



This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Award No. 2303732
<https://bradley.edu/ADVANCEBU/>

APPENDICES:
ADVANCE BU REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
ON BRADLEY UNIVERSITY TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES

The recommendations contained in this document have been generated by a team of faculty (from all five colleges and the library) after analysis of (1) campus-wide survey data, (2) meetings with all College Executive Committees, (3) the analysis of all available internal TPR documents, and (4) a review of the literature on equitable TPR practices. They should be understood not as a top-down initiative, but as a starting point for campus conversations about revisions to Bradley's TPR practices.

Appendix 1: Operationalized Coding Categories for Bradley TPR Documents (Adapted from Ampaw et. al 2024)

Area	Category	Codes	Operationalization
Document and Unit Details	Unit	EHS1, LAS1, Other1, Handbook, etc.	Academic departments are anonymized as EHS1, EHS2, etc. Colleges and other units (such as the Library) are anonymized as Other1, Other2, etc. The Handbook is not anonymized.
	STEM/Non-STEM	0 = non-STEM 1 = STEM field 2 = both or neither	Bradley's STEM fields, as defined by NSF, are Biology, Chemistry & Biochemistry, Computer Science/Information Systems, Engineering (any branch), Math, Physics, Economics, Political Science, Psychology, or Sociology
	Document type	1 = Dept TPR 2 = Dept Bylaws 3 = College TPR 4 = Fac Handbook 5 = Other	1 = Dept/unit-level TPR 2 = Dept/unit-level Bylaws 3 = College TPR 4 = <i>Faculty Handbook</i> 5 = Other
	Document length	Number of pages	Number of pages
	Document date	Year	Year the document was last revised
Teaching or Librarianship	Detailed description of what "effective teaching" (or "effective librarianship") entails	0 = absent 1 = yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no explication of effective teaching (or effective librarianship) beyond broad terms such as "excellent," "high quality," "successful" etc. 1 = some detailed explication, but ambiguous or needs detail 2 = detailed and clear explanation of what effective teaching entails
	Detailed explanation of evidence and process used to judge effective teaching	0 = absent 1 = yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no explanation of the procedures and documents used to evaluate effective teaching 1 = some details, but with lack of specific forms of evidence and/or no substantive details beyond listing a-g under <i>Teaching Effectiveness</i> (or a-f for Library Faculty) in the <i>Handbook</i> (2024: 75-77); 2 = detailed description of specific forms of evidence that will be used to judge teaching effectiveness (or effective librarianship).

	Detailed explanation of how student evaluations of teaching (SETs) will be used	0 = absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no reference to SETs 1 = listing SETs as sources of evidence, but not providing specific benchmarks or weighting 2 = explanation of specific benchmarks (eg. 5-year average at or above departmental average, or average of 3.5+) or weighting (eg. SETs as most important, as minimally important, etc.) Note: The scholarship on SETs generally recommends against specific benchmarks due to problems with reliability, validity, comparability, and bias in results . However, SETs can provide useful feedback in combination with other forms of evidence. So, units should inform faculty how feedback on SETs will be used and weighted in TPR decisions.
	Concrete expectations for teaching performance at each rank	0 = absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no delineation by rank in terms of teaching performance 1 = some delineation, such as “demonstrate continued improvement” or “increasing effectiveness” with increases in rank, but no concrete benchmarks 2 = clearly delineated expectations for teaching performance at each rank
	Concrete expectations for quality advising	0 = no absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no explanation of what quality advising entails 1 = some explanation of what quality advising entails, but not how it will be evaluated or weighted 2 = explanation of what quality advising entails, and how it will be evaluated or weighted
Research and Creative Production	Detailed explanation of research/creative production expectations	0 = absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no explanation of research/creative production expectations beyond broad terms such as “high quality,” “significant,” “meaningful,” (etc.), without details 1 = some explanation (such as a list of specific types of products), but with no relative weighting or ranking of those products; or no substantive details beyond listing a-d under <i>Research/Creative Production in Handbook (2024: 76)</i> ; 2 = detailed explanation of different types of research/creative products and the ways they are ranked or weighted in the unit, and/or delineation of product “categories” (Category I, II, etc.) and expectations for contributions in each category
	Concrete expectations for research/creative production by rank	0 = absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no delineation by rank in terms of research/creative production 1 = some delineation, but no substantive details beyond broad terms such as “significant contributions,” or beyond the general expectations set out under <i>Criteria for Academic Appointment and Promotion for Tenure-Track Positions in the Handbook (2024: 80-83)</i> OR detailed explanations for only some tenure-track ranks (like Full Professor) 2 = clearly delineated expectations for research/creative production at each rank, including, for instance, numbers and/or types of scholarly/creative products and activities
	Detailed explanation of how sole versus collaborative contributions are valued and weighted	0 = absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no explanation of the relative value/weighting of sole versus collaborative research/creative products 1 = some explanation of the relative value/weighting of sole versus collaborative research/creative products, but with fairly broad descriptions such as “valued more highly” or “of lesser value” 2 = detailed explanation of the relative value/weight of sole versus collaborative work AND detailed instructions about how to document one’s contribution to collaborative work

Service	Concrete expectations for service by rank	0 = absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no concrete guidelines for how much service is expected at each rank 1 = some concrete guidelines for how much service is expected at each rank, but lacking details OR detailed expectations for only some ranks (like Full Professor) 2 = detailed guidelines for how much and what kind of service is expected at each rank
	TPR Process	Detailed explanation of relative “weight” (or value) of teaching, research and service in TPR decisions	0 = absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear
Detailed explanation of what materials to submit for TPR, how to organize them, and when, where, and how to submit them		0 = absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no explanation of what materials, and when, where, and how to submit them for TPR 1 = some explanation of materials and process, but either lacking some details or out-of-date 2 = detailed explanation of what materials to submit, how to organize and submit them, and relevant timelines and administrative processes
Detailed explanation of membership of TPR review committee (eg. criteria for inclusion, and means of selection)		0 = absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no explanation of membership of TPR review committee 1 = some explanation of membership of TPR review committee, but lacking detail (eg. “members of the department,” does not specify which members or how they are chosen) 2 = detailed explanation of membership of TPR review committee (eg. “all tenured members of the department,” “5 tenured members of the department elected by vote of all fulltime faculty”)
Detailed explanation of how votes are counted in TPR decisions		0 = absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no explanation of how votes are counted in TPR decisions 1 = some explanation, but lacking detail (eg. “simple majority,” but not clear if chair votes) 2 = detailed explanation of who votes, the proportion of votes required, and any other rules (eg. “secret ballot” etc.)
Detailed explanation of selecting external reviewers (when required)		0 = absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no explanation of selection process, beyond merely noting that external reviewers are required 1 = some explanation of selection process, but lacking detail (eg. “the department will select”) 2 = detailed explanation of selection process (eg. “the candidate offers 4 names, the chair offers 4 names, and the candidate may reject up to 2 names”)
Detailed information on (or links to) policies for accommodations and pause in tenure clock		0 = absent 1 =yes, but vague 2 = yes, and clear	0 = no information on accommodations including pausing the tenure clock 1 = some information, but lacking details (eg. “in extraordinary situations, faculty may request”) 2 = detailed information on accommodations and circumstances that may justify a tenure clock extension, and/or links to those policies in the <i>Handbook</i>

Appendix 2: Exemplars from Bradley TPR Documents

Some TPR documents at Bradley include clear and detailed articulations of one or more of the recommended elements. Units may wish to model their revised guidelines on the examples below, incorporating discipline appropriate criteria. Guidelines have been de-identified and abridged or slightly modified to serve as models across disciplines.

Teaching

Detailed description of what “effective teaching” entails AND Detailed explanation of evidence and process used to judge effective teaching

Teaching Effectiveness: Rationale

The goal of effective teachers is to provide challenging, as well as meaningful, course content and requirements and to make equity and rigor compatible and co-existing characteristics of their teaching. From the first day of class, effective teachers clearly communicate their expectations, requirements, and evaluation criteria to students and strive to adhere to those elements and apply them in a consistent manner... Teachers as scholars must be intellectually engaged and widely read; they must also be life-long learners who facilitate the development of their students as life-long learners. Great teachers “. . . stimulate active, not passive, learning and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over” (Boyer, 1990, p. 24). ...The guidelines included in this document incorporate Boyer’s suggestion that evidence to assess teaching incorporate information from self- assessment, peer assessment, and student assessment.

Components and Descriptions

*Teaching Effectiveness includes six components: (1) **Teaching Performance**, (2) **Course Development and Revision**, (3) **Clinical Supervision**, (4) **Advising**, (5) **Teaching Awards and Honors**, and (6) **Other Evidence** (described in the section on Evidence). An individual faculty member may not have evidence to provide in support of all components, but at the minimum must have evidence of Teaching Performance.*

Demonstration of Teaching Effectiveness

1. Teaching Performance: *Successful performance in the area of teaching in the Department...is demonstrated when the faculty member:*

- *Exhibits positive professional relationships with students, staff, and colleagues.*
- *Uses innovative, varied, and appropriate teaching techniques and methodology for the subject being taught, including use of appropriate technologies.*
- *Displays ethical behavior, including maintaining confidentiality of student records, grades and concerns.*
- *Treats students fairly and equitably with demonstrated respect for the individual.*
- *Channels student complaints and concerns to appropriate individuals.*
- *Maintains availability to students.*
- *Performs assessment and clerical tasks related to teaching in a timely manner.*
- *Teaches from a current knowledge base.*
- *Demonstrates best practices in online and distance learning.*
- *Reflects best practices in delivering course content in all courses.*
- *Achieves overall student evaluation course means that average at least 3.75, with overall positive comments for Associate Professor. Overall student evaluation course means average at least 4.25, with overall positive comments for Full Professor.*

- **[ADVANCE BU note: The literature on SETs generally advises against setting such benchmarks with standardized evaluation scores, due to a robust [scholarly literature demonstrating limitations of SETs in terms of reliability, statistical validity, and bias](#). However, SETs can be a valuable source of data when combined with other triangulating forms of data.]**

2. Course and Curricular Development and Revision: Another activity related to teaching is course and curricular development and revision. Successful performance in course and curricular development and revision by a Bradley University professor shall be demonstrated in the Department ... when the faculty member:

- Provides complete syllabi (aligned with master syllabi) to students which includes: a) mode of instructional delivery, b) description of course, c) textbook(s)/resources used, d) alignment of course goals, e) course objectives, f) appropriate [disciplinary] standards addressed, g) [disciplinary] dispositions, h) evaluation criteria and procedures, and i) tentative agenda or a schedule and/or course outline.
- Reviews course content and updates syllabi on the basis of changes in the knowledge base.
- Uses assessment methods appropriate for subject matter and course objectives.
- Effectively integrates current instructional technologies in the development of synchronous and asynchronous online teaching and learning activities.
- Designs courses that are rigorous and appropriate for students' level of professional development.
- Matches methods of instruction to course content.
- Reviews, revises, or creates program curriculum.
- Shares teaching with colleagues, inviting them to have critical conversations about teaching and learning.

3. Field and Clinical Supervision: Part of the faculty member's teaching responsibilities may include the supervision of field and clinical experiences. ... An important job of the faculty member is to systematically assist the student in assuming the responsibilities of [a professional in the field]. If a faculty member's load includes field or clinical supervision, successful performance shall be demonstrated when the faculty member:

- Arranges visits in a manner that is acceptable to the site supervisor...and considers the agency... schedules, and clinical caseloads.
- Makes the appropriate number of visits designated in the handbooks...with more frequent visits made when a problem exists.
- Provides feedback, no matter how brief, immediately after observations.
- Analyzes the performance of the student and provides the student with a written evaluation within a reasonable length of time.
- Applies good teaching practices in the accompanying seminar or practicum/internship.
- Arranges periodic conferences with the site supervisor...
- Prepares and submits administrative records related to the supervision responsibility in a timely manner.
- Confers with appropriate personnel (students, site supervisors, clinical directors, ... administrators) with an effectiveness that promotes the best interests of the program and the department.
- Creates collaborative connections with community partners.

4. Advising: Advising is an activity related to teaching that is also integral to the faculty role... Successful performance in advising shall be demonstrated by the following:

- Knows current program requirements
- Knows current licensure requirements
- Demonstrates commitment to quality academic advising for each advisee (i.e. semester and long-range planning, timely completion of paperwork).
- Considers student abilities and interests when assisting with program planning.
- Support students' development in taking responsibility for their own academic progress (i.e. reading handbooks, participating in the advising process, meeting deadlines, making and keeping appointments).
- Is available to students by providing multiple methods of connecting with students (i.e. keeps appointments, provides sufficient access time, returns phone calls and e-mails to students).
- Refers students to appropriate resources, services, etc. when needed.
- Interacts respectfully with students and practices reflective listening.

- Advising Survey (completed by advisees each semester)
- Actively improves advising by participating in best practices.

➤ [ADVANCE BU Note: Some units place advising under “Service,” which is out of alignment with the Handbook which specifies that it is a function of Teaching.]

5. Teaching Awards and Honors: Faculty are sometimes recognized for their outstanding teaching or contributions to teaching through receiving awards or honors from departments, colleges, student organizations, alumni organizations, parent organizations, and professional organizations. To be considered for such awards and honors, one must meet rigorous criteria. Faculty in the Department ... can demonstrate successful performance via awards and honors when:

- Complete information about the nature of the acknowledgement or honor is provided.
- It is clear the recognition is the result of a formal selection process based on recognizable evaluation criteria that relate to teaching.

Evidence of Effective Teaching Performance: Evidence of effective teaching performance must include multiple sources of data in addition to student course evaluation summaries. An evaluation summary for each course taught by the faculty member during the assessment period is required. Other documentation may include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Course or curricular creation, development or revision (as described in Components Descriptions...above).
- Clinical supervision (as described in Components and Descriptions...above).
- Advising (as described in Components and Descriptions...above).
- Teaching Awards and Honors (as described in Components and Descriptions...above).
- Peer review for observation of teaching, review of syllabi and assessment methods (e.g. tests) and review of the Professional Development Plan.
- Measures of student competence such as mastery of course objectives; completion of course content, assignments, and projects; successful completion of certification exams and on-the-job performance of graduates.
- Alumni exit interviews (only information specifically pertaining to the faculty member).
- Results of survey of graduates that reflect on faculty performance (the evidence used here must specifically focus on the individual faculty member).
- Observations by Associate Dean/Director of Department (at request of the faculty member or due to necessity as specified by the Associate Dean/Director and/or College Dean)
- Rigor of coursework, which shall be determined using the previous forms of evidence.
- Instructional materials, that may include created handouts, project assignments, computer software, faculty-developed audiovisual materials.
- Study for credit in an area related to the faculty member’s teaching assignment
- Course syllabi
- Other self-assessments

Detailed explanation of how student evaluations of teaching (SETs) will be used

Course evaluations: Bradley emphasizes teaching. Teaching, defined in terms of learning or in any other acceptable way, is difficult to measure. Less difficult to assess is student acceptance of the faculty members' classroom performance. We are not convinced that quality teaching is necessarily highly correlated with student ratings. We also believe that placing too great an emphasis on student evaluations would have a detrimental effect on the overall quality of our academic institution. At the same time, we believe that to achieve our teaching mission at Bradley, faculty must demonstrate a certain minimal level of student acceptance as assessed in student reviews. ...Our department is in agreement that, except when there are compelling explanations for low evaluations, mean course evaluations below the midpoint on course evaluation scales are unacceptable.... In

addition to course evaluations, the Departmental TPR Committee will consider other criteria that may be relevant to teaching. Candidates for tenure and promotion should prepare a portfolio which provides the TP&R Committee information about class sizes, level at which courses are taught, number of preparations, and some (but not all) of the following:

- syllabi and other course materials and additional information about the courses' contents and assessment techniques.
- solicited and unsolicited letters from former students and colleagues that address in part or in whole the candidate's teaching style and abilities.
- observations by colleagues of the candidate in the classroom. The candidate should be free to choose whether observations are made, who observes, and which class sessions are observed.
- a list and description of courses, workshops, conferences attended, and any sabbatical leave activities that reflect professional development in the service of teaching.
- information about advising and other student related activities such as participating in student organization events, serving as faculty advisor for student groups (Faculty members may, instead, wish to include this information under Service.)
- information about supervision of independent reading and research students (e.g. number of students and the types of activities).
- information about ... master's thesis committees the person chaired or on which the candidate served as a reader.
- information about the development or modification of courses while at Bradley.
- information about textbooks, study guides, and other ancillary materials that have been developed for publication as evidence of professional development in service to teaching.
- awards, honors, or special recognition related to teaching or advising.
- information about teaching experience outside of the Department...or outside of the University.

Concrete expectations for teaching performance at each rank

Criteria for Assessing Teaching Effectiveness: What constitutes “successful teaching effectiveness” will vary depending upon the rank and number of years of service of the faculty member. In brief, as a faculty member’s years of experience and rank increases, his/her level of teaching effectiveness is expected to show a trend of continual improvement. The expectation is that the faculty member will maintain a consistently high level of teaching effectiveness (with the understanding that an occasional course may fall either above or below that level). [Detailed tables delineating expectations by rank are provided in the guidelines.]

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure: Teaching Effectiveness*

Area	Criteria	Minimum Expectations	Evidence
Teaching Performance	Overall student evaluations and comments are above average	Overall student evaluation course means average at least 3.75, as an assistant professor, with overall positive comments. It should be noted, this does not require every semester course mean is 3.75 or above, but there is substantial evidence of growth in teaching from the first year to the fifth year.**	Course evaluations, including means of 3.75 or above. Each semester’s data including qualitative and quantitative data (course means and all of students’ comments) should be provided for review.**
	Increased evidence of student competence in areas taught	Measures of student competence such as mastery of course objectives; completion of course content, assignments, and projects.	Samples of descriptions, requirements, and levels of students’ achievement on course projects.

	<i>Use of appropriate and varied innovative methodology</i>	<i>Methodology is varied/ appropriate to course objectives/student needs.</i>	<i>Narrative describing methodologies utilized in courses.</i>
<i>Course and/or Curricular Development</i>	<i>Demonstrates successful performance</i>	<i>Syllabi that demonstrate established course design methodologies including alignment of course goals, assessments and instruction delivery appropriate to goals and students.</i>	<i>Course syllabi</i>
	<i>Appropriate rigor in course development</i>	<i>Assignments/projects/student feedback show appropriate rigor for students and course.</i>	<i>Descriptions of assignments and projects in courses</i>
<i>Clinical Supervision</i>	<i>If assigned clinical supervision, demonstrates successful performance</i>	<i>Competence attested to by student and cooperating [professional] evaluations, and by Clinical Coordinator as appropriate and necessary.</i>	<i>Evaluation data of university supervisor's performance completed by students and cooperating [professionals]</i>
<i>Advising</i>	<i>Demonstrates successful performance in student advising with a well-grounded understanding of departmental programs and procedures</i>	<i>Knows/communicates elements of departmental programs/ procedures and how they are articulated with [professional] standards and student success.</i>	<i>Outcomes of advising surveys per semester</i>

*Corresponding table provided for promotion to Full Professor

** The [literature on SETs](#) generally advises against setting such benchmarks with standardized evaluation scores, for the reasons set out above. However, SETs can be a valuable source of data when combined with other triangulating forms of data.

Concrete expectations for quality advising

Advising: *Advising is an activity related to teaching that is also integral to the faculty role... Successful performance in advising shall be demonstrated by the following:*

- *Knows current program requirements*
- *Knows current [professional] licensure requirements*
- *Demonstrates commitment to quality academic advising for each advisee (i.e. semester and long-range planning, timely completion of paperwork).*
- *Considers student abilities and interests when assisting with program planning.*
- *Support students' development in taking responsibility for their own academic progress (i.e. reading handbooks, participating in the advising process, meeting deadlines, making and keeping appointments).*
- *Is available to students by providing multiple methods of connecting with students (i.e. keeps appointments, provides sufficient access time, returns phone calls and e-mails to students).*
- *Refers students to appropriate resources, services, etc. when needed.*
- *Interacts respectfully with students and practices reflective listening.*
- *Advising Survey (completed by advisees each semester)*
- *Actively improves advising by participating in best practices.*

Research & Creative production (“Scholarship”)

Detailed explanation of research/creative production expectations

Research and scholarship fulfill a vital role in the College... It is expected that faculty members will engage in scholarly pursuits as a natural activity of the profession they have chosen, and for which their education and training have prepared them...Research serves to expand the body of knowledge and to solve problems, as well as to enhance and maintain the intellectual capital of faculty members. Teaching is also complemented and enhanced by research. The ideal is for research to be self-motivated, self-directed, and continuous. It should be part of a chosen pattern of academic and professional life. However, research also depends upon institutional support and a conducive environment. Research should be pursued diligently and with energy, but not at the expense of teaching. Though research is expected of all faculty being considered for tenure and promotion, it would be unrealistic to expect the same quantity and quality of research as would be expected at a research university with its extensive system of support, including considerably reduced teaching loads. In appraising research in the College, attention should be given to the kinds of research that are feasible at this type of institution as well as the goal of balance between teaching and research that is central to the College model.

What constitutes adequate research and professional activity should be determined on an on-going interactive basis among the candidate, departmental colleagues, the Department Chairperson, and the Dean. The answer will depend upon such factors as type and quality, as well as quantity, of research and publications; stage of research project; and evidence of progress. Thus, an answer to “how much?” can best be determined through the annual review of professional plans and faculty performance. However, ranked categories of scholarly and professional productivity have been developed to aid the faculty member in self-evaluation as well as to serve as a guide for those who must evaluate the progress of this faculty member. All candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to have completed research that falls into Category I, with activities in the other categories serving as a supplement to the Category I core. Three ranked categories of research and professional development activities are offered below.

- *Category I: Published Refereed Research. Examples: professional journal articles, including high quality internally refereed journal articles. (Examples in Category II may qualify for Category I; likewise, some journal articles may not warrant Category I status. The burden of proof is upon the candidate to justify the appropriate category for all research and professional activity.)*
- *Category II: Other Publications and Papers. Examples: monographs, textbooks, published proceedings, published cases, and edited books of readings or cases. (Examples in Category II may qualify for Category I or III. The burden of proof is on the candidate.)*
- *Category III: Miscellaneous Scholarly Activities. Examples: ongoing research, paper presentations at professional meetings, papers at faculty workshops and working papers, research-related grant and consulting activities (See also ServiceCategory II.), book reviews, notes, discussant comments, panel participant, and paper reviewer.*

The examples in each of the above categories are suggestive only, and they are not meant to be exhaustive. Each activity must be judged on its own merits. The Department in which the candidate is a member has the primary role in justifying the ranking of a publication or activity.

OR, here is a shorter example from another unit, which provides specificity on the relative value of different types of work, but may require greater specificity in terms of the number of works expected, and on terms such as “reputable publisher” and “a project judged to be of a significant nature”.

- a. *Weighted highest*
 - *Publication in a peer reviewed journal with a national or international distribution*
 - *Publication in a highly-specialized, peer reviewed journal with at least a national distribution*
 - *Publication of a paper by a reputable publisher in the refereed proceedings of a conference*
- b. *Weighted second*
 - *Publication in a peer reviewed journal with regional distribution*
 - *Presenting a paper at a national or international conference*
 - *Making a principal address at a national or international conference*
 - *Receiving an externally funded grant for research*
 - *Publishing a textbook which exhibits innovative and valuable additions to the discipline*
 - *Refereeing papers*
 - *Acting as consultant on a project judged to be of a significant nature*
- c. *Weighted third*
 - *Publication in a peer reviewed journal with statewide or local distribution*
 - *Presenting a paper at a regional or local conference*
 - *Receiving an internally funded grant for research*
 - *Writing a grant proposal*
 - *Participating in workshops or conferences*

Concrete expectations for research/creative production by rank
--

Criteria for Assessing Research and/or Creative Production

What constitutes “successful research and/or creative production” will vary depending upon the rank and number of years of service of the faculty member. In brief, as a faculty member’s years of experience and rank increases, his/her level of research and/or creative production is expected to show a trend of continual improvement. This growth should be evident in not only the number of activities in which one has engaged, but also the type or level (e.g., Level I, Level II, or Level III) of the activities. For example, faculty new to the profession would not be expected to have several nationally refereed publications, whereas someone who had been in the profession for six years would be held to that expectation. Similarly, a faculty member would not be expected to have all his/her activities from those listed for Level I and none for the other levels since activity at the other levels is of importance in different ways. For example, activity within the community is something deeply embedded within the fabric of Bradley University’s role as an institutional neighbor in the Peoria area, and to ignore or not participate at that level would be a disservice to both the university and the community. [Detailed tables delineating expectations by rank are provided in the guidelines.]

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor and Tenure: Research and/or Creative Production***

Area	Criteria	Minimum Expectations	Evidence
Research/Creative Production	<i>Continued effort, dedication, peer recognition in research and creative processes consistent with Individualized Professional Development Plan (IPDP)</i>	<i>Has established self as shown by multiple pieces of evidence from Levels I, II, III continuously and consistently through years of service, all of which directly meet goals of [their annual professional plan].</i>	<i>a) copies of articles, book chapters, books, monographs, curriculum materials in progress</i> <i>b) copies of professional conference programs, indicating presentations</i>
	<i>Significant accomplishment as measured by peer review and a clear contribution to the profession</i>	<i>On average, must have at least one Level I activity per service year with a minimum of five peer reviewed publications beyond that required for promotion to associate professor, along with other evidence of externally reviewed scholarly production.</i>	<i>c) copies of each published work and / or created curriculum materials</i> <i>d) documentation indicating award of research grant(s), including monetary amount</i>
	<i>Recognition from peers inside and outside the university</i>	<i>Efforts and products are recognized by peers inside and outside the university as being significant contributions to the profession.</i>	<i>e) documentation indicating award of a patent, copyright, or license agreement for a [disciplinary] discovery, invention, and/or product</i>
	<i>Evidence of a well-developed, self-sustaining program in research/creative productivity with both immediate and long-term goals</i>	<i>Efforts and products are the result of and contribute to a self- sustaining, well-defined and focused program of research/creative productivity that meet both immediate and long-term goals of the faculty member and profession.</i>	<i>f) documentation indicating major acknowledgement or honor for research and/or creative production activity</i> <i>g) writing state or national accreditation reports</i>

***Corresponding table provided for promotion to Associate Professor

Detailed explanation of how sole versus collaborative contributions are valued and weighted

- i. Research and Creative Production in [the discipline] are sometimes collaborative enterprises... and are sometimes dictated by sponsors and/or project leaders, etc.*
- ii. Degree of creative control and input are important factors for evaluating creative production. Generally, the more control and input the candidate has during a particular project, the higher the evaluation may be. However, in some cases, a person with low (or no) creative control/input may be able to present a persuasive argument about the value of the work.*
- iii. Candidates must document the degree and level of creative control that they exerted over projects brought for evaluation.** *The relevant scope of the creative control is the area of the project for which the faculty member is responsible. The department recognizes that there are situations when a faculty member might exercise significant creative control despite holding a subordinate role on a project. In such cases, the faculty member needs to provide compelling documentation (such as a letter from the creative director or client) for the project to be considered a Category 1 achievement.*

A faculty member who has complete discretion in establishing the parameters of a project exhibits a **high level of creative control**.... Examples of projects that may involve a significant level of creative control:

- a. A solo project
- b. A project in which the faculty member is overseeing other contributors and has final authority
- c. A collaborative project in which creative decisions are made via consensus

A faculty member who has input toward, but not control over, establishing the parameters of a project exhibits a **moderate level of creative control**. Examples of projects that may involve a moderate level of creative control:

- a. A faculty member is creating a [product]. Several mockups are created, the client selects one to develop. Several revisions of the design are made in response to only client input. Documentation showing the process in which the designs were created by the designer isn't provided.

Projects in which another party (such as a client...) has greater authority than the faculty member demonstrate a **low amount of creative control**. However, a person might be specially chosen/hired because they are highly ranked/sought after for their expertise at the particular task. Likewise, the work output might be distinctive in quality or quantity; the client/venue might be particularly prestigious. ... A candidate without creative control and/or input must present compelling, documented, evidence of factor(s) of distinction in order for that activity to rate higher evaluation. Examples of projects that may involve a low level of creative control:

- a. The faculty member provides technical advice and writes the code for [the product], but did not shape the idea for the project...

Service

Concrete expectations for service by rank

1. Professors are expected to take on significant service obligations with leadership roles. This includes serving on college and university committees as chair or being an officer of a professional group.
2. Associate Professors are expected to be active, but take on less demanding obligations than Professors. They do not have to fill leadership roles. Appropriate activities include serving on the Senate, serving on college and university committees, or significant involvement with professional groups;
3. Assistant Professors must devote some time to service on college committees, advising student groups or involvement with professional groups.
4. As a minimum, a... faculty member is expected to support the needs and help develop and fulfill the goals of [the] Department.

OR (an example from a different unit)

Service Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor ****

The faculty member shall demonstrate effective leadership in a consistent and successful record of service. At the associate level, the faculty member is actively contributing time, talents and effort to the effectiveness of the department, profession and community. The following are expectations to demonstrate this record of successful service:

1. Active contribution to the effective operation of the department through administrative duties, committee work, and/or assistance in other assigned areas.
2. Contribution to the efforts of the College and/or University through participation in committees, task forces or serving as a faculty advisor to student groups.
3. Participation in service to the profession by involvement in several of the following activities:
 - Membership in professional organizations

- *Attending professional meetings at the local, state and/or national levels*
- *Contributing to professional leadership at the local, state or national levels*
- *Volunteering time in professional organizations*
- *Pro bono professional service*
- *Participating in professional practice or consultation*
- *Involvement in community organizations in a role consistent with the profession*

4. *Participation in community service or service organizations*

- *Serving on community or organizational boards or councils*
- *Pro bono professional service that is meeting unmet needs*
- *Active volunteerism in public or private educational organizations and community activities*
- *Other (must give reason why the activity is included in the section)*

****Corresponding list provided for promotion to Full Professor

TPR Process

Detailed explanation of relative “weight” (or value) of teaching, research and service in TPR decisions

In keeping with College and University guidelines, teaching performance will be given the highest priority (50% weight), scholarship/creative production will be given second priority (40% weight); and service will be given third priority (10% weight). While each faculty member should seek to excel in the above three areas, for tenure, promotion and renewal all faculty must demonstrate at least satisfactory performance in each of these areas of responsibility.

OR (an example from another unit)

TEACHING (60% for tenure-track faculty & 80% for in-residence faculty)

Teaching is the highest priority amongst the three areas of assessment (teaching, scholarship and service). Teaching effectiveness will be based on student course evaluations, and teaching quality during the Fall and Spring semesters. With the faculty activity reports, faculty are to submit:

- *Signed and approved performance plan for 2023-2024*
- *PDF Student Course Evaluations for each Fall/Spring course - Detailed Reports and Comments*
- *Faculty Course Improvement Report/Reflection of Teaching for each semester*
- *A spreadsheet containing the letter grades given/earned by students for each Fall/Spring course for the following: Midterm, Pre-Final, and Final grades.*
- *Evidence that accreditation data has been prepared and submitted for courses taught.*

SCHOLARSHIP (10 to 30%) [Note: this range requires clarification]

Scholarship in [the Department] will be measured primarily based on the faculty member’s publication record, per the list below. Journal papers are valued more than conference papers. External proposals and grants are valued more than internal proposals and grants.

- *Textbooks and Chapters*
- *Quality Journal Papers*
- *Conference papers*
- *Grant Reports*
- *External research grants managed*
- *Internal research grants managed*
- *Students supported through research*
- *External grant proposals submitted*
- *Internal grant proposals submitted*
- *Student research projects and theses supervised*

- Collaboration and efforts to help colleagues
- Recognition and awards
- Other

SERVICE (10 to 30%) *[Note: this range requires clarification]*

The primary responsibility of the faculty is service to our students and the department, College and University. Relevancy and value of one's contributions to the department is of paramount importance. The focus is on leadership and active service. Some examples of service activities include:

- Department Leadership
- Student recruitment and placement
- Faculty Advisor to student organizations
- [Redacted] accreditation
- Development of on-line courses if not assigned as teaching load
- Academic advisement
- Outreach Programs/Efforts
- Leadership and significant participation in College and University committees
- [Designated community service agency service]
- Collaboration and efforts to help colleagues
- Recognition and Awards
- Other

Detailed explanation of what materials to submit for TPR, how to organize them, and when, where, and how to submit them

Procedures for Annual Evaluation: *Following are the procedures for the annual evaluation of each faculty member.*

1. Annual Performance Plan: *Each faculty member proposes plans for the academic year. At a conference held at the beginning of the year the faculty member and Chairperson identify specific goals and an Annual Performance Plan for the year...*

2. Initial Assessment of Annual Performance Plan: *The Chairperson and Dean provide each faculty member the Initial Assessment of Annual Performance Plan. Within the first two weeks of the fall semester, a faculty member may revise this APP until a satisfactory plan is developed.*

3. End-of-Year Assessment: *At the end of the faculty member's contract period, an End-of-Year Assessment shall be completed...This includes a conference between the faculty member and Chairperson in which the faculty member's performance for the past year is reviewed. Unless otherwise indicated, the following items shall be submitted by the faculty member and are required to complete the annual evaluation:*

- Completed Annual Performance Plan
- Initial Assessment of APP
- Chairperson's evaluation (provided by Chairperson)
- Classroom observations by Chairperson (optional)
- Self-Evaluation and supporting documentation
- Student evaluations
- Peer evaluations of research and/or creative production

4. Faculty Activity Reports: *Individual Faculty Activity Reports are due September 1 from the faculty member to the Dean; Faculty Activity Reports are due October 1 from the Dean to the Provost; faculty and staff evaluations are due November 1 from the Dean to the Provost.*

- [ADVANCE BU Note: Timetable of the relevant dates for submission and subsequent processes is also provided.]

OR (an example from another unit)

ORGANIZATION AND CONTENTS OF PROMOTION AND TENURE MATERIALS

- A. Title Page
- B. Table of Contents
- C. Application Information
 1. Nominee's Name
 2. Type of Action (check one)
 - ___ a. Advancement in Rank (check one)
 - ___ Professor
 - ___ Associate Professor
 - ___ Assistant Professor
 - ___ b. Tenure
 - Present Rank and Date of Rank _____
 - Previous Ranks and Dates of Rank _____
- D. Nominating Letter(s)
- E. Current Vita (Resume)
- F. Information Related to Teaching Evaluation
- G. Information Related to Research, Creative Activity, and Professional Development Evaluation
- H. Information Related to Service Evaluation

Information Related to Teaching Evaluation

1. Background
 - Critical Self-Evaluation: Teaching Philosophy and Specific Teaching Objectives
 - Teaching and Advising Responsibilities: Credit and Non-Credit Courses
2. Teaching Evaluations: In addition to information provided by course evaluation forms, these should include one or more of the following and possibly also additional items:
 - Summation of evaluations that were not given to current classes [e.g., evaluations given to all alumni who took class, of just majors after graduation, or some other group of present students or alumni (include copies of the forms used and state to whom they were directed)]
 - List of and copies of prepared (published or unpublished) teaching materials
 - List of activities furthering teaching (e.g., short courses, Chautauquas, and field courses)
 - Letters (solicited or unsolicited) from current or past students (specify group) evaluating teaching
 - Peer reviews by faculty and/or chair
 - Awards, special recognition or other indications of teaching competence

Information Related to Research, Creative Activity, and Professional Development Evaluation

1. Background
 - Past research/creativity interests and activities
 - Present research/creativity interests and activities
 - Future research/creativity interests and activities
2. Desirable Research Materials (in addition to publications, the applicant should include at least some of the following items, and possibly also some not mentioned)
 - List of publications or software
 - Copies ... of publications or software
 - List of grant proposals, copies of the proposals, and their status

- Lists of scholarly talks and poetry (prose) readings
- Lists of other activities (e.g., research, other creative activities, short courses, field courses, Chautauquas reviewing, serving as delegate, official, or editor for a scholarly group)
- Internal or external peer reviews or letters regarding research, creative production or professional development
- Awards, special recognition, or other indications of research competence and scholarship

Information Related to Service Evaluation

1. Committees (give names, function, applicant's level of involvement, and dates of service)
 - University
 - College
 - Department or institute
 - Interdepartmental
2. Administrative duties [give duty (duties), applicant's level of involvement, and date(s) of duty (duties)]
 - University
 - College
 - Department or institute
 - Interdepartmental
3. List and explain any other university service
4. List of service talks
5. List and explain service to local, national, and international community
6. Awards, special recognition, or other indications of significant service

Detailed explanation of membership of TPR review committee (ie. criteria for inclusion and means of selection)

Tenure and Promotion Committee Membership: The committee shall consist of three full-time tenured faculty members. The Chairperson of the Department ... is not a member of the committee but will attend the meetings of the committee to listen to the deliberations and provide factual information in support of these deliberations. These faculty members shall be elected by secret ballot of the full-time tenured faculty. The committee members will elect the Chair of the committee. If there are three or less full-time tenured faculty, these individuals will automatically be on the committee. In the event the department Tenure and Promotion Committee does not have three tenured members, the Dean shall appoint tenured faculty within the College...to bring the committee number to three...In this case, the Department Chair appoints the Chair of the evaluation Committee. In the event that the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee does not have three faculty holding the rank to which the individual aspires, the Dean shall appoint faculty of that rank or higher from within the ... College to bring the number to a minimum of three.

Detailed explanation of how votes are counted in TPR decisions

The Department Constitution requires a majority vote of the TPR for approval of tenure, promotion and renewal decisions. For all tenure, renewal, and promotion decisions, the Department Chair has the right to be a voting member of the Department Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Committee.

- [ADVANCE BU Note: Rules around voting vary considerably across the institution. Some units require a secret ballot; some require a simple majority; some regard a tie as a negative vote (which is problematic because research by Spitzmueller et. al 2023 demonstrates that faculty from underrepresented groups are more likely to receive split votes); but other units do not have these rules. Some units allow the department chair to vote on the committee, while others specify that the department chair shall not vote on the committee, since the department chair effectively “votes” with their formal assessment of the candidate. And some guidelines do not include any explanation of voting procedures.]

Detailed explanation of selecting external reviewers (when required)

The Department Chairperson, in consultation with the Department Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal Committee and the candidate, shall develop a list of 5-7 knowledgeable and impartial individuals to serve as potential reviewers. The goal shall be to obtain at least three letters. The list will be shared with the nominee. The faculty member has the right to reject external reviewers that he/she finds unacceptable. The candidate has the right to reject a total of three proposed reviewers. The nominee, the chair, and committee members shall state any conflict of interest with the reviewers. Examples of conflict of interest include, but are not limited to: family members, graduate school advisors or committee members, persons with whom the nominee, chair or committee members have or have had a close personal relationship, persons who have coauthored a publication or been a co-investigator with the candidate, chair or committee members...The Dean shall solicit agreement to serve as a reviewer from each of those selected as reviewers, and shall send a packet of information to all reviewers who agree to serve.

Detailed information (or links to) policies for accommodations, and pause in tenure clock

Candidates for tenure/promotion must notify the Department Chair by letter of their intent to apply by May 15 in the academic year that precedes their application. An individual cannot remain in the tenure track for more than seven years without being granted tenure, unless [an] extension of the probationary period has been granted (see Policy for Extending the Probationary Period in the Bradley University Faculty Handbook; <http://www.bradley.edu/academics/senate/handbook/>).

Other: Detailed articulation of “professionalism”

While we did not code for articulations of “professionalism,” several units do include language around expectations for professional behavior. This includes not only behaviors commonly understood as “collegiality,” but also ethical behavior, and behavior that contributes to the well-being of one’s unit, one’s students, and one’s colleagues. Other units may wish to add similar language to formally establish expectations around professionalism.

*The department faculty believes it is important to function in a professional manner... The faculty in the department have agreed upon a vision, toward which faculty should strive with respect to professional demeanor and ethical behavior. Taken together, these behaviors are identified as “professionalism.” Professionalism includes, but may not be limited to, the faculty member’s cooperation, responsiveness, integrity, ethics, reflective practices, observed and experienced interactions with others, accountability, taking responsibility, and willingness to expand and/or further develop one’s expertise and skills. Professionalism is subsumed within each of the three categories of faculty assessment: teaching, scholarly activity, and service. **A faculty member demonstrates professionalism through . . .***

- *advocating for the department and its programs*
- *being accountable to department faculty, staff, and students*
- *collaborating with others to enhance opportunities for learning*
- *contributing to the profession through publication, presentation, etc.*
- *demonstrating appreciation and respect for diversity and equity, including international connections*
- *demonstrating concern for effective communication with all constituents*

- *demonstrating empathy and caring for others*
- *devising, developing, and implementing appropriate and effective professional development plans for themselves*
- *exhibiting and practicing appropriate professional and ethical behavior*
- *valuing scholarship and research about [the discipline]*

*Just as expectations of senior faculty in teaching, scholarly activity, and service are greater than those for junior faculty, the bar for senior faculty professionalism is set higher. **In addition to the above, senior faculty should be expected to demonstrate professionalism by ...***

- *advocating for junior faculty as appropriate*
- *continually working to develop and practice a productive leadership style*
- *recognizing and utilizing appropriate lines of governance on issues needing addressed*
- *progressing in the following sequence: internal to external, with internal being department, college, and university and external being community and profession*
- *serving as an appropriate role model for junior faculty*
- *willingness to actively assume responsibilities of leadership that enhance the functioning of the department and its programs*
- *willingness to actively assume responsibilities of leadership that relieve undue burden on junior faculty*

Other: Clarification of relative weight of teaching and scholarship

Campus surveys (2018, 2024) demonstrate a perception among faculty that, contrary to language in the *Handbook* (which prioritizes teaching over scholarship), in reality research and creative production are weighted more heavily than teaching in tenure and promotion decisions (especially for promotion to Full Professor). For instance, when we asked Associate Professors in 2024 whether they intend to apply for promotion within five years, only half of women replied “Yes,” with one respondent commenting “I feel like the cards are stacked against me. The process feels like it ONLY evaluates scholarship. Since my focus has been on teaching, service, and other important roles at the institution, my scholarship isn't strong enough,” and another noted “The university pretends that promotion is achievable for all but the statistics reveal that this is false.”

To remedy this, ADVANCE BU recommends one of the following:

- That the Senate clarify *Handbook* language regarding the relative “weight” of teaching and research/creative production. It currently gives “highest priority” to teaching, but in practice, research/creative production is often the most important factor, particularly for promotion to Full Professor. In exemplar language from another institution (Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne--below), faculty applying for promotion to Associate or Full Professor must document satisfactory performance in both areas (teaching and research/creative production) AND a record of excellence in at least one area.
- Alternatively, change *Faculty Handbook* language to affirms that research/creative production is weighted more heavily in TPR decisions, which is typically the perception of current practices.
 - [Note that the Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne guidelines also allow for the possibility of applying for promotion on the basis of service, but they advise faculty that service will seldom be seen as a “stand-alone” basis on which to build a case for promotion to Full Professor. Some universities are now incorporating the “Scholarship of Institution Building” as a form of applied scholarship for high-level service and leadership activities that entail the application of scholarly expertise for the purpose of building or transforming institutional structures and processes.]

Criteria for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

All of the criteria which apply to the demonstration of satisfactory performance in all areas in teaching, research/scholarship, and service must be demonstrated again with one's activities since the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Thus, the candidate must meet these minimum standards in their work that has not been considered for their previous promotion to Associate Professor. In addition to demonstrating satisfactory performance in all areas, the candidate must demonstrate that they have a record of excellence in one of the areas of faculty productivity; teaching, scholarship, or service in their accomplishments since their promotion to Associate Professor.

1. Excellence in Teaching

If teaching is selected by the candidate as the area of demonstrated excellence, he/she must fulfill as a minimum in this regard the department standards for reappointment, and in addition, should furnish evidence of teaching effectiveness beyond those required for tenure. As stated in [University guidelines]: "if [teaching is] the primary basis for promotion to Professor the candidate should not only have established a record of excellent teaching but also have contributed to the general improvement of instruction at [the University] or in the discipline." This may include the form of student's work in the course which provides evidence of meeting course learning objectives statements from peers of teaching effectiveness, student evaluation which provide students' self-assessment of their performance in meeting the course learning objectives, letters from former students attesting to the candidate's teaching effectiveness (unsolicited letters preferred), as well as awards and citations that are based upon demonstrated effective teaching. Employing and documenting the results of multiple methods of evaluation is considered a cardinal principle for demonstrating satisfactory performance in teaching, and/or excellence. The candidate for promotion based upon excellence in teaching must also demonstrate their teaching excellence by means of their contributions in the area of course and curriculum improvement and in the contributions to the teaching [in their discipline] by means of the publication of articles, chapters in edited volumes, textbooks, or other pedagogical material used to advance the teaching [in their field].

2. Excellence in Research or Scholarship

If the candidate selects research as the area of demonstrated excellence, they must normally fulfill one of the following minimal requirements: (1) a published book or a book length manuscript accepted for publication as determined by the peer review process noted previously in this document and which advances the knowledge of the discipline; (2) a minimum of four quality articles published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed scholarly journals, or as chapters in peer review edited volumes which advances the knowledge of the discipline. In the case of applied research reports that are not published in peer reviewed publication, the candidate should be sure to work with the department chairperson to submit these reports for evaluation using the peer reviewed process noted above. The quality of applied work may also be demonstrated by how the report was used by the client. This information should also be included in the information submitted to peer reviewers of the report. In addition to the peer review process as a measure of quality, some common measures of research quality should be specified; for example, impact of journal, acceptance rate of journal, reprint history, and author citation rates. Also, faculty should provide an English translation of all works not originally composed in English. Furthermore, candidates must demonstrate that they have achieved a national or international reputation in their areas of scholarly expertise. This can be demonstrated by presenting information as to the impact of one's scholarship upon an area or subarea of the discipline. Where published work is co-authored, the candidate must submit a letter from co-authors noting the nature of the collaborative work.

3. Excellence in Service

The guidelines suggested for demonstrating satisfactory performance in university, professional, and community service are of the same general order as those set forth for reappointment. However, the candidate for promotion to professor would be well advised not to depend too heavily upon service as a primary or "stand alone" basis for requesting promotion.

Excellence in service within the university system shall include the candidate demonstrating leadership roles in system, university, school, or departmental committees that have achieved noteworthy accomplishments as designated by the sponsoring organization. Evidence for excellence in service to the profession or community shall include the candidate demonstrating noteworthy contributions to professional organizations, reviewing of scholarly materials (e.g., journal articles, books, grants), or professionally related activities in the community. Evaluations by professional peers shall serve as an important source of information about the candidate's noteworthy service contributions. All service accomplishments accumulated by the candidate since the promotion to Associate Professor is to be the basis of one's case for promotion to the rank of professor."

Appendix 3: One Bradley Unit's Application of Boyer's Expanded Model of Scholarship

The Department of [redacted] accepts and supports the expanded concept of scholarship first proposed by Ernest Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered*, and refined in *Scholarship Assessed*, which includes: 1) the scholarship of discovery, 2) the scholarship of teaching and learning, 3) the scholarship of application and 4) and the scholarship of integration. These categories of scholarship are defined as follows:

Scholarship of Discovery - where new and unique knowledge is generated. Some working definitions of varieties of discovery research include empirical, qualitative, and quantitative research; the creation of original works of art; historical research; theory development; methodological studies; and philosophical inquiry. Examples of documentation of the quality of Scholarship of Discovery:

- peer-reviewed publications of research, theory, or philosophical essays;
- presentation of research, theory, or philosophical essays;
- grant awards in support of research or scholarship;
- mentoring of junior colleagues in research or scholarship;
- publicly presented productions, readings, or stagings of original work;
- institutional, state, regional, national, or international recognition as a scholar in an identified area;
- positive critical or peer evaluations of the body of work.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning - where the teacher creatively builds bridges between his or her own understanding and the student's learning. Some manifestations of varieties of scholarship of teaching include knowledge of the discipline or specialty applied in teaching/learning; development of innovative teaching and evaluation methods; program development and learning outcome evaluation; and professional role modeling. Examples of documentation of the quality of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:

- peer-reviewed publications of research related to teaching methodology or learning;
- outcomes, case studies related to teaching-learning, learning theory development, and development or testing of educational models or theories;
- authorship of accreditation or other comprehensive program reports;
- successful application of technology to teaching and learning;
- positive peer assessments of innovations in teaching;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master teacher;
- published textbooks or other learning aids;
- grant awards in support of teaching and learning;
- design of outcome studies or evaluation/assessment programs;
- presentations related to teaching and learning.

Scholarship of Application - where the emphasis is on the use of new knowledge in practical arenas. Components of the scholarship of application include the [presentation or performance of work in the discipline]; application of evaluative or research skills that advance the [discipline] and are used in the evaluation of institutions or departments; development of quality indicators, and of innovative [professional] delivery models; professional development; and service directly related to the ... specialty of the faculty member and flows from professional activity. Examples of documentation of the quality of Scholarship of Application:

- consultation reports;
- products, patents, license copyrights;
- reports compiling and analyzing [professional] outcomes in institutions or departments;
- peer reviews of practice;
- presentations related to practice;
- reports based on meta-analysis related to practice problems;
- policy papers related to practice;
- grant awards in support of [professional practice];

- *state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master [professional in the field];*
- *professional certifications, degrees, and other specialty credentials;*
- *critically or peer-reviewed productions, performances, publications of research, case studies, or other practice issues.*

Scholarship of Integration - where new relationships among disciplines are discovered. Works that would be recognized in the scholarship of integration include interfaces between [our discipline] and a variety of disciplines; integrative reviews of the disciplinary literature ... and related areas of study in relation to other fields; analysis of governmental policy in [our disciplinary realm]; development of interdisciplinary educational programs and service projects; studies of ... organizations and institutions [related to our discipline]; original interdisciplinary research; and the development of integrative models or paradigms across disciplines. Examples of documentation of the quality of Scholarship of Integration:

- *peer-reviewed publications of research, policy analysis, case studies, integrative reviews of the literature, and others;*
- *copyrights, licenses, patents, or products for sale;*
- *published books;*
- *positive peer evaluations of contributions to integrative scholarship;*
- *reports of interdisciplinary programs or service projects;*
- *interdisciplinary grant awards;*
- *scholarly presentations at disciplinary or interdisciplinary meetings;*
- *policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments.*

Appendix 4: Example Tenure and Promotion Roadmap

This is for illustrative purposes only. The specific expectations may vary by discipline. (Continued on next page)

Area	Assistant Professor First Year Expectations	Assistant Professor Year 3 Expectations	Assistant Professor Years 5 and 6 Expectations	Promotion to Full Professor (Year 7+)
Teaching	<p>Produces clear and detailed syllabi and course materials.</p> <p>Incorporates assignments and assessments closely tied to course objectives.</p> <p>Participates in professional development related to teaching.</p> <p>Completes course administration tasks (such as submitting grades) in a timely manner.</p> <p>Is accessible and responsive to students outside of the classroom.</p>	<p>In addition to First Year expectations, by Year 3, the faculty member will have incorporated feedback from student evaluations and peer/chair observations (and ideally from professional development) into course design. Specifically, any areas of concern have shown improvement.</p> <p>Also, by Year 3, the faculty member will have adequate knowledge of program requirements to advise majors and minors in the discipline.</p>	<p>In addition to Year 3 expectations, by Years 5 and 6 the faculty member will have contributed to curricular development, revision, or innovation in the unit or discipline.</p> <p>Also, by Years 5 and 6, evaluations by students and observations by peers/chair will indicate a high degree of teaching competence (including up-to-date knowledge of the course subject matter).</p> <p>Finally, by Years 5 and 6, the faculty member will have assumed advising duties.</p>	<p>In addition to the expectations for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a Full Professor will have a consistent record of positive feedback from faculty and peers/chair; will have regularly updated course materials to stay current with discipline); and will have taken a leading role in curricular development and/or advising.</p>

Area	Assistant Professor First Year Expectations	Assistant Professor Year 3 Expectations	Assistant Professor Years 5 and 6 Expectations	Promotion to Full Professor (Year 7+)
Research/Creative Production	<p>Develop plan for producing and disseminating research/creative production over the probationary period.</p> <p>Actively participate in research/creative activities that result in discernable output. At a minimum, this would include drafts, advanced outlines, or other works in progress. Ideally, it would include at least one work submitted for peer review and another draft/in-progress work, and participation in one professional conference.</p>	<p>By the start of Year 3, the faculty member should have at least one peer-reviewed work published (or otherwise publicly presented, for creative or applied work); another work completed and submitted for peer-review; and another work in draft or advanced outline form.</p> <p>Additionally, the faculty member will have presented their work publicly at one or more academic conferences or in other appropriate professional settings.</p>	<p>By Years 5 and 6, the faculty member will have published at least three peer-reviewed articles (one or more as sole or lead author), and will show evidence (in the form of drafts or advanced outlines) of ongoing scholarly endeavors.</p> <p>The faculty member will have a record of regularly disseminating (an <i>average</i> of at least once per service year) their scholarship through peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, and other professional venues.</p> <p>The faculty member will have applied for external funding to support ongoing scholarly endeavors (if applicable).</p>	<p>The candidate for Full Professor will regularly (an <i>average</i> of at least once per service year) disseminate their scholarship through peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, and other professional venues, with at least three peer-reviewed works published since promotion to Associate.</p> <p>Will have achieved regional, national or international recognition from professional peers in the form of: invited presentations at professional meetings; invitations to serve as external reviewer for academic programs, scholarly works, TPR cases, state or federal grants, or graduate theses; receipt of professional awards or honors; and/or invitations from media outlets to comment on areas of expertise.</p> <p>Will show evidence of facilitating the advancement of junior faculty in research/creative production.</p>
Service	<p>Will actively participate in departmental meetings and familiarize themselves with unit, College, and University requirements, policies and procedures.</p>	<p>By Year 3, the faculty member will have served on one departmental committee OR served as a member of one college or university committee or as advisor to a student organization.</p>	<p>By Years 5 and 6, the faculty member will have served on at least one departmental committee AND served as a member of one college or university committee or as advisor to a student organization.</p>	<p>The candidate for Full Professor will have a record of consistent service (an <i>average</i> of one service commitment per service year) to the unit, College and/or University, AND will have assumed leadership duties in one or more of those service roles.</p>