

TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES & GUIDELINES

College of Education and Professional Studies

7.22.2026

CEPS TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES

Electronic Access Procedures

The College of Education and Professional Studies adheres to the University Promotion and Tenure Policy and Procedures. The procedures explaining electronic access, uploading responsibilities, security roles, file naming, and uploading documents are maintained on the Division of Academic Affairs website at:

<https://www.southalabama.edu/departments/academicaffairs/promotiontenure.html>.

A summary of these guidelines and procedures are provided in this document for each level of review.

Candidate Application Procedures

In addition to the college guidelines, the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines in the Faculty Handbook should be consulted to prepare and organize the Candidate's materials. The Candidate bears the primary responsibility for the presentation of material in support of tenure and/or promotion. For tenure, candidates may include materials produced throughout an academic career. For promotion, candidates should clearly distinguish materials produced before and after the last promotion. Important dates associated with the tenure and/or promotion process are summarized at the end of this document.

Indicators of Merit for Tenure

Tenure decisions are based on the candidate's **ongoing faculty achievements** across their professional career. Reviewers will evaluate the cumulative record of professional achievement in teaching effectiveness, research, scholarship, creative activity, and professional service. Additionally, tenure requires a specific assessment of **collegiality**, which evaluates consistent behaviors showing respect for others and cooperative efforts toward the University's common mission.

Indicators of Merit for Promotion

While promotion also recognizes professional merit and achievement, it specifically requires evidence of substantial research, scholarship, and creative activity since attaining the present rank. Candidates for initial promotion (such as moving from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor) must demonstrate that their high-quality contributions and significant scholarly or creative career have continued and advanced during their time in their current rank.

Inclusion of Prior Service Credit

If a candidate was granted credit for prior full-time service at another institution of higher education, those years and the associated achievements are considered part of the probationary period for both tenure and promotion. For this prior merit to be considered, the initial letter of appointment must explicitly specify the number of years granted (up to a maximum of three years). According to

University policy, if credit is granted toward tenure, the same number of years of credit must also be granted toward promotion.

Summary for Candidates

- **For Tenure:** You should include materials documenting your **entire academic career** and professional growth, as decisions are based on ongoing achievements and cumulative merit.
- **For Promotion:** You must clearly distinguish and highlight accomplishments and evidence of growth **accrued since attaining your current rank**.
- **For Prior Service:** If your appointment letter grants years of credit for service at a previous institution, the accomplishments from those specific years are included in the evaluation for both processes

External Review of Candidates

General Requirements

An external review of the candidate's scholarship is a mandatory component of all applications for tenure and for promotion to the ranks of Associate Professor or Professor. External reviews are not required for promotion to Senior Instructor. For candidates applying for both tenure and promotion simultaneously, the external review for tenure serves to satisfy the requirement for both processes. Obtaining these reviews is the responsibility of the Department Chair in accordance with University policy.

Selection of Reviewers

External reviewers must be professionally competent and qualified to evaluate the candidate's academic credentials and must be recognized scholars in the candidate's field of scholarship. Reviewers must be external to the University and should normally hold a rank **at or above** the rank for which the candidate is being considered.

Individuals who have a conflict of interest, the appearance of one, or whose objectivity may be questioned (such as former teachers, personal friends, or frequent co-workers in research) may not serve as reviewers. The candidate has the right to submit the names of individuals they believe would have a conflict of interest, accompanied by a description of the potential conflict.

Selection Process

The selection process is designed to ensure a balanced and objective evaluation through the following steps:

- *List Submission:* Three separate lists of appropriate sources for external review must be prepared by: (1) the Candidate, (2) the Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, and (3) the tenured faculty of the department.
- *Verification:* The candidate is responsible for verifying the names and contact information on their list before submission. The Committee Chair is responsible for verifying the names on their own list

and the list provided by the tenured faculty.

- *Final Selection:* The Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee will select at least one name from each of the three lists for a total of three (3) external reviewers.
- *Communication:* The Committee Chair submits the selected names to the Department Chair, who then contacts the reviewers to request a written evaluation of the candidate's scholarship. The Chair will provide each reviewer with the candidate's materials, the relevant Tenure and Promotion Guidelines, and context regarding the candidate's teaching load and departmental role.

Confidentiality and Notification

The identity of the external reviewers is strictly confidential during the active review process. Any written recommendations shared with the candidate by the Department Chair or committees during the process must omit the names of the external reviewers. Candidates will be notified of the names of the individuals selected to serve as referees only after the tenure and promotion process has been completed.

Candidate's Submission Requirements

To facilitate the external review, the candidate must submit the following items in PDF format to the Department Chair:

1. A formal letter of application.
2. A Curriculum Vita generated from Watermark Faculty Success.
3. Samples of published works or similar evidence of the quality of the candidate's scholarship.

The external reviews will be included in the candidate's portfolio and will be considered at all levels of the review process.

Document Submission Instructions

A Candidate who is applying for tenure and/or promotion is required to submit the Watermark Faculty Success Promotion and/or Tenure Report and a Portfolio document that will be described below.

The Candidate will receive email notification from Academic Affairs when Google Drive access is available to upload their Promotion and/or Tenure Report and Portfolio.

The following two documents are required from all candidates applying for tenure and/or promotion:

Promotion and/or Tenure Report

A digital copy of the Candidate's Promotion and/or Tenure Report from Watermark Faculty Success (formerly Digital Measures) (<https://www.digitalmeasures.com/login/southalabama/faculty/authentication/showLogin.do>) must be included that reflects time-in-rank (including years of pre-tenure service the candidate has brought in from another institution). Time-in-rank requirements refer specifically to service at the University of South Alabama at a specified rank (see *Faculty Handbook*; Section 3.10.2)

To run a Promotion and Tenure Report in Watermark Faculty Success: Go to <http://www.digitalmeasures.com/login/southalabama/faculty/authentication/showLogin.do>

1. Log in to Watermark Faculty Success.
2. Select **Activities** at the top of your screen.
3. At the bottom of the screen under section Promotion and Tenure, click on **Confirmation and Submission**
4. To add a record, select the **+Add New Item** button
 - Complete Type of Nomination, Promotion to Rank, check box for “I have reviewed this package and believe that to the best of my knowledge it is complete.
 - Enter date
 - Save
 - Screen will return to **Confirmation and Submission**
5. Select **Reports** at the top of your screen.
6. Item 1. Select “**Promotion and/or Tenure Report**” from the list.
7. Item 2. Select the **Date Range** for the information you wish to include in your report. (Refer to your college administrator for the **Date Range** that you should use). Watermark Faculty Success will warn you if you attempt to create a report with an end date before the report’s start date.
8. Item 3. Select the **File Format** for your report from the drop-down list. Select Microsoft Word (.doc) and page size as “Letter”. However, if you are using a MAC you may have to select PDF as the output option instead of Word if the links do not work.
9. Click **Run Report** at the top right of the page.
10. Watermark Faculty Success will build your report and prompt you to either open it or save it locally.
11. A MS Word file will be generated that you can save and edit.
12. When you are finished editing your file, save as a PDF so you can upload to the google drive.

The Candidate is responsible for reviewing the report, ensuring all electronic links are active, and making all needed changes on the report electronically. Once the Candidate is satisfied that the report accurately reflects his or her activities and accomplishments, a copy of the report should be electronically saved from MS Word as a PDF file for uploading to the Candidate’s Google Drive folder as T&PReport.pdf.

Portfolio

The following documents must be organized and included in the Candidate’s electronic portfolio and named Portfolio.pdf:

1. **Table of Contents.** A paginated table of contents (should be the first entry in the portfolio).
2. **College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.** A copy of the College of Education and Professional Studies Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.
3. **Letter of Application.** A cover letter of application specifying what the Candidate is

applying for (tenure and/or promotion).

4. **Letter of Eligibility from the Dean.** A copy of the Tenure and/or Promotion notification letter received from the Dean.
5. **Curriculum Vita.** A copy of the Candidate's *vita* generated from Watermark Faculty Success reflecting accomplishments across the entirety of one's career.
6. **Mid-Probationary Reviews.** Include signed copies of the Department Mid-Probationary Review Committee, Department Chair, and College Mid-Probationary Review Committee reports.
7. **Letters of Support.** Candidates may include statements of support from university and professional colleagues, students, and others who can provide substantive evaluations of the merits of the Candidate's professional activities and achievements.
8. **Journal Impact Table.** The candidate will include a Journal Impact Table (see below) that includes the listed elements (if known). If unknown indicate with "UN". Modify and/or reproduce table (as necessary) to fit and include identifying elements of published work.

[illegible]

Supplemental Materials

The Candidate may submit a hard copy of a book separately.

The Candidate is responsible for reviewing the Portfolio for accuracy and ensuring all electronic links are active. Once the Candidate is satisfied that the Portfolio accurately reflects his or her activities and accomplishments, the Portfolio should be electronically saved as a PDF file for uploading to the Candidate's Google Drive folder as Portfolio.pdf

Committees

The Department and College Tenure and Promotion Committees are guided by University policies as outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*. The members of the faculty charged with review and evaluation of their colleagues' applications for tenure and/or promotion are responsible for the strictest professionalism and confidentiality during and after the review process. Department and College Committees reach their decisions by discussion and secret written vote of each Candidate. Faculty members who participate in the peer review process at both the department and college level must abstain from voting at the College level when Department colleagues are considered.

Departmental Review

The Department Tenure Committee is normally comprised of all tenured faculty members in the Department, excluding the Department Chair. The Department Promotion Committee is comprised of all members of the department, except Assistant Professors, senior in rank to the Candidate, excluding the Department Chair.

The Department Tenure Committee and the Department Promotion Committee are separate entities, though there is likely overlapping membership. With the exception of the review of Candidate's seeking promotion from Instructor to Senior Instructor, membership on the Department Tenure and Promotion Committees may be combined for the purposes of the reviews under a single Chair.

The review process will begin with email notification to committee members from Academic Affairs of Google Drive access to Candidate materials. The Committee reviews all materials with the realization that evidence of continuing scholarly/research/creative productivity as well as teaching effectiveness are typically the essence of all tenure and promotion recommendations. The members of the Department Tenure and/or Promotion Committee are expected to distinguish between scholarship and popularization, and between research for scholarly purposes and activity that is essentially service oriented. This distinction requires a careful evaluation by the committee of the Candidate's research objectives, contributions, and publications and an evaluation of any published commentaries on the Candidate's work. The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee should include an assessment of the quality of the journals in which papers have been published and identify refereed and non-refereed journals, and the degree the Candidate has engaged in external funding opportunities.

The Department Committee's written report must include evaluation of the Candidate's work by the members of the Committee and include a summary of the external reviews. In the case of split decisions, the recommendations must clearly represent the majority and minority viewpoints. The Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee prepares the tenure and promotion report, as appropriate. The Committee Chair, on behalf of the Committee, must submit a written narrative report that includes the sense of the deliberations and the decisions of the Committee (including a tally of all votes as "yeas," "nays," and "abstentions") that specifically addresses teaching effectiveness; research, scholarship, and creative activity; professional service; and in the case of tenure, collegiality. Every member of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, including the Committee Chair, must sign the report with a handwritten signature. The Committee Chair uploads the narrative report in the Candidate's Google Drive folder as Reviews.pdf and forwards the signed original report to the Department Chair.

College Review

The College Tenure and Promotion Committee must consist of at least five (5) faculty appointed each year by the Dean with respect to achieving a balance of disciplines. Membership on this Committee shall be limited to tenured faculty at the Associate and Professor ranks. The Committee reviews all applications for tenure and promotion.

The review process begins with email notification to committee members from Academic Affairs of Google Drive access to review the Candidate's materials. The committee reviews all materials with the realization that evidence of continuing scholarly/research/creative productivity as well as teaching effectiveness are typically the essence of all tenure and promotion recommendations. The committee should include an assessment of the quality of the journals in which manuscripts have been published and identify refereed and non-refereed journals, and the degree the candidate has engaged in external funding opportunities.

The College Committee's evaluation must include review of the Candidate's work by the members of the Committee and include a summary of the external reviews. The Committee Chair prepares the tenure and/or promotion report, as appropriate, that indicates a sense of the deliberations and tenure and/or the promotion decision (including a tally of all votes as "yeas," "nays," and "abstentions"). In the case of split decisions, the recommendations must clearly represent the majority and minority viewpoints. Every member of the Committee (whether voting or abstaining), including the Committee Chair, must sign this letter using their handwritten signature. The Committee Chair uploads the narrative report in the Candidate's Google Drive folder as Reviews.pdf and forwards the signed original to the Dean.

Department Chair

The Department Chair's report for promotion and/or tenure and justification for the recommendation(s) should be carefully documented and provide a considered statement assessing the Candidate's strengths and concerns in teaching, research and/or creative activities, service, and when appropriate, collegiality. The statement should address all relevant criteria and assess the extent to which the Candidate has met all requirements.

The Department Chair is responsible for each of the following:

1. Communicates with external reviewers who agreed to serve by sending a standard email or letter with review instructions (see note below) and a PDF copy of the candidate's letter of application, curriculum vita, and samples of published works.
2. Informs candidate of the external reviewers selected to serve after the tenure and/or promotion process has been completed.
3. Charges the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.
4. Makes available to the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee copies of the external reviewer letters.
5. Evaluates the Candidate's portfolio and develops a narrative report.
6. Provides a written summary of both the Department Chair's report and the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee report to the Candidate. At this meeting, the Candidate is presented with the Department Review Notification Form for signature. They have the opportunity to add additional materials within one week of receiving the Department Review Notification Form. Supplemental materials need to be emailed to the dean to be included with the form. Go to the following link:
(https://www.southalabama.edu/departments/eforms/academicaffairs/deptrevnotificationr_ev080819.pdf).
7. Forwards to the Dean the signed original external reviewer letters (include envelope if received by mail or a copy of email message if received electronically), Department Tenure and Promotion Committee report, the Department Chair report, the Department Review Notification Form and a copy of the summary report of the Department Chair's and the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee's reports.
8. Uploads to Candidate's Google Drive folder as Reviews.pdf the signed external review letters and Department Chair report.

Note: Department Chair communication with external reviewers should include the following information/materials:

- Introductory statement about the Candidate and the tenure and/or promotion process at the University of South Alabama (USA).
- Provide a copy of the CEPS Tenure & Promotion Procedures & Guidelines document.
- Background information on USA and the College of Education and Professional Studies and a brief description of the Candidate's department and its mission.
- The Candidate's application letter, Curriculum vita and other pertinent information from the Candidate's file to include samples of published works or similar evidence of the quality of the Candidate's scholarship that have been provided by the Candidate. Each external reviewer should be provided with the same representative set of the Candidate's scholarly materials.
- Request that the external reviewer:
 - State the nature of their acquaintance with the Candidate.

- Provide a written review of the candidate's scholarship including a comment on the Candidate's recognition or standing among peers and the likelihood that the Candidate will emerge as a scholar whose work is known and respected by leaders in the field.
- Write and sign the review on Department letterhead. If returning the review by email, attach the signed review as a PDF and send directly from the external reviewer's institutional email address to the Department Chair.
- A statement that the external reviewer's name will be made known to the Candidate, but that the Candidate will not be provided access to the review letter.
- Indicate the date (deadline) for receipt of the external review (see Timeline beginning on Page 11).
- Note: The external review letter must contain the handwritten signature of the external reviewer and sent directly to the Department Chair.

Dean

The Dean is responsible for each of the following:

- Provides the Candidate with a notification letter that specifies eligibility for tenure and/or promotion. For promotion, the appropriate rank should be specified.
- Appoints and charges the College Tenure and/or Promotion Committee.
- Reviews the recommendations of the external reviewers, Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Department Chair, and the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.
- Uploads via Google Drive the signed Department Review Notification Form, supplemental materials (if applicable) submitted by the Candidate, and the Dean's report.
- Maintains in the college the original signed external reviewer letters, Department Tenure and Promotion Committee report, Department Chair report, Department Review Notification Form and summary report, College Tenure and Promotion Committee report, and the Dean's report.

Appeal Procedures

Any challenge of promotion and/or tenure decisions must proceed according to the University's Grievance Procedure (see *Faculty Handbook*, Section 4.2).

CEPS T&P Procedures Timeline

August 2026

1. Dean informs Candidate of eligibility for tenure and/or promotion.

Department Chair appoints the Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee and reviews tenure and promotion guidelines with the Dean. Potential external reviewers are identified/verified/contacted.

College of Education & Professional Studies Tenure and Promotion Guidelines are published on the College Faculty Resources webpage.

- 16 The Candidate and the Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee meet with the Department Chair to review tenure and/or promotion procedures.

The Candidate, via email, digitally (in PDF format) provides a letter of application, vita generated from Watermark Faculty Success, and sample materials as evidence of the Candidate's scholarship to the Department Chair.

- 27 The Chair of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee receives the external reviewer lists of verified names and contact information and selects one name from each list and forwards the names to the Department Chair.

September 2026

- 3 Department Chair submits via email to the external reviewers participating in the review a letter requesting a written review of the Candidate's scholarship and attaches PDF files containing the Candidate's letter of application, vita, and samples of published works or similar evidence of scholarship.

The Dean appoints the College Tenure and Promotion Committee and appoints the committee chair.

- 30 List of candidates and their tenure/promotion committees due to Academic Affairs.
College Electronic Tenure and Promotion Timeline due to Academic Affairs.

October 2025

- 15 External review letters to the Department Chair are due.

The Department Chair schedules a meeting of the members of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Candidate given access to Google Drive folder to upload T&PReport.pdf and Portfolio.pdf.

- 22 Candidate's access to Google Drive folder removed.
- 25 Department Chair given access to Candidate's Google Drive folder and uploads external review letters as Reviews.pdf.
- 25 Department Tenure and Promotion Committee given access to Candidate's Google Drive folder.

November 202

- 15 Department Tenure and Promotion Committee completes their evaluation. Chair of Department Tenure and Promotion Committee uploads report to Candidate's Google Drive folder as Reviews.pdf and forwards the original signed report to the Department Chair.

Department Tenure and Promotion Committee Google Drive access removed.

December 2025

- 10 Department Chair completes their evaluation and meets with the Candidate. At this meeting, the Candidate is provided a summary report of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee and Department Chair reviews. The Candidate is provided a copy of the Department Review Notification Form for signature and instructed on the options identified on the form. The Candidate has up to one week after the initial meeting to return the signed Department Review Notification Form to the Department Chair. The Candidate emails any supplemental materials, as a PDF, to the Dean.

Department Chair uploads his/her review and forwards to the Dean signed originals of the Department Chair's review, the Department Review Notification Form and summary report, the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee review, and the external reviewer letters.

Department Chair Google Drive access removed.

- 13 Dean given access to Candidate's Google Drive folder to upload Department Review Notification Form and the summary report letter as DepartmentalReviewNotification.pdf along with any supplemental materials and the originating email (if applicable).

College Tenure and Promotion Committee given access to Candidate's Google Drive folder.

January 2026

- 28 College Tenure and Promotion Committee completes their evaluation. The Committee Chair uploads via Google Drive the committee report as Reviews.pdf and forwards the signed original of the Committee's review to the Dean.

College Committee Google Drive access removed.

February 2026

- 28 Dean completes the candidate's review and uploads the review in Reviews.pdf. All original letters are maintained in the Dean's office.

Dean uploads to the College folder the Dean's Promotion Recommendation Summary table as PromotionRecommendationSummary.pdf and/or the Dean's Tenure Recommendation Summary table as TenureRecommendationSummary.pdf.

March 2026

- 1 Dean's Google Drive access removed

Candidate materials begin review by the Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President

Department Chair informs the Candidate of the names of the selected external reviewers, who then forward recommendations to the University Board of Trustees.

June 2026

University Board of Trustees formally approve Candidates recommended for tenure and/or promotion.

August 2026

- 15 Promotion and/or tenure becomes effective.

Timeline dates indicate the action or task is performed prior to or no later than 5:00 PM on the specified date.

CEPS TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

Timeline for Implementation of CEPS T&P Guidelines

Tenure-track Timeline

In August 2025, Academic Affairs approved the Revised Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for the College of Education and Professional Studies as presented in this document. For ease and clarity, these new guidelines will be referred to as the 2025 Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. The 2025 Tenure and Promotion Guidelines describe the promotion and tenure expectations for tenured and tenure-track faculty members whose faculty appointment began on or after August 15, 2025.

Beginning August 2030, the 2025 Tenure and Promotion Guidelines will be in effect for all tenure and promotion decisions regardless of initial faculty appointment.

Between August 2025 and August 2030, tenure-track and tenured faculty members applying for tenure and/or promotion will have the choice of following the guidelines in place at the time of hire OR those outlined in the 2025 Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. The decision regarding whether to follow the 2025 guidelines should be made in consultation with the department chair and must be communicated by the faculty member prior to August 1st of the year in which they are applying for tenure and/or promotion.

Non-tenure Track Timeline

In August 2026, Academic Affairs approved the college's promotion guidelines for the non-tenure track, instructional professorial positions. These guidelines describe the expectations for promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction and Full Professor of Instruction for faculty members whose appointment in their current rank began on or after August 15, 2026.

Beginning August 2030, the college's guidelines for these non-tenure track positions will be in effect for all promotion decisions regardless of initial faculty appointment to the current rank. Between August 2026 and August 2030, faculty members applying for promotion to associate or full professor of instruction will have the choice of following the guidelines in this document OR the general criteria provided in the Faculty Handbook. The decision regarding whether to follow the college's new guidelines should be made in consultation with the department chair and must be communicated by the faculty member prior to August 1st of the year in which they are applying for promotion.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	7
GENERAL UNIVERSITY STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION.....	7
General Requirements for Achieving Promotion.....	7
General Requirements for Achieving Tenure	8
COLLEGE-SPECIFIC STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE.....	9
Promotion to Associate Professor	9
Teaching	9
Research and Scholarship.....	10
The Value of Community-Engaged Research.	10
Standards for Research and Scholarship.....	10
Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles.....	11
Books.....	13
Audience.....	13
Content.....	13
Publisher.	13
Book Equivalencies to Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles	14
Grants and Contract Awards.	15
Conference Presentations.	16
Service	17
Promotion to Professor.....	17
Teaching	18
Research and Scholarship.....	18

The Value of Community-Engaged Research.	18
Standards for Research and Scholarship.	18
Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles.	20
Books.	21
Audience.	21
Content.	21
Publisher.	22
Book Equivalencies to Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles.	22
Grants and Contract Awards.	23
Conference Presentations.	24
Impact of Scholarship.	25
Service	25
Tenure.	26
GENERAL UNIVERSITY STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION – NON-TENURE TRACK	
INSTRUCTIONAL PROFESSORIAL LEVELS	27
Associate Professor of Instruction.	27
Professor of Instruction	28
COLLEGE STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION – NON-TENURE TRACK INSTRUCTIONAL	
PROFESSORIAL LEVELS	28
Promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction.	29
Sustained Excellence in Teaching	29
Teaching Narrative.	30
Student Perceptions of Instruction.	31

Continuous Professional Development	32
Substantive Service.....	34
Promotion to Professor of Instruction	34
Sustained Excellence in Teaching	34
Teaching Narrative.....	35
Student Perceptions of Instruction.	36
Significant and Impactful Professional Growth	37
Excellence in the Field	39
Significant and Sustained Service	39

Introduction

This document provides expectations for tenure and promotion for faculty in the College of Education and Professional Studies (CEPS) at the University of South Alabama. In doing so, the goal is to create transparency; establish consistency within and across the college; describe pathways to success; provide benchmarks for success along the way; and create a holistic expectation for research and scholarship that is not limited to publications.

To begin, the General University Standards for Tenure and Promotion are summarized, with connections made to the University of South Alabama's Faculty Handbook, hereafter referred to as the Faculty Handbook. The College's minimum criteria are then provided in the following order: promotion to Associate Professor; promotion to Professor; tenure; promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction; and promotion to Professor of Instruction.

General University Standards for Tenure and Promotion

The language that follows describes the minimum merit in the areas of teaching, research, service, and collegiality required for candidates to achieve promotion to Associate Professor and Professor as well as to be granted tenure. The Faculty Handbook outlines the standards for seeking and obtaining tenure and promotion in Section 3.11.

General Requirements for Achieving Promotion

The Faculty Handbook provides general guidance on relevant standards for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor. The Faculty Handbook states that promotion decisions are based solely on demonstrated professional merit, the quality of contributions to the University, and the competent and regular performance of duties. In addition, the Faculty Handbook specifies that merit should be evaluated in the specific domains of teaching, research, and service.

The Faculty Handbook provides general criteria for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor. For promotion to Associate Professor, the Faculty Handbook states that candidates must:

- display evidence of research, scholarship, and creative activity of sufficient quality to indicate the continuation of a significant scholarly or creative career;
- display evidence of effective teaching and student advising; and
- demonstrate competent work in university-related services at one or more levels.

The Faculty Handbook provides similar language to describe criteria for promotion to Professor. Specifically, the Faculty Handbook provides the same language for how merit in teaching and service is determined, but in the area of research describes the standard for merit as follows: The candidate must display evidence of outstanding scholarly (or equivalent creative) work including, for instance, one or more significant book-length works or number of substantial articles.

General Requirements for Achieving Tenure

The Faculty Handbook makes clear that tenure is granted in recognition of the faculty members' professionalism and professional achievements, and that all tenure decisions are based solely on demonstrated professional merit, the quality of contributions to the University, and the competence and regular performance of duties, including one's ability to participate harmoniously in a healthy learning environment. Further, the Faculty Handbook provides broad statements about what constitutes merit in the areas of teaching, research, service, and collegiality.

College-Specific Standards for Promotion and Tenure

As stated in the Faculty Handbook, each academic unit may develop a written statement of criteria and expectations that elaborates on the general criteria listed above. To this end, the language that follows outlines minimum criteria and expectations for merit towards the granting of promotion and tenure in CEPS. These criteria and expectations are intended to complement, not supplant, the University's established expectations outlined in the Faculty Handbook. They provide additional guidance while remaining fully aligned with University's general criteria.

Promotion to Associate Professor

For promotion to associate professor, expectations and criteria outlined in the following sections are to be met during time-in-rank as assistant professor. According to the Faculty Handbook:

The time-in-rank requirements refer to service only at the University of South Alabama. For prior teaching or other professional experience to count toward promotion eligibility, the individual's initial letter of appointment must so specify and indicate the extent to which it will be counted. Lacking this specification, no prior experience can be used to establish eligibility to be considered for promotion.

Teaching

Departmental and college tenure and promotion committees and department chairs should refer to the Faculty Handbook for guidance on standards for review of teaching effectiveness. This can be found in Section 3.10.2 of the Faculty Handbook in regards to standards for teaching effectiveness sufficient to warrant promotion.

Research and Scholarship

The Value of Community-Engaged Research. Although specific criteria for promotion in CEPS are provided below, and where possible quantitative criteria, there are some general values CEPS holds in regards to research and scholarship that warrant consideration. Among these general values is the importance of community-engaged research in the College. The mission of the College emphasizes efforts to transform and improve the surrounding community, and in evaluating faculty research efforts particularly, credence will be given to research that involves partnerships with community entities and research activity that provides a direct service and impact to the university community and the larger external community.

Standards for Research and Scholarship. The standards that follow represent general expectations for scholarly publishing that a successful candidate for promotion to Associate Professor within CEPS will meet. At the level of annual review of faculty, scholarly publications and grants/contracts activity must together account for at least 30% of the faculty member's annual effort.

As a broad expectation, promotion to Associate Professor should be accompanied by evidence of publications of various types that demonstrate a clear line of research focus. Although a candidate may have multiple lines of research, their body of work should depict a focus that the candidate can articulate and describe in their support essays. A line of research may be operationalized by a variety of scholarly publication mechanisms: systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and other forms of original research. Such artifacts demonstrate growth and increasing competence within the candidate's field of study. Reviewers should examine a candidate's portfolio, broadly, for evidence of this standard.

A variety of other scholarly activities are valuable and should be noted in the candidate's self-evaluation narrative. Examples of these may include authored/co-authored books, edited books, book chapters, conference proceedings, technical papers, program evaluation reports, and policy documents written on behalf of external entities. Another valued type of activity is conducting evaluation and disseminating findings with local community partners, even if such activity does not lead to a publication. Department and college committees should carefully consider how any of these types of scholarly activities add merit to the candidate's portfolio. However, among these only edited books, single/multiple-authored books, and book chapters may offset the standard for peer-reviewed journal articles, if particular criteria are met. These other scholarly activities do not reduce the minimum expectations for peer-reviewed journal articles and conference presentations outlined here.

Below are several distinct criteria that a successful candidate will typically meet to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor. In general, a candidate should meet ALL of the criteria below, though within some criteria there are multiple means of meeting the given criteria. These criteria are based on the expectation that research account for 30% of the faculty member's annual effort. In those instances where this is not the case, the department chair should adjust the criteria appropriately and provide the candidate with documentation of these adjustments at the time of initial appointment. Documentation of adjusted criteria should be included in the portfolio.

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles. To achieve promotion to Associate Professor in CEPS, typically eight peer-reviewed journal articles represent the minimum acceptable amount of scholarly productivity for the successful candidate. Although the minimum number of peer-

reviewed journal articles may be reduced as a result of other works (see the following sections on *Books* and *Grants and Contract Awards*), the criteria that follow must be met.

- These articles must be accepted or published during the candidate's time in rank in CEPS (this includes years in rank that are brought in from a previous tenure-track position as stipulated in the candidate's hiring letter).
- Articles that are accepted, but not published, must be accompanied by a copy of the letter from the journal indicating final acceptance of the manuscript.
- All articles that contribute to meeting these criteria must be in national or international journals, defined as journals that have a scope of readership, editorial board composition, and geographical focus that is either national or international.
- The candidate must be the first author on at least two of these articles. In some instances, serving as the corresponding author may be applied to this criterion, particularly when the lead author is a student working with the candidate.
- At least two of these articles must be in journals for which the journal published a measured impact factor. There is no minimum impact factor level required. Impact factors can be established through a variety of means. The candidate is responsible for presenting evidence (e.g., acceptance rate, double-blind review process) of the journal impact factor by citing the source of this information in their materials. Candidates should include the link to the source of evidence/metrics.
- At least six of these articles must be in journals that are indexed in Scopus or similar indices.
- At least 50% or four of these articles must align with the candidate's primary research focus.

Importantly, in those instances where books or grants/contracts are used to offset the number of journal articles, a minimum number of six journal articles, either published or in press, is expected to meet the above criteria.

Books. The above standard is worded in terms of peer-reviewed journal articles; however, in some instances, it may be appropriate for a candidate to disseminate knowledge through the publication of edited books, single/multiple-author books, or chapters in edited books. For these publications to offset the expected number of peer-review journal articles, the book must meet criteria related to audience, content, and publisher. Descriptions of these criteria follow, along with the established equivalencies for peer-reviewed journal articles.

Audience. The audience for the book must be primarily academics, scholars, and/or researchers. Books that have a primarily practitioner audience do not contribute to this standard for qualifying book publications. Although practitioner-focused texts are valuable, they cannot be used to offset the number of peer-reviewed journal articles for promotion to Associate Professor. Additionally, books whose intended audience appears to be the general public do not qualify under this standard.

Content. The content of the book must be research-based, as opposed to content that conveys personal beliefs and experiences. Reviewers of candidate's materials may consider factors such as the degree to which the content of the book presents, cites, and is oriented towards empirical research findings and theories within the candidate's discipline; however, there is no quantitative standard for book length.

Publisher. The entity that publishes a book must be scholarly in its mission and practices. Below are objective and quantitative standards for what counts as a scholarly publisher. For books to count towards tenure or promotion standards, they must meet each of the criteria below.

- The publisher is a university press or a professional association within or adjacent to the candidate's discipline. Otherwise, the candidate can make an argument that the publisher primarily disseminates scholarly products such as original empirical research, theoretical/conceptual papers, or comprehensive/systematic reviews of the literature.
- The publisher does not charge fees for the candidate to publish.
- The publisher is not a religious or political association.
- The publisher engages the author in a meaningful, peer-review process, through either a single editor/peer reviewer or team of editors/peer reviewers that provide feedback on the candidate's contributions to the book. This should be documented by the candidate through the procedures set forth by the publisher and through including correspondence with the publisher substantiating that a meaningful, peer-review process occurred.

Book Equivalencies to Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles. In those instances where a candidate's published book or book chapter meets the audience, content, and publisher expectations previously stated, the criterion below will be used to determine the impact on the general expectation of eight peer-reviewed journal articles.

- Edited Book. These are texts in which the candidate served as a single editor or one of several editors of the book, rather than writing the contents of the book. An edited text counts as the equivalent of one peer-reviewed journal article.
- Group of Authors Publishing a Book. These are books in which the candidate is part of a team of authors who wrote the content that comprises the book. A group-authored text counts as the equivalent of one peer-reviewed journal article.

- *Solo-Authored Book*. This is a text for which the candidate is the sole author of the content of the text. A solo-authored text counts as the equivalent of two peer-reviewed journal articles.
- *Revised Book*. If the book in question is merely a revision of an existing text, this book counts as the equivalent to one peer-reviewed journal article.
- *Chapter in an Edited Book*. A chapter in an edited book counts as the equivalent of one peer-reviewed journal article.

As a reminder, when books or book chapters are used to offset the number of journal articles, a minimum number of six journal articles, either published or in press, is still expected.

Grants and Contract Awards. Candidates must document submission of at least one proposal for external funding during their pre-tenure period of service. To receive promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate does not need to be awarded any external funding, but at least one application must be present. These submissions for external funding can be to federal, state, and/or local entities, and there is no minimum financial amount required for a submission to meet this standard.

Grant or contract submissions that meet this standard must be in a content area that is within the candidate's research foci. External awards that are not intended to support faculty research efforts, either through the project's design or opportunities that arise through the project's activities, do not meet this standard. Internal grant awards do not count towards this standard.

The expected eight journal articles described in the previous section can be reduced to six journal articles if the candidate is involved in externally funded projects that fit the previous description and, in addition, meet at least one of the following criteria.

- The candidate is the principal investigator of at least one funded federal grant or other highly competitive funding source regardless of funding amount.
- The candidate is a co-principal investigator of at least one funded federal grant or other highly competitive funding source regardless of funding amount and can document the research-related work and project deliverables or outcomes for which the candidate is responsible. In this way, the co-principal investigator shares the leadership and responsibilities with the principal investigator.
- The candidate is a principal investigator or co-principal investigator on two or more externally funded projects of any type, whether they be federal, non-federal or whether they be grants or contracts, with the total amount of funding of at least \$75,000 across all externally funded projects.

As a reminder, when grants or contracts are used to offset the number of journal articles, a minimum number of six journal articles, either published or in press, is still expected.

Conference Presentations. The candidate is expected to present their research or scholarship at five national and/or international conferences over the course of their time in rank as assistant professor. This standard does not pertain to a specified number of presentations; rather, it requires attending and presenting at five distinct conferences. These conferences must clearly be professional in nature and should primarily be academic organizations in which research and/or best professional practices are disseminated. Conferences should be sponsored by a professional organization within the candidate's discipline or closely related. Merely attending conferences, while often valuable to a candidate's professional development, does not contribute to meeting the conference presentation standard. There is no requirement on the type of presentation (e.g., poster, roundtable, report session) that must be conducted.

Presentations at regional (i.e., multi-state) conferences may be used to reduce this standard of presenting at five national and/or international conferences. Specifically, presenting at two regional conferences is equivalent to presenting at one national/international conference. This equivalency can be used twice to reduce the total number of expected national/international conferences to three, but no lower. For example, a candidate who presents at four regional conferences can reduce the expected number of national/international conferences to three.

Service

Departmental and college tenure and promotion committees and department chairs should refer to the Faculty Handbook for guidance on standards for review of service effectiveness. This can be found in Section 3.10.2 of the Faculty Handbook in regards to standards for service effectiveness sufficient to warrant promotion.

In terms of criteria specific to CEPS for service warranting promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must provide evidence of actively engaging with college, department, and program committees as assigned by their department chair.

Promotion to Professor

For promotion to full professor, expectations and criteria outlined in the following sections are to be met during time-in-rank as associate professor. According to the Faculty Handbook:

Time-in-rank requirements refer to service only at the University of South Alabama. For prior teaching or other professional experience to count toward promotion eligibility, the individual's initial letter of appointment must so specify and indicate the extent to which it will be counted. Lacking this specification, no prior experience can be used to establish eligibility to be considered for promotion.

Teaching

Departmental and college tenure and promotion committees and department chairs should refer to the Faculty Handbook for guidance on standards for review of teaching effectiveness. This can be found in Section 3.10.2 of the Handbook in regards to standards for teaching effectiveness sufficient to warrant promotion.

Research and Scholarship

The Value of Community-Engaged Research. Although specific criteria for promotion in CEPS are provided below, and where possible quantitative criteria, there are some general values CEPS holds in regards to research and scholarship that warrant consideration. Among these general values is the importance of community-engaged research in the College. The mission of the College emphasizes efforts to transform and improve the surrounding community, and in evaluating faculty research efforts particularly, credence will be given to research that involves partnerships with community entities and research activity that provides a direct service and impact to the university community and the larger external community.

Standards for Research and Scholarship. The standards that follow represent the general expectations for scholarly publishing that a successful candidate for promotion to Professor within CEPS will meet. At the level of annual review of faculty, scholarly publications and grants/contracts activity must together account for at least 30% of the faculty member's annual effort.

As a broad expectation, promotion to Professor should be accompanied by evidence of publications of various types that demonstrate a synthesis and summarization of a faculty member's program of research. Although a candidate may have multiple lines of research, their body of work should depict a focus that the candidate can articulate and describe in their support

essays. A line of research may be operationalized by a variety of scholarly publication mechanisms: systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and other forms of original research. Such artifacts demonstrate growth and competence within the candidate's field of study. Reviewers should examine a candidate's portfolio, broadly, for evidence of this standard.

A variety of other scholarly activities are valuable and should be noted in the candidate's self-evaluation narrative. Examples of these may include authored/co-authored books, edited books, book chapters, conference proceedings, technical papers, program evaluation reports, and policy documents written on behalf of external entities. Another valued type of activity is conducting evaluation and disseminating findings with local community partners, even if such activity does not lead to a publication. Department and college committees should carefully consider how any of these types of scholarly activities add merit to the candidate's portfolio. However, among these only books and book chapters may offset the standard set forth below for production of peer-reviewed journal articles, if particular criteria are met. These other scholarly activities do not reduce the minimum expectations for peer-reviewed journal articles and conference presentations outlined here.

Below are several distinct criteria that a successful candidate will typically meet to be considered for promotion to Professor. In general, a candidate should meet ALL of the criteria below, though within some criteria there are multiple means of meeting the given criteria. These criteria are based on the expectation that research account for 30% of the faculty member's annual effort. In those instances where this is not the case, the department chair should adjust the criteria appropriately and provide the candidate with documentation of these adjustments at the time of initial appointment. Documentation of adjusted criteria should be included in the portfolio.

Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles. To achieve promotion to Professor in CEPS, typically 10 peer-reviewed journal articles represent the minimum acceptable amount of scholarly productivity for the successful candidate. Although the minimum number of peer-reviewed journal articles may be reduced as a result of other works (see the following sections on ***Books*** and ***Grants and Contract Awards***), the criteria that follow must be met.

- These articles must have been accepted or published during the time in rank as Associate Professor. Any publications listed in the portfolio leading to initial promotion should be excluded from consideration to meet this standard.
- Articles that are accepted, but not published, must be accompanied by a copy of the letter from the journal indicating final acceptance of the manuscript.
- All articles that contribute to meeting these criteria must be in national or international journals, defined as journals that have a scope of readership, editorial board composition, and geographical focus that is either national or international.
- The candidate must be single/solo author on at least one journal article or demonstrate that they have served as first author on at least 4 of the 10 required publications. In some instances, serving as the corresponding author may be applied to this criterion, particularly when the lead author is a student working with the candidate.
- At least 7 of the 10 required peer-reviewed journal articles must be in a journal with an established impact factor, though no minimum impact factor is specified. Impact factors can be established through a variety of means. The candidate is responsible for presenting evidence (e.g., acceptance rate, double-blind review process) of the journal impact factor by citing the source of this information in their materials. Candidates should include the link to the source of evidence/metrics.

- At least 50% or five of these articles must align with the candidate's primary research focus.

Importantly, in those instances where books or grants/contracts are used to offset the number of journal articles, a minimum number of seven journal articles, either published or in press, is expected to meet the above criteria.

Books. The above standard is worded in terms of peer-reviewed journal articles; however, as is common, senior scholars in a field may choose to disseminate knowledge through the publication of edited books, single/multiple-author books, or chapters in edited books. For these publications to offset the expected number of peer-review journal articles, the book must meet criteria related to audience, content, and publisher. Descriptions of these criteria follow, along with the established equivalencies for peer-reviewed journal articles.

Audience. For candidates applying for Professor, no distinction should be made between texts intended for practitioners vs. researchers. Rather, the only criteria that should be used to determine the merit of a book is the broad standards stated below regarding that the book's content be scholarly in nature and that the book be published by a scholarly entity. However, books whose intended audience appears to be the general public do not qualify under this standard.

Content. Regardless of whether the audience is practitioners, scholars, or researchers. the content of the book must be research-based, as opposed to content that conveys personal beliefs and experiences. Reviewers of candidate's materials may consider factors such as the degree to which the content of the book presents, cites, and is oriented towards empirical research findings and theories within the candidate's discipline; however, there is no quantitative standard for book length.

Publisher. The entity that publishes a book must be scholarly in its mission and practices.

Below are objective and quantitative standards for what counts as a scholarly publisher. For books to count towards tenure or promotion standards they must meet each of the criteria below.

- The publisher is a university press or a professional association within or adjacent to the candidate's discipline. Otherwise, the candidate can make an argument that the publisher primarily disseminates scholarly products such as original empirical research, theoretical/conceptual papers, or comprehensive/systematic reviews of the literature.
- The publisher does not charge fees for the candidate to publish.
- The publisher is not a religious or political association.
- The publisher engages the author in a meaningful, peer-review process, through either a single editor/peer reviewer or team of editors/peer reviewers that provide feedback on the candidate's contributions to the book. This should be documented by the candidate through the procedures set forth by the publisher and through including correspondence with the publisher substantiating that a meaningful, peer-review process occurred.

Book Equivalencies to Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles. In those instances where a candidate's published book or book chapter meets the audience, content, and publisher expectations previously stated, the criterion below will be used to determine the impact on the general expectation of 10 peer-reviewed journal articles.

- Edited Book. These are texts in which the candidate served as a single editor or one of several editors of the book, rather than writing the contents of the book. An edited text counts as the equivalent of one peer-reviewed journal article.

- Group of Authors Publishing a Book. These are books in which the candidate is part of a team of authors who wrote the content that comprises the book. A group-authored text counts as the equivalent of two peer-reviewed journal articles.
- Solo-Authored Book. This is a text for which the candidate is the sole author of the content of the text. A solo-authored text counts as the equivalent of three peer-reviewed journal articles.
- Revised Book. If the book in question is merely a revision of an existing text, this book counts as the equivalent to one peer-reviewed journal article.
- Chapter in an Edited Book. A chapter in an edited book counts as the equivalent of one peer-reviewed journal article.

As a reminder, when books or book chapters are used to offset the number of journal articles, a minimum number of seven journal articles, either published or in press, is still expected.

Grants and Contract Awards. The candidate must document submission of at least one proposal for external funding during the time in rank of Associate Professor. The candidate must be the principal investigator on the submission and the award amount must be at least \$30,000. For promotion to Professor, the candidate does not need to be awarded any external funding, but at least one application must be present.

Although Assistant Professors seeking tenure and promotion are expected to seek external funding that supports their research agenda, Associate Professors will likely engage in externally funded work that is service-oriented and supports engagement with community partners. Therefore, grant or contract submissions that meet this standard do not have to be in a content area that is within the candidate's research foci. External awards, whether research-

focused or service-focused, may meet this standard. Internal grant awards do not count towards this standard.

The expected 10 journal articles described in the previous section can be reduced to eight journal articles if the candidate is involved in externally funded projects that fit the previous description and, in addition, meet at least one of the following criteria.

- The candidate is the principal investigator of at least one funded federal grant or other highly competitive funding source regardless of funding amount.
- The candidate is a co-principal investigator of at least one funded federal grant or other highly competitive funding source regardless of funding amount and can document the project deliverables or outcomes for which the candidate is responsible. In this way, the co-principal investigator shares the leadership and responsibilities with the principal investigator.
- The candidate is a principal investigator or co-principal investigator on two or more externally funded projects of any type, whether they be federal, non-federal or whether they be grants or contracts, with the total amount of funding of at least \$75,000 across all externally funded projects.

As a reminder, when books or book chapters are used to offset the number of journal articles, a minimum number of seven journal articles, either published or in press, is still expected.

Conference Presentations. The candidate is expected to present their research or scholarship at five national and/or international conferences while in rank as Associate Professor. This standard does not pertain to a specified number of presentations; rather, it requires attending and presenting at five distinct conferences. These conferences must clearly be professional in nature and should primarily be academic organizations in which research and/or best

professional practices are disseminated. Conferences should be sponsored by a professional organization within the candidate's discipline or closely related. Merely attending conferences, while often valuable to a candidate's professional development, does not contribute to meeting the conference presentation standard. There is no requirement on the type of presentation (e.g., poster, roundtable, report session) that must be conducted.

Presentations at regional (i.e., multi-state) conferences may be used to reduce this standard of presenting at five national and/or international conferences. Specifically, presenting at two regional conferences is equivalent to presenting at one national/international conference. This equivalency can be used twice to reduce the total number of expected national/international conferences to three, but no lower. For example, a candidate who presents at four regional conferences can reduce the expected number of national/international conferences to three.

Impact of Scholarship. The candidate for Professor is expected to have positively impacted their discipline through their scholarship. Although this standard does not dictate a quantitative standard for demonstrating positive impact, the candidate is expected to demonstrate such impact in a variety of ways in their promotion materials. Among these ways should be tabulating the number of times their work is cited by others, noting invited conference presentations or workshops, media interviews, or other indicators that one's scholarship is being read and applied by other entities within and outside of the academy.

Service

Departmental and college tenure and promotion committees and department chairs should refer to the Faculty Handbook for guidance on standards for review of service effectiveness. This can be found in Section 3.10.2 of the Faculty Handbook in regards to standards for service effectiveness sufficient to warrant promotion.

In terms of criteria specific to CEPS for service warranting promotion to Professor, the candidate should present evidence of internal or external service that meets at least one of the following criteria:

- The candidate has chaired at least one college- or university-level committee.
- The candidate can demonstrate evidence of at least one community service project or service to a professional organization that has specific deliverables and activities and that has been sustained for at least two years. The external service activity must be relevant to the candidate's discipline or the candidate must present an argument that the activity is relevant to a departmental, college, or university strategic priority.
- The candidate has served as a sponsor for at least one student organization for at least two years.

Tenure

According to the Faculty Handbook, tenure constitutes recognition of an individual's professionalism and professional achievement and is evaluated in the areas of teaching, research, service, and collegiality. General expectations for teaching, research, and service may be found in the Faculty Handbook, Section 3.11.4.1. Further, it is the expectation that the individual applying for tenure meets the College's promotion requirements previously described for the appropriate rank.

Additionally, collegiality is to be considered in tenure decisions. In defining collegiality, the Handbook states,

Collegiality is more than civility and getting along with colleagues, staff, students and others in all university environments; rather it is consistent behaviors that show respect for others, cooperative and concerted efforts to achieve department, college, and

university goals, and the assumption of responsibilities for the good of the whole.

Hallmarks of collegiality include, but are not limited to, cooperative interaction, open and honest communication, mutual support, respect, and trust of others, and collaborative efforts toward the common mission.

General University Standards for Promotion – Non-Tenure Track Instructional

Professorial Levels

The language that follows describes the minimum merit in the areas of teaching, professional growth (i.e., professional development and/or scholarship), and service required for candidates to achieve promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction and Professor of Instruction. The Faculty Handbook outlines these standards for promotion.

Associate Professor of Instruction

According to the Faculty Handbook, candidates for promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction are expected to demonstrate:

- sustained excellence in teaching – Evidence may include classroom/laboratory/clinical teaching, supervision of students' independent research or study, academic advising, course and curriculum development, or implementation of evidence-based pedagogical practices;
- continuous professional growth – Professional growth can be documented through continuing professional development, discipline-specific scholarship or scholarship of teaching and learning, or creative activity appropriate to the field; and
- substantive service – Service should include contributions to the Department, College or University.

All evidence must be drawn from time in rank as Assistant Professor of Instruction.

Professor of Instruction

According to the Faculty Handbook, candidates for promotion to Professor of Instruction are expected to demonstrate:

- sustained excellence in teaching – Evidence may include classroom/laboratory/clinical teaching, research advising, academic advising, curriculum development, or development of evidence-based pedagogical practices;
- significant and impactful professional growth – Professional growth can be documented through significant and impactful discipline-specific scholarship, scholarship of teaching and learning, professional development, and/or creative activity appropriate to the field;
- excellence in the field – Demonstrating excellence in the field can be demonstrated in a variety of ways. Examples may include invited presentations at national conferences and conventions, publication of peer reviewed articles in disciplinary or pedagogical national or international journals, authoring or contributing to textbooks or other innovative instructional materials, creative activity, or making significant, innovative contributions to the curriculum; and
- significant and sustained service – Service should include significant and sustained service to the Department, College, or University.

All evidence must be drawn from time in rank as Associate Professor of Instruction.

College Standards for Promotion – Non-Tenure Track Instructional Professorial Levels

Although the Faculty Handbook provides general expectations for promotion, the language that follows utilizes these expectations to outline guidelines that a successful candidate for promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction and Professor of Instruction in CEPS will typically meet.

Promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction

To receive promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction, candidates must demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching, continuous professional growth, and substantive service. Importantly, the criteria that follow are based on the expectation that teaching accounts for 90% of a candidate's effort in their annual evaluation and, therefore, should influence decisions regarding promotion. With that said, a candidate's portfolio should be evaluated holistically to be sure that the standards in all three areas have been met. Copies of the candidate's annual evaluations during time in rank should be included in the portfolio.

In those instances where teaching does not represent 90% of a candidate's effort, the department chair should adjust the criteria appropriately and provide the candidate with documentation of these adjustments at the time of initial appointment or upon any later revision to their assigned responsibilities. Documentation of adjusted criteria should be included in the portfolio.

Sustained Excellence in Teaching

To demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching, the Faculty Handbook lists the following as potential sources for evidence: classroom/laboratory/clinical teaching, supervision of students' independent research or study, academic advising, course and curriculum development, or implementation of evidence-based pedagogical practices. Additional guidance is provided in the [*USA Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness*](#) policy, available on the Academic Affairs website. Notably, the candidate is expected to have engaged in the process of peer review of instruction outlined in this policy as appropriate for their time and rank and following the college guidelines.

The sections that follow are intended to clearly define expectations within the first source of evidence: classroom/laboratory/clinical teaching, hereafter referred to as classroom teaching. Other sources of evidence (e.g., academic advising) provide additional options for evidence that can be leveraged to demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching; however, the classroom teaching criteria that follow represent general expectations that a successful candidate will typically meet in order to be promoted. Importantly, the candidate is expected to utilize their electronic teaching portfolio for reflecting on and demonstrating teaching effectiveness. Components of the teaching portfolio follow.

Teaching Narrative. The *USA Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness* policy expects faculty to work toward continuous improvement in teaching, including responding to evaluations and feedback on the quality and effectiveness of their teaching. The candidate should use the Teaching Narrative to demonstrate these efforts, along with a general description of the evolution of their teaching. At a minimum, the Teaching Narrative should include:

- A discussion of the candidate's evolution of teaching, including a description of efforts to engage in the process of assessment, reflection, and change over time. This will include changes that have been made to improve instruction along with what led to the desire to make changes and how the changes impacted instruction and/or student learning.
- A discussion of the candidate's results from the Student Perceptions of Instruction instrument, including contextual factors that may have influenced this data. Examples of contextual factors include: new course development; first time teaching a course; change in course modality; writing-intensive course; course level (e.g., graduate, undergraduate); and student population served.

- A reflection on the candidate's feedback from peer reviews of instruction, along with a discussion of how this feedback has influenced the candidate's teaching. **Areas of Strength/Instructional Impact** and **Suggestions for Continuing Development** provided by the peer reviewer via the CEPS Course Observation Rubric should be included and addressed in the reflection.

Student Perceptions of Instruction. Results from the Student Perceptions of Instruction instrument represent one means for evaluating effectiveness in classroom teaching. To receive promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction, the successful candidate is expected to achieve the criterion that follows:

The candidate's overall mean for all items from student evaluations from all semesters during the time in rank, preceding the submission of their promotion application and including summers if the data are available, should be greater than the college's mean of all items during the same time period OR within one standard deviation of the college's mean. In other words, the candidate's overall mean falls within the average range of the college.

For example, if a candidate has an overall mean of 4.26, but the college's overall mean during the same time period is 4.45 with a standard deviation of .15, the candidate's mean would be more than one standard deviation below the college's mean. In this example, the candidate has not met this criterion. The candidate's mean here would need to be at or above $4.45 - .15 = 4.3$.

Student perceptions of instruction are helpful, but they are also vulnerable to external factors (e.g., bias, rigor, course content). Therefore, if this criterion is not met, the candidate is encouraged to utilize their teaching narrative as a space for providing details regarding contextual factors that may have influenced the scores. Additionally, the candidate may include

an analysis of scores for the most recent semesters to build a case for continuous improvement of teaching effectiveness.

Continuous Professional Development

According to the Faculty Handbook, candidates for Associate Professor of Instruction can demonstrate continuous professional growth through continuing professional development, discipline-specific scholarship or scholarship of teaching and learning, or creative activity appropriate to the field. Although this list presents three options for demonstrating continuous professional growth, the candidate must, at a minimum, demonstrate an ongoing effort to engage in development of their pedagogical skills, including course delivery methods, course design, technology integration, content delivery skills, and/or evaluation skills. Typically, the successful candidate should be able to clearly demonstrate that they have successfully performed **at least four** of the examples of pedagogical professional development and activity listed below. Candidates should submit in the Professional Development narrative clear evidence that the activity was performed and describe the resulting professional growth from each activity. It is important to note that this list is not considered exhaustive; thus, a candidate may submit activities that do not appear on this list as long as a convincing argument regarding professional growth is provided.

- Formal professional development in pedagogical areas, such as Quality Matters or ILC classes. The candidate can make arguments for any pedagogical professional development but higher weight will be given to formal experiences, particularly those that lead to a certification or endorsement in an area of pedagogical practice.
- Continuous, informal professional learning (e.g., a book study)
- Leadership activities related to the field and pedagogy, both on and off campus

- Involvement with university student learning and student success initiatives (e.g., Quality Enhancement Plan, Level UP, TBL).
- Involvement in research within the candidate's discipline that has a direct or indirect contribution to their pedagogical skills.
- Demonstrating student engagement strategies in course teaching and beyond. The candidate's involvement in activities that robustly engage students and help extend their learning and professional development are of interest in this item.
- Curriculum development and/or pedagogical innovation.
- Contributing to the production of textbooks that are used for pedagogical purposes. This might include authoring a pedagogy-related chapter in a textbook or serving as a reviewer for a pedagogy-related textbook.
- Contributing to accreditation-related activities.
- Developing and delivering study abroad programs.
- Developing and engaging in innovative and impactful student advising and mentoring strategies.
- Mentoring student research projects.
- Establishing a significant presence in media outside of formal pedagogical activities (e.g., podcasts, videocasts, blogs) that are deployed for pedagogical purposes.
- Attending and/or presenting at professional conferences.
- Applying for external or internal funding to support professional growth (e.g., LevelUP Program Accelerator, SoTL Institute)
- Publishing a peer-reviewed article that is discipline-specific or that represents the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Substantive Service

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor of Instruction are expected to engage in substantive service to the department, college, and/or university that is consistent with their faculty load. Service to the community and/or profession that contributes to their teaching is valued but not required.

Promotion to Professor of Instruction

To receive promotion to Professor of Instruction, candidates must demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching, significant and impactful professional growth, excellence in the field, and significant and sustained service. Notably, teaching represents 90% of a candidate's effort in their annual evaluation and, therefore, should influence decisions regarding promotion. With that said, a candidate's portfolio should be evaluated holistically to be sure that the standards in all four areas have been met. Copies of the candidate's annual evaluations since the time of the last promotion should be included in the portfolio.

In those instances where teaching does not represent 90% of a candidate's effort, the department chair should adjust the criteria appropriately and provide the candidate with documentation of these adjustments at the time of initial appointment or upon any later revision to their assigned responsibilities. Documentation of adjusted criteria should be included in the portfolio.

Sustained Excellence in Teaching

To demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching, the Faculty Handbook lists the following as potential sources for evidence: classroom/laboratory/clinical teaching, research advising, academic advising, curriculum development, or development of evidence-based pedagogical practices. Additional guidance is provided in the *USA Assessment of Teaching*

Effectiveness policy, available on the Academic Affairs website. Notably, the candidate is expected to have engaged in the process of peer review of instruction outlined in this policy as appropriate for their time and rank and following the college guidelines.

The sections that follow are intended to clearly define expectations within the first source of evidence: classroom/laboratory/clinical teaching, hereafter referred to as classroom teaching. Other sources of evidence (e.g., academic advising) provide additional options for evidence that can be leveraged to demonstrate sustained excellence in teaching. However, the classroom teaching criteria that follow represent minimums that will typically be met in order to be promoted. Importantly, the candidate is expected to utilize their electronic teaching portfolio for reflecting on and demonstrating teaching effectiveness. Components of the teaching portfolio follow.

Teaching Narrative. The *USA Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness* policy expects faculty to work toward continuous improvement in teaching, including responding to evaluations and feedback on the quality and effectiveness of their teaching. The candidate should use the Teaching Narrative to demonstrate these efforts, along with a general description of the evolution of their teaching. At a minimum, the Teaching Narrative should include:

- A discussion of the candidate's evolution of teaching, including a description of efforts to engage in the process of assessment, reflection, and change over time. This will include changes that have been made to improve instruction, along with what led to the desire to make changes and how the changes impacted instruction and/or student learning.
- A discussion of the candidate's results from the Student Perceptions of Instruction instrument, including contextual factors that may have influenced this data. Examples of contextual factors include: new course development; first time teaching a course; change

in course modality; writing-intensive course; course level (e.g., graduate, undergraduate); and student population served.

- A reflection on the candidate's feedback from peer reviews of instruction along with a discussion of how this feedback has influenced the candidate's teaching. **Areas of Strength/Instructional Impact and Suggestions for Continuing Development** provided by the peer reviewer via the CEPS Course Observation Rubric should be included and addressed in the reflection.

Student Perceptions of Instruction. Results from the Student Perceptions of Instruction instrument represent one means for evaluating effectiveness in classroom teaching. To receive promotion to Professor of Instruction, the successful candidate is expected to achieve the criterion that follows:

The candidate's overall mean for all items from student evaluations from all semesters during the time in rank, preceding the submission of their promotion application and including summers if the data are available, should be greater than the college's mean of all items during the same time period OR within one standard deviation of the college's mean. In other words, the candidate's overall mean falls within the average range of the college.

For example, if a candidate has an overall mean of 4.26, but the college's overall mean during the same time period is 4.45 with a standard deviation of .15, the candidate's mean would be more than one standard deviation below the college's mean. In this example, the candidate has not met this criterion. The candidate's mean here would need to be at or above $4.45 - .15 = 4.3$.

Student perceptions of instruction are helpful, but they are also vulnerable to external factors (e.g., bias, rigor, course content). Therefore, if this criterion is not met, the candidate is

encouraged to utilize their teaching narrative as a space for providing details regarding contextual factors that may have influenced the scores. Additionally, the candidate may include an analysis of scores for the most recent semesters to build a case for continuous improvement of teaching effectiveness.

Significant and Impactful Professional Growth

According to the Faculty Handbook, candidates for Professor of Instruction can demonstrate significant and impactful professional growth through significant and impactful discipline-specific scholarship, scholarship of teaching and learning, professional development, and/or creative activity appropriate to the field. Although this list presents four options for demonstrating continuous professional growth, the candidate must, at a minimum, demonstrate an ongoing effort to engage in development of their pedagogical skills including course delivery methods, course design, technology integration, content delivery skills, and learning evaluation skills. Candidates should be able to clearly demonstrate that they have successfully performed **at least four** of the examples of pedagogical professional development and activity listed below. Although this list of examples appears to be identical to those found in the promotion criteria for Associate Professor of Instruction, the candidate's selection of activities should be purposefully conducted, recognizing the need to leverage these experiences as evidence for establishing **excellence in the field**, as described in a later section.

Candidates should submit in the Professional Development narrative clear evidence that the activity was performed and describe the resulting growth from each activity. It is important to note that this list is not considered exhaustive; thus, a candidate may submit activities that do not appear on this list as long as a convincing argument regarding professional growth is provided.

- Formal professional development in pedagogical areas, such as Quality Matters or ILC classes. The candidate can make arguments for any pedagogical professional development but higher weight will be given to formal experiences, particularly those that lead to a certification or endorsement in an area of pedagogical practice.
- Continuous, informal professional learning (e.g., a book study)
- Leadership activities related to the field and pedagogy, both on and off campus
- Involvement with university student learning and student success initiatives (e.g., Quality Enhancement Plan, Level UP, TBL).
- Involvement in research within the candidate's discipline that has a direct or indirect contribution to their pedagogical skills.
- Demonstrating student engagement strategies in course teaching and beyond. The candidate's involvement in activities that robustly engage students and help extend their learning and professional development are of interest in this item.
- Curriculum development and/or pedagogical innovation.
- Contributing to the production of textbooks that are used for pedagogical purposes. This might include authoring a pedagogy-related chapter in a textbook, or serving as a reviewer for a pedagogy-related textbook.
- Contributing to accreditation-related activities.
- Developing and delivering study abroad programs.
- Developing and engaging in innovative and impactful student advising and mentoring strategies.
- Mentoring student research projects.

- Establishing a significant presence in media outside of formal pedagogical activities (e.g., podcasts, videocasts, blogs) that are deployed for pedagogical purposes.
- Attending and/or presenting at professional conferences.
- Applying for external or internal funding to support professional growth (e.g., LevelUP Program accelerator, SoTL Institute)
- Publishing a peer-reviewed article that is discipline-specific or that represents the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Excellence in the Field

Promotion to Professor of Instruction requires candidates to demonstrate that their pedagogical expertise extends beyond campus and, as a result, has garnered attention from others in the discipline. Candidates are, therefore, expected to provide evidence of recognition in the form of invited presentations at national conferences and conventions, publication of peer-reviewed articles in disciplinary or pedagogical national or international journals, authoring or contributing to textbooks or other innovative instructional materials, creative activity, or making significant, innovative contributions to the curriculum.

Significant and Sustained Service

Candidates for promotion to Professor of Instruction are expected to engage in significant and sustained service to the department, college, and/or university that is consistent with their faculty load. In addition, the successful candidate will typically demonstrate service to the community and/or profession that contributes to their teaching.