valued to an international or national venue.

- **Electronic products:** This might include computer programs, websites, blogs, and social media engagement along one's area of expertise. The breadth of the external audience will be considered, as well as levels of engagement with the product.
- **Other outreach products:** videos, books, blogs, etc. The breadth of the external audience will be considered. Examples include: YouTube videos for a general audience about one's area of expertise, invited or produced podcast episodes or series documenting outreach program, educational displays in museums, educational institutions, or other public spaces, or a book to help an external audience with your content area.
- **Copyrights, patents, and inventions.** This is not typically an area of focus in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching. However, examples might include books or curricula aligned with one's area of expertise. The breadth of the external audience will be considered.

d. **Contracts, grants, and gifts**

- **Proposals for contracts and grants submitted related to outreach.** Documented submission of contracts and grants can contribute to a candidate's national/international reputation. The amount of requested funding and scope of the project should be considered when assessing the merit of the achievement.
- **Contracts, grants, and gifts awarded related to outreach.** Awarded funding from agencies, university and college grant awards, and other relevant awards can contribute to a candidate's national/international reputation. The amount of funding and scope of the project should be considered when assessing the merit of the achievement. The narrative should be explicit about how any contract, grant, or gift funding activity is related to a specific Outreach agenda.

- e. **Other Outreach Activities.** NOTE: There are multiple ways to demonstrate engagement and impact in outreach incorporating evidence from any or all of the activities and products. However, evaluation of distinction follows the criteria outlined in Section A above.

D. **Service**

According to the AU Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3.6.1.D, service includes "(a) participating in departmental, college or school, and University governance and committee work; (b) assisting in the recruitment of new faculty; and (c) developing and assisting in the implementation of new academic programs" (p. 59). According to Chapter 3.6.5-C-(2)-4, "[a]administrative work that reduces the candidate's teaching or research assignment should be listed here" (p. 66). Service to the faculty member's profession, including "[s]ervice to professional associations and learned societies," is also included.

In the Department of Curriculum and Teaching (C&T), service contributions relate to the shared governance within the Department, College, and the University, as well as external educational and professional organizations. Typically, all faculty in C & T have some percentage of their workload allocated to service. The evaluation of service should depend on the negotiated level of effort in the faculty member's workload.

A candidate is not required to develop a national/international reputation in service (external reputation), although service can contribute to that national reputation. Moreover, a candidate cannot be promoted to Associate Professor or Professor without demonstrating acceptable service to the department and profession (internal reputation).

Distinction in Service

1. Assistant to Associate Professor in Curriculum and Teaching

Candidates demonstrate distinction in service for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor by establishing *an emerging national/international reputation of service to the profession*. A national/international reputation can most easily be demonstrated through service to national and/or international societies, committees, advisory boards, and other initiatives that are connected to the faculty member's academic work. Dissemination of scholarship related to service activities may also contribute to that national reputation, with an emphasis on peer-reviewed outlets. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate how their professional record in service offers evidence of an *emerging national/international reputation*.

Candidates demonstrate acceptable levels in service by meaningfully engaging in university, college, departmental and/or professional service activities.

2. Associate to Full Professor in Curriculum and Teaching

Candidates demonstrate distinction in service for promotion from associate professor to professor by establishing *an established national/international reputation of service to the profession*. A national/international reputation can most easily be demonstrated through service to national and/or international societies, committees, advisory boards, and other initiatives that are connected to the faculty member's academic work. Dissemination of scholarship related to service activities may also contribute to that national reputation, with an emphasis on peer-reviewed outlets. It is the responsibility of the candidate to demonstrate how their professional record in service offers evidence of an *emerging national/international reputation*.

Candidates demonstrate acceptable levels in service by meaningfully engaging in university, college, departmental and/or professional service activities.

Evaluating Service Work

All service activities should be documented in the CV or dossier, with a brief description of those representing significant service to the profession. Service activities should contribute to the needs of the department, college, university, local community and state, and profession.

Given that opportunities for service may vary over time, an acceptable level of service at any rank includes engagement in university, college, departmental and/or professional

service activities. While service cannot be the sole basis for demonstrating distinction, it can provide additional support for distinction in other areas, such as research or outreach, by demonstrating meaningful, influential impact in a variety of university and/or professional service activities.

Categories of Service Work

Typical examples that may be included in the evaluation of service in C&T follow.

- a. **University service.** Service to the university can occur at the departmental, college, and/or university-wide levels.
 - **Departmental-level service**
 - **Committees.** Serving in a leadership role (e.g., committee chair) or other documented evidence of outstanding contributions to the committee may demonstrate a higher level of impact.
 - **Student recruitment.** Documented evidence of outstanding and/ or innovative contributions to recruiting may demonstrate a higher level of impact.
 - **Faculty recruitment.** Documented evidence of outstanding and/ or innovative contributions to recruiting may demonstrate a higher level of impact.
 - **Program coordination.** Documented evidence of outstanding and/ or innovative contributions as Program Coordinator may demonstrate a higher level of impact.
 - **Graduate program officer.** Documented evidence of outstanding and/or innovative contributions as Graduate Program Officer may demonstrate a higher level of impact.
 - **Peer review of teaching.** Faculty may review one another's teaching and write a letter that gets added to their dossier.
 - **Mentoring faculty.** This includes informal mentoring, serving on a mentoring committee, or chairing a mentoring committee. Successful service as chair may demonstrate a higher level of impact.
 - **Other departmental-level service.** Other significant contributions to supporting the work of the department and/or program.
 - **College-level service**
 - **Committees.** Serving in a leadership role (e.g., committee chair) or other documented evidence of outstanding contributions may demonstrate a higher level of impact.
 - **Advisor to student organization.** Documented evidence of outstanding and/ or innovative contributions may demonstrate a higher level of impact.
 - **Work on accreditation documentation (e.g., SACS, CIEP, SPA, etc.).**

Documented evidence of outstanding and/ or innovative contributions may demonstrate a higher level of impact.

- **University-level service**

- **Committees.** Serving in a leadership role (e.g., committee chair) or other documented evidence of outstanding contributions to the committee may demonstrate a higher level of impact.
- **Other university-level service.** The assessment of impact depends on the extent and significance of the work.

- b. **Examples of Professional Service**

- **Holding office.** The reach of the organization (including membership and whether it is local, state, regional, or national) and its prominence within the field, as well as the office held, contribute to the assessment of the level of impact.
- **Committee work.** The reach of the organization (including membership and whether it is local, state, regional, or national) and its prominence within the field contribute to the assessment of the level of impact.
- **Scholarly reviewer** (e.g., manuscripts, textbooks, grants, and conference proposals). Reviewing for international and national venues may demonstrate more impact than regional and local venues. Reviewing for top-tier refereed journals with national editorial boards in a field may demonstrate a higher level of impact. Likewise, reviewing for national or international conferences may demonstrate more impact than regional and local conferences.
- **Editorships and/ or editorial boards.** Serving on the editorial board of international and national journals may demonstrate more impact than regional and local journals, and top-tier refereed journals with national editorial boards in a field may demonstrate a higher level of impact.
- **External reviewer of candidates for promotion and tenure.** Serving as a formal external reviewer for a candidate for promotion and tenure at another institution represents significant impact.
- **Member of discipline-related advisory boards.** The broader the external audience and impact the higher the level of impact.
- **Formal mentoring of colleagues external to the university.** Assisting peers in research and publication may demonstrate a higher level of impact.
- **Other service to the profession.** Roles not included above that promote the profession, as demonstrated in the candidate's narrative.

**Department of Curriculum and Teaching | College of
Education Procedures for Promotion and Tenure, Third-Year
Reappointment, and Faculty Annual Review**

I. Introduction

The Department of Curriculum and Teaching has established the following procedural guidelines to help faculty plan for promotion and tenure candidacy, mandatory-third year review, and annual faculty review.

II. Promotion and Tenure Procedures

Following the Provost's call for recommendations of candidates for promotion and/or tenure during the spring semester, the department head will develop and release a timeline for the P&T submission and review to the department faculty. All dossiers as well as department and department head letters should be submitted to the Dean no later than 40 working days before they are due to the Provost. The department head is to inform the Dean's office in writing by July 1 of faculty intending to apply for promotion and tenure.

A. Dossier Development for Promotion and Tenure

After initiating the process, the candidate prepares the dossier for promotion and tenure or for promotion following the format described in the [AU Faculty Handbook](#). The candidate may also prepare supplemental materials designed to illustrate their accomplishments in greater depth for use in the internal and external reviews.

All materials prepared for the promotion and tenure process or for promotion are confidential and should only be used by C&T administrators, by tenured faculty in the department, and by external reviewers. In accordance with Auburn University Faculty Handbook guidelines, the candidate will have access to all written letters with the exception of the external reviews. Dossier materials should not be copied and/or distributed to anyone beyond those faculty members who are eligible to vote on the candidate.

B. External Reviewers

C&T requires external review by evaluators for all faculty members seeking promotion and tenure or seeking promotion regardless of rank. The list of external reviewers should be provided by the candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure to the department head. Tenured faculty should be consulted regarding the list of recommended reviewers. The department head chooses from the list and any additional recommendations from the tenured faculty when soliciting outside reviewers. See the [Auburn University Faculty Handbook](#), for a detailed description of procedures for selection of external evaluators.

C. Internal Review by Departmental Faculty

The department head will coordinate with the candidate to establish deadlines for the submission of required materials, to schedule the candidate's presentation to the departmental faculty when applicable, and to schedule a meeting of the voting faculty. See the [Auburn University Faculty Handbook](#), for a complete description of the procedures for promotion and tenure. An overview of the procedures for internal review follows:

1. *Departmental Dossier Review*

The candidate will provide the department head with electronic copies of the dossier in the required format and with any supplemental materials. The department head will make dossier and supplementary material available to the eligible voting faculty. The candidate's dossier is a confidential document that is to be maintained in a secure location. The Auburn University Faculty Handbook and this document should be the points of reference for the process of internal review.

2. *Departmental Meeting and Faculty Vote*

The department head will schedule a meeting of all eligible voting faculty to discuss and vote upon the candidate's credentials related to promotion and/or tenure. In accordance with the [Auburn University Faculty Handbook](#) candidates, "if they so wish," can make a presentation of their credentials and respond to questions for the first part of the meeting. The department head will then facilitate the deliberation and secret ballot vote on the candidate.

If a candidate is under consideration for tenure and promotion, then separate votes for tenure and promotion must be taken and recorded. In such a case, the promotion vote shall come first. If an eligible voting faculty member cannot attend the meeting, but intends to vote on the candidate's application, that faculty member is responsible for sending the vote in a sealed envelope in advance of the meeting to the department head. Vote counting should not begin until the ballots of all faculty members in attendance and all votes from absent and voting faculty are submitted to the meeting chair. Except in highly unusual circumstances, a tenure-track candidate for associate professor should not be granted tenure without promotion. However, recommendation for promotion at this level does not necessarily entail recommendation for tenure since the criteria for tenure, which include collegiality, are more exacting than the criteria for promotion.

Per the faculty handbook, the department head shall not vote at the departmental level. Faculty serving on committees at a college- or university-level may vote at the department-level, but can only vote once. Immediate family members should recuse themselves from all deliberation and voting on promotion and tenure matters.

3. *Departmental Letters*

A designated faculty member will prepare a draft letter that summarizes the department's discussion and reports the final vote. The voting faculty will sign that they have reviewed this letter. The department head will also provide a letter with a written evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee via the Dean. The letter should provide additional information relative to workload and other relevant conditions of the faculty member's appointment. Most importantly, the letter should clearly indicate the department head's recommendation regarding the candidate's tenure and/or promotion. Individual faculty members may also submit letters to the department head explaining their support or lack of support for the candidate's promotion and/or tenure. All departmental letters will be made available to the candidate, who has the right to submit a rebuttal.

The candidate's dossier is due to the Dean's office by the date designated by the Dean. Once the department head submits the candidate's complete dossier (including all letters and any rebuttals from the candidate) to the Dean's office, no additional documents from the departmental level may be added.

4. *Communication to Candidate*

"The department head shall communicate the department's vote to the candidate and make available to the candidate all letters submitted by the committee, the department head, and individual faculty members. After reviewing the letters, the candidate has five working days to write a rebuttal if desired. The candidate can also make an informed decision about whether to continue with the process of seeking promotion and/or tenure. If the candidate wishes to continue the process despite a negative recommendation, the department head and Dean shall honor the candidate's request."

D. *Dean Recommendation and Submission to the Office of the Provost*

The Dean will review all available materials after the process of faculty deliberation, the external reviews, and the department head's recommendation. The Dean will provide a letter with a written evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. It should indicate a recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion. The letter is placed in the candidate's dossier prior to forwarding to the Provost's office. The full dossier will be submitted to the Office of the Provost by the designated deadline.

III. *Review Procedures for Probationary Faculty and Faculty Annual Review Process*

The Faculty Annual Review procedures described in the following sections are part of an ongoing departmental process that occurs across the academic year.

Professional development opportunities (such as departmental mentoring committees and the peer review of teaching), individual faculty meetings with the department head at least once a year, and an annual review of probationary faculty by tenured faculty are essential components of this process. All procedures within the Department of Curriculum and Teaching are intended to comply fully with Auburn University policies and guidelines as stipulated in the [Auburn Faculty Handbook](#).

According to the Auburn University Faculty Handbook, “All department heads/chairs or unit heads shall conduct at least one annual review before April 30 with each faculty member to evaluate his or her performance and to discuss his or her future development.” Teaching, research, outreach, service, and collegiality are addressed as part of the annual assessment of faculty and for promotion and/or tenure applications. The annual assessment process takes into account yearly faculty activity and considers the yearly contribution in the larger context of the faculty member’s body of work. Specific teaching, research, outreach, and service goals are reviewed and revised every year for each faculty member.

A. General Guidelines and Submission of Review Materials (due January 31st)

By January 31st, each faculty member submits Faculty Annual Review Template (see Appendix A) to the department head. The template comprises 3 parts:

Part 1. Accomplishments in Teaching, Research, Outreach, Service for the year of review

Part 2. Personal Statement (not to exceed 1000 words) that includes a self-assessment.

Part 3. An up-to-date curriculum vitae.

A. Tenured Faculty Review of Probationary Faculty (February to April)

Probationary faculty and non-tenured track faculty also participate in an annual review by their tenured colleagues in the department. Associate professors who intend to apply for promotion to professor may also choose to have their dossiers reviewed by the full professors in the department. Approximately two weeks prior to the scheduled date of the annual review meeting of tenured faculty, the department head makes available to tenured faculty the dossiers for each faculty member who is to be reviewed.

1. Probationary Faculty Annual Review (mid-February)

Tenured faculty in the department will receive access to the faculty annual review materials for each probationary faculty (not in third-year review) and non-tenured track faculty. The department head will provide an electronic survey asking tenured track faculty to comment on the strengths, and where applicable, areas of growth for each non-tenured faculty member. Pursuant to this meeting and before the faculty annual review (FAR) conference, the department head will provide each reviewee with a written document summarizing comments from tenured faculty.

2. *Third-Year Review (mid-March)*

As described in the [Auburn University Faculty Handbook](#), candidates on tenure-track appointments must be reviewed by their tenured faculty peers in the third year of their fulltime appointment and again when the candidate initiates the process of application for tenure and promotion. Procedures for the third-year review are more exacting and thorough, including a formal ballot, a letter prepared by a faculty representative that reflects the faculty discussion and reports progress and any deficits, and a separate written evaluation prepared by the department head. Both third-year review letters will be sent to the Dean.

The focus of the third-year review is to assess the candidate's progress towards tenure and promotion. The review must be completed before April 30 of the candidate's third academic year (based upon years of full-time service and may include years toward tenure agreed upon at the time of hire). The candidate's department head is responsible for scheduling the candidate's third-year review at the appropriate time. Two weeks prior to the third-year review, the candidate should turn in a current dossier following the format specified by the AU Faculty Handbook for review by the tenured faculty in the department.

The review process may include a presentation by the candidate followed by a discussion by the tenured faculty only. If a tenured faculty member cannot attend the third-year review meeting and would like to vote on the candidate's progress, the vote must be sent in writing in advance of the meeting to the department head or to the unit's tenure and promotion committee chair. Vote counting should not begin until all ballots of those in attendance are turned into the meeting chair. The result of the vote must be announced at the meeting. Third-year review voting records will be retained by the department and reported to the Office of the Provost upon request. After the faculty vote is complete, a faculty representative prepares a letter that reflects the discussion and reports progress and any deficits. The department head prepares a separate written report summarizing the results of the review for the candidate. These written reports will be made available to the candidate, all tenured and higher-ranking faculty in the department, and the Dean.

B. Faculty Annual Review Conference (target early March)

The department head and each faculty member will meet to discuss the faculty member's performance over the review period and workload assignment for the coming academic year.

Before the conference, the department head reviews the current and cumulative contributions and progress of each faculty member in the areas of teaching, research, outreach, service, and collegiality based on the faculty member's specific responsibilities and workload assignment. Faculty members are responsible for providing the information to demonstrate significance or impact of their endeavors, level of engagement, and the context for the activities.

The department head assesses each faculty member's performance in relation to

departmental criteria using the Auburn University performance descriptor scale: Exemplary, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Marginal, or Unacceptable (performance that requires a comprehensive development plan, can trigger post-tenure review as per the Post Tenure Review Policy, or requires a letter of non-continuance). In addition to providing an assessment of performance in each area, the department head also provides an overall assessment of the faculty member's performance using one of the same descriptors.

During the conference, the department head and faculty member will discuss the department head's assessment of the faculty member's performance and the faculty member's professional goals and workload allocation for the next academic year.

C. Written Faculty Annual Review Report (target early March)

Within two weeks of the FAR conference, the department head prepares a written report covering the major points of the conference. The report indicates the faculty member's overall performance level and includes evaluative comments according to the performance descriptors Exemplary, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Marginal, or Unacceptable. The report specifies the faculty member's assignment for the next academic year and may include feedback from the department head regarding the faculty member's professional goals.

The faculty member receives a copy of the report, which must be signed by both the department head and the faculty member and submitted to the Dean's Office. Each faculty member is responsible for signing a copy of the report to indicate that it was received. If the faculty member disagrees with information in the report, then she or he may write a response and append it to the report. One copy of the signed report and response, if applicable, is retained for the faculty member's departmental personnel file and the faculty member also receives a final copy. This report is to remain confidential.

D. Allocation of Time and Effort

C&T faculty workloads are established each year during the annual review process for faculty. The allocation percentage is agreed upon between each faculty member and the department head and ratified by the Dean's Office. Allocations are reevaluated each year during the faculty annual review and will be distributed across the areas of research, teaching, outreach and service. Workload will vary given the responsibilities of the faculty member. Faculty should refer to the College of Education workload guidelines for a description of the default allocations and descriptions of professional responsibilities.

E. Summer Teaching

Summer teaching is not included in the normal workload allocation for faculty on 9-month contract. The C&T standard full-time teaching load (1 FTE) in the summer semester is 9 credit hours teaching courses that meet minimum enrollment, and it is compensated at 1/3 of the 9-month base salary. The Dean must approve variations from this standard.

F. Graduate Faculty

Faculty may be appointed to the Graduate Faculty at Levels 0 or 1 by application. Level 2 appointment requires faculty to meet membership criteria and requires a vote of all Level 2 Graduate Faculty. The Graduate School approves all graduate faculty appointments. See Graduate Faculty Appointment and Reappointment Criteria and Standards in the AU Faculty Handbook and the Department of Curriculum and Teaching *Graduate Faculty Appointment and Reappointment Criteria and Standards* (Appendix B).

Appendices

Appendix A

Faculty Annual Review Template

[Add Year] Accomplishments

**Please do not delete sections. If a section does not apply to your previous year's professional activity, then leave it blank.

PART 1: Accomplishments for the Year

Department: College:

Present Rank: Years Completed in present Rank:

Years in Faculty Service at AU: Years in Faculty Service Elsewhere: _

Graduate Faculty Status:

Date Awarded:

Allocation of Time and Effort:

Teaching	Research	Outreach	Service

Any Departmental Assignments and Responsibilities (e.g., Program Coordinator or Graduate Program Officer)

Teaching [Add Year]

Semester	<u>Course Title</u>	<u>Credit Hours</u>	<u>Number Enrolled</u>	<u>Total SCH</u>

Graduate students completed/graduated during the year:

<u>Student</u>	<u>Degree Awarded</u>	<u>Year Degree Awarded</u>	<u>Current Position</u>	<u>Role</u>

Graduate students on whose committee the candidate is presently serving:

<u>Student</u>	<u>Degree Seeking</u>	<u>Work the candidate has done.</u>	<u>Role</u>

Other Activities/Awards Related to Teaching:**Research[ADD YEAR]****Peer-Reviewed/Refereed Publications (Use most recent APA Style, indicate if it is student co-authored)***Books (if applicable)**Book chapters (if applicable)**Articles (if applicable)**Conference proceedings (if applicable)***Number of Peer-Reviewed/Refereed Publications over the past three years:**

[ADD YEAR]	[ADD YEAR]	[ADD YEAR]	Average # of peer-reviewed publications per year

****If applicable, please include Google Scholar citations for the year (including h-indices), impact factors associated with journal, or other metrics of note:**

Other non-peer reviewed publications (if applicable)**Professional Presentations***International**National**State**Local***[ADD YEAR] Grants and Professional Contracts Submitted and Obtained***Grants/Contracts Funded (if applicable)**Grants/Contracts Not Funded (if applicable)***Other Grants/contracts Ongoing from Previous Years:****Professional Awards Related to Research:****Outreach [ADD YEAR]****Brief description of collective outreach efforts (2-3 sentences)**

Name of Project and Partner(s)	Description of outreach contribution (include funding if relevant)

Other Activities/Awards Related to Outreach:**Service [ADD YEAR]****Current National, State or Local leadership Roles or Committees**

Dates

Role

Current University, College or Department Leadership Roles or Committees

Dates Role

PART 2. A personal statement (not to exceed 1000 words) that includes a self-assessment of the extent to which the reviewee fulfilled his/her duties and achieved goals for the review period and an annual plan indicating workload and professional goals for the next academic year.

Any supporting materials the reviewee wishes to include (e.g., copies of publications).

PART 3. An up-to-date vita

Appendix B

Graduate Faculty Appointment Criteria and Standards

LEVELS OF MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS OF APPOINTMENT

The Curriculum and Teaching Department recognizes three levels of membership within the Graduate Faculty:

Level 0 (3 Years): The instructor may teach at 6000 level and above and serve on master's committees.

Level 1 (7 Years): The faculty member may teach at 6000 level and above, serve on master's and doctoral committees, direct master's theses, and advise master's and doctoral students. In addition, the faculty member may Co-Chair dissertations with a Level 2 faculty member.

Level 2 (7 Years): The faculty member may participate in the activities delineated for Level 1 and chair doctoral dissertations.

CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND PROCEDURES: APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT

Level 0

Initial Appointment: Nominees must have the highest terminal degree commonly awarded in their field (typically the doctorate) and hold the rank of Instructor, Visiting Faculty, or Adjunct.

Procedures: The Department Head will notify candidates to apply for initial appointment. Information to be supplied by the candidate includes current curriculum vitae. Candidates are to access (after obtaining a password from the Graduate School) the Graduate Faculty Approval System (GFAST) and complete the form by entering appropriate supporting information in the fields and uploading their vita.

The Department Head, upon recommendation by the tenured faculty in the program area, will submit application materials to the Graduate School for action by the Dean of the Graduate School. Application should be made prior to assuming teaching responsibilities. There is no faculty vote for this level.

Reappointment: Nominees must have (a) taught a 6000 level or above course, and (b) have an administrative annual review of "meets expectations" or above. Candidates must be recommended for reappointment by the tenured faculty in the program area and the Department Head. Level 0 appointment may be renewed annually upon recommendation of the tenured program faculty for a maximum of five years. Reappointment beyond that five- year period will require a 2/3 vote of the Graduate Level 2 faculty in the department.

Procedures: The Department Head will notify candidates to apply for reappointment. Candidates should submit information of performance at or above a level that satisfies standards for the department. Candidates are to access (after obtaining a password from the Graduate School) the Graduate Faculty Approval System (GFAST) and complete the form by entering appropriate supporting information in the fields and uploading their vita.

The Department Head, upon recommendation by the tenured faculty in the program area, will submit application materials to the Graduate School for action by the Dean of the Graduate School. ***Reappointment only available to NTT not required to seek promotion.**

Level 1

Initial Appointment: Nominees must have the highest terminal degree awarded in their field (typically the doctorate) and hold the rank of Instructor, Visiting Professor, Adjunct, Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor either on a tenure or non-tenure track appointment. Clinical and Research Faculty are eligible for Level 1 appointments. ***Tenure track faculty are required to be appointed to Level 2 prior to applying for Tenure & Promotion.**

Procedures: Upon consultation with program faculty, the Department Head will notify candidates to apply for initial appointment. Candidates are to access (after obtaining a password from the Graduate School) the Graduate Faculty Approval System (GFAST) and complete the form by entering appropriate supporting information in the fields and uploading their vita. Information to be supplied by the candidate includes current curriculum vitae in compliance with that described in the Faculty Handbook. The Department Head will be notified of the application. Application should be made prior to assuming teaching responsibilities.

Reappointment: Nominees must have (a) prior services at Level 1 or higher, and (b) have been active by teaching 6000 level and above AND at least one of the following: a) serving on master's and/or doctoral committees, b) directing master's theses, or c) advising master's and doctoral students. ***NTT may be reappointed to level 1. TT faculty must seek level 2 appointment.**

Procedures: Same as procedures for Level 1 Initial Appointment

Level 2

Initial Appointment: In addition to the criteria for nominees at Level 1, nominees must (1) have at least three years' experience participating regularly in a graduate program in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching or at another institution of higher education, (2) have served on the advisory committee of at least three graduate students, either at Auburn or at another institution of higher education and (3) have demonstrated their ability to engage successfully in scholarship. ***Tenure track faculty are required to be appointed to Level 2 prior to applying for Tenure & Promotion. Level 2 status must be maintained for future promotions.**

In the C&T Department, demonstration of scholarship is evidenced in the following ways:

- a. Candidate must be author or co-author of at least two research articles (major author of at least one of these) published in or accepted for publication in reputable refereed journals.
- b. Candidate must also be author or co-author of a third scholarly contribution, either already published or accepted for publication, such as a) an article related to theory or practice in a refereed journal, b) an article in a refereed proceedings publication, c) an externally funded grant with substantial research component, or d) other significant scholarly works (e.g., books, book chapters, monographs, or multimedia products).

*Note: the third scholarly contribution could also be a third article meeting the criteria listed above in section a.

Procedures: Upon consultation with program faculty, the Department Head will notify candidates to apply for appointment. Candidates are to access (after obtaining a password from the Graduate School) the Graduate Faculty Approval System (GFAST) and complete the form by entering appropriate supporting information in the fields and uploading their vita. Information to be supplied by the candidate includes a) current curriculum vitae in compliance with that described in the Faculty Handbook, and b) typed responses to Department Criteria. The Department Head will be notified of the application, provide documents to Level 2 faculty for review, and facilitate a vote on the candidates' eligibility. If a voting faculty member has a question related to shared documents, they should send their concerns to the Department Head who will address the issue.

Reappointment: Candidates must seek reappointment before or during the last six months of each seven-year term. (Credentials should be made available to faculty two weeks prior to the November or the April meeting of Level 2 members.) Candidates must meet Level 2 initial appointment criteria.

Procedures: Same as procedures for Level 2 Initial Appointment